

FY 2008 HOPE VI REVITALIZATION NOFA

SIDE BY SIDE COMPARISON WITH 2007 NOFA

The following table summarizes the differences between the Fiscal Year 2008 HOPE VI Revitalization Notice of Funding Availability (“NOFA”) issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) on March 26, 2008, and the Fiscal Year 2007 HOPE VI Revitalization NOFA issued by HUD on July 31, 2007. The 2008 NOFA anticipates the award of approximately \$97.6 million among four to five successful grant applications.

Important dates

Application due date: June 20, 2008

Date funds must be expended: September 30, 2013

The entire 2008 NOFA, brief summary of key issues in the HOPE VI NOFA, and related information is available at www.renocavanaugh.com. If you have any additional questions, please contact Jennifer Alpha, Esq., at jalpha@renocavanaugh.com, or any other attorney in our firm.

	2007	2008
<p>Purpose/ Objectives</p> <p>2008 NOFA Section I.A.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the living environment for public housing residents of severely distressed public housing projects through the demolition, rehabilitation, reconfiguration, or replacement of obsolete public housing projects (or portions thereof); 2. Revitalize sites (including remaining public housing dwelling units) on which public housing projects are located and contribute to the improvement of the surrounding neighborhood; 3. Provide public housing that will avoid or decrease the concentration of very low-income families; and 4. Build sustainable communities. 	<p>All items are the same.</p>
<p>Award Information</p> <p>2008 NOFA Section II.A.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed Rescission of Funds: the FY 2007 budget proposes the rescission of 2006 HOPE VI funds, and thus awards made under this NOFA may not ultimately be funded. 2. Revitalization Grants: there will be approximately four awards totaling no more than \$94.52 million. 3. Housing Choice Voucher Assistance (Section 8 Assistance): HCV assistance is available from the tenant protection voucher fund to applicants that receive a Revitalization award. Applications must be prepared in accordance with PIH Notice 2007-10. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deleted. No rescission of funds language included. 2. Revitalization Grants: There will be approximately four – five awards totaling no more than \$97.6 million. 3. Same.

	2007	2008
	<p>4. Grant Term: the period for completion may not exceed 54 months from the date the NOFA award is executed by HUD.</p>	<p>4. Same.</p>
<p>Units Qualifying as Replacement Units</p> <p>2008 NOFA Section I.C.2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public Housing rental units; ▪ Eligible homeownership units under Section 24(d)(1)(J) of the 1937 Act; and ▪ Housing Choice Voucher assistance that does not exceed the number of units demolished and/or disposed of at the targeted public housing project. 	<p>All items are the same.</p>
<p>Funding Restrictions</p> <p>2008 NOFA Section IV.E.</p>	<p>1. Statutory Time Limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Required obligation date is on or before September 30, 2007. b. Funds must be expended by September 30, 2012. <p>2. Ineligible Activities. Funds may not be used for activities carried out on or before the date of the letter announcing the award; for units that do not qualify as public housing or homeownership replacement units; or for retail, commercial, or non-public housing office facilities.</p> <p>3. Total Development Cost (TDC):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The total cost of development, including relocation, is limited to the sum of (a) Up to 100% of TDC limits for the cost of demolition & new construction multiplied by the number of replacement units; and (b) 90% of TDC limits multiplied by number of public housing units after substantial rehabilitation and reconfiguration. (2) The TDC limit for a project is made up of the Housing Cost Cap (HCC) and Community Renewal (CR). (3) CSS: Applicants may request an amount up to 15% of the total HOPE VI grant to pay the costs of Community & Supportive Services (CSS) activities (these costs are excluded from the TDC calculation) (4) Demolition and Site Remediation: Applicants may request an amount necessary for demolition and site remediation costs of units that will not be replaced on-site (these costs are 	<p>1. Statutory Time Limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Required obligation date is on or before September 30, 2008. b. Funds must be expended by September 30, 2013. <p>2. Same.</p> <p>3. Same, and adds that funds may not be requested for units that are already completed as of the application deadline.</p>

	2007	2008
<p>Funding Restrictions</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section IV.E.</p>	<p>excluded from the TDC calculation). (5) Extraordinary Site Costs: Applicants may request a reasonable amount to pay costs related to unusual pre-existing site conditions, including environmental abatement and removal of hazardous site conditions and lead-based paint (these costs are excluded from the TDC calculation).</p> <p>4. Cost Control Standards: Hard development costs must be realistic, and soft costs must meet HUD's Cost Control and Safe Harbor Standards. HUD will delete unallowable items from budget and may reduce grant award accordingly.</p> <p>5. Withdrawal of Grant Amounts: HUD may withdraw unobligated funds if the grantee does not proceed within a reasonable time frame. HUD will redistribute any withdrawn amounts to one or more other applicants eligible for HOPE VI assistance or to one or more other entities capable of proceeding expeditiously in the same locality in carrying out the Revitalization plan of the original grantee.</p>	<p>4. Same.</p> <p>5. Same.</p>
<p>Threshold Requirements (Non-Curable)</p> <p>2008 NOFA Section III.C.2.</p>	<p>1. Submit up to two (2) HOPE VI applications, each targeting a different public housing property. § III.C.2.b(1).</p> <p>2. Demonstrate the appropriateness of the proposal. § III.C.2.b(2)</p> <p>3. Each application proposing revitalization of more than one PH development may target only contiguous sites or sites within ¼ mile of each other. Applicants must provide a city map for reference. § II.C.2.b(3).</p> <p>4. Include in applications proposing revitalization of a scattered site project only sites in a one mile radius, or proof that the targeted sites are located within the hard edges of a neighborhood. Applicants must provide a city map for reference. § III.C.2.b(3)(2).</p> <p>5. Applicants may submit a Revitalization application that targets part of a project that is being or has been revitalized or replaced under a HOPE VI grant.</p>	<p>1. Submit only one (1) HOPE VI application per applicant. § III.C.2.b(1).</p> <p>2. Same. § III.C.2.b(2)</p> <p>3. Same, and removes requirement that public housing projects may not be disposed of, as of the application deadline date. § III.C.2.b(3).</p> <p>4. Same. § III.C.2.b(3)(b).</p> <p>5. Same + cannot request HOPE VI funds for units that are already completed. § III.C.2.b(4).</p>

	2007	2008
<p>Threshold Requirements (Non-Curable)</p> <p>2008 NOFA Section III.C.2.b</p>	<p>Applicants may not apply for new HOPE VI funds for units in the project that were funded by the existing HOPE VI revitalization grant which are used to achieve significant revitalization of units even if those funds are inadequate to pay the costs to revitalize or replace all of the targeted units. Applicants must provide a listing of which units were funded previously, and which are proposed for funding. Funds cannot be requested for units already under construction § III.C.2.b(4).</p> <p>6. Demonstrate in applications to revitalize only portions of a development that the housing is sufficiently separable from the remainder of the project to make use of the building(s) feasible for revitalization and that the remaining properties will not have a negative impact on the revitalized buildings. Roads are considered “separable.” § III.C.2.b(5).</p> <p>7. Compliance with any desegregation or other Fair Housing-related court order. § III.C.2.b(6)</p> <p>8. Compliance with Fair Housing Civil Rights laws. § III.C.2.b(8)</p> <p>9. No delinquent federal debts on date of application. § III.C.2.b(9)</p> <p>10. No Debarment or suspension. § III.C.2.b(10)</p> <p>11. Default. Existing HOPE VI Grantees who have received a letter from HUD indicating default status under their HOPE VI grants and have not resolved the issues are ineligible for funding. § III.C.2.b(11).</p>	<p>6. Same. § III.C.2.b(5).</p> <p>7. Same. § III.C.2.b(6).</p> <p>8. Same. § III.C.2.b(8).</p> <p>9. Same. § III.C.2.b(9).</p> <p>10. Same. § III.C.2.b(10).</p> <p>11. Same. § III.C.2.b(11).</p> <p>12. NEW SECTION: § III.C.2.b(12).</p> <p>Site Control – moved and expanded from curable thresholds.</p> <p>For off-site housing developed in any phase of proposed revitalization plan (regardless of financing type), you must provide evidence in your application that you as the PHA, your PHA’s instrumentality, or your developer (including when any of these three entities are part of a partnership that will own the property(ies)), have site control of every property. For the developer to count, the developer must be under a contract, or some equivalent form of predevelopment agreement, with you that dedicates the off-site property(ies) for the uses proposed in your revitalization plan. If you propose to</p>

	2007	2008
<p>Threshold Requirements (Non-Curable)</p> <p>2008 NOFA Section III.C.2.b</p>		<p>develop off-site housing and you do not provide acceptable evidence of site control, your entire application will be disqualified from further consideration for funding.</p> <p>(a) Site control documentation may only be contingent upon (i) The receipt of the HOPE VI grant; (ii) Satisfactory compliance with the environmental review requirements of this NOFA; (iii) The site and neighborhood standards in section III.C.3. of this NOFA; and (iv) Standard underwriting procedures.</p> <p>(b) If you demonstrate site control through an option to purchase, the option must extend for at least 180 days after the application deadline date.</p> <p>(c) Evidence may include, but is not limited to, an option to purchase the property, a sales agreement, a land swap, a deed, or a ground lease. Evidence, however, may NOT include a letter from the mayor or other official, letters of support from members of the relevant municipal entities, or a resolution evidencing the PHA's intent to exercise its power of eminent domain.</p> <p>(d) If one or more of your off-site parcels are a public housing property, you still must provide evidence of site control for those properties.</p> <p>(e) Include documented evidence of site control in your attachments.</p>
<p>Threshold Requirements (General)</p> <p>2008 NOFA Section III.C.2</p>	<p>Applications must meet all threshold requirements in order to be rated and ranked. If an application does not meet all threshold requirements, HUD will not consider the application as eligible for funding and will not rate and rank it. HUD will screen for technical deficiencies and administer a cure period. If an applicant does not cure all its technical deficiencies that relate to threshold requirements within the cure period, HUD will consider the threshold(s) in question to be failed, will not consider the application as eligible for funding, and will not rate and rank</p>	<p>Same, except adds that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The "match" requirements listed under III.B. are threshold requirements (not identified whether curable or not): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicants must have in place a match in the amount of 5 % of the requested grant amount in cash or in-kind donations to be considered for funding - Applicants that proposing use more than 5% of HOPE VI grant for CSS

	2007	2008
	it.	<p>must have in place funds (cash or in-kind donations) from sources other than HOPE VI that match the amount between 5 and 15% of the grant to used for CSS . These resources do not need to be new commitments in order to be counted for match.</p> <p>■ Clarifications or corrections of technical deficiencies, in accordance with the information provided by HUD must be submitted within 7 calendar days of the date of receipt of the HUD notification. (If the deadline date falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, your correction must be received by HUD on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday.)</p>
<p>Threshold Requirements (Curable)</p> <p>2008 NOFA Section III.C.2.a</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certification by engineer or architect that project is severely distressed. § III.C.2.a(1). 2. Evidence of PHA's ownership or option to own any proposed off-site locations with added requirement that even off-site public housing requires evidence of control. § III.C.2.a(2). 3. Certify that all necessary land use approvals are secured. § III.C.2.a(3) 4. Certify that (a) you have initiated an RFQ by the application due date for the competitive procurement of a developer or that (b) you will act as your own developer. HUD reserves the right to rescind the grant if recipients later change developers and/or decide to not serve as their own developer. § III.C.2.a(4). 5. Certify (a) that a Relocation Plan has been created in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act (URA), or (b) that relocation has been completed in compliance with the URA. § III.C.2.a(5). 6. Certify that at least one resident training session & at least 3 public meetings were held. § III.C.2.a(6) 7. CFFP: A PHA with an approved or submitted capital fund financing proposal (CFFP) must also: (1) include legal opinion that the HOPE VI activities are permitted under its CFFP documents and (2) certify that to the extent demo proposed under the HOPE VI program 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Same. § III.C.2.a(1). 2. Deleted. This is now a non-curable threshold requirement. 3. Same. § III.C.2.a(2). 4. Same. § III.C.2.a(3). 5. Same. § III.C.2.a(4). 6. Same. § III.C.2.a(5) 7. Same and adds to the demo certification that the PHA must make this certification even if the proposal has already been approved. § III.C.2.a(8)

	2007	2008
	would reduce debt service coverage ratio (DCR) below the HUD approved level, the PHA will defease, redeem, or otherwise prepay the CFFP financing sufficient to maintain the required DSR § III.C.2.a(9).	
<p>Eligible Revitalization Activities</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section III.C.1.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relocation (see Sections III.C. and V.A. of the NOFA for relocation requirements). 2. Demolition. 3. Disposition. 4. Rehabilitation & physical improvement of public housing and/or community facilities for CSS. 5. Development of (1) public housing replacement units and (2) other units (e.g., market rate units) provided a need exists for such units and such development is performed w/ non-public housing funds. 6. Assistance involving the rehabilitation and development of homeownership units. Assistance may include (1) down payment or closing cost assistance; (2) second mortgages; or (3) construction or permanent financing for new construction, acquisition, or rehabilitation costs related to homeownership replacement units. 7. Acquisition of (1) rental and homeownership units; (2) land for off-site replacement units and community facilities; and (3) land for economic development-related activities. 8. Necessary management improvements including transitional security activities. 9. Administration, planning technical assistance, and other activities that are related to the implementation of the Revitalization Plan. 10. CSS activities designed to promote upward mobility, self-sufficiency and improved quality of life for residents of the public housing project. 11. Leveraging other resources, including additional housing resources, supportive services, job creation, and other economic development uses. 	All items are the same.

Rating Factors 2007 NOFA Section V.A.	2006 total possible points = 125	2007 total possible points = 125
<p>Rating Factor 1 (Capacity)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A. 1</p>	<p>Capacity</p> <p>23 points</p> <p>a. Capacity of Development Team (5 points). Full points awarded if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer & other team members have extensive, recent & successful experience in activities comparable to HOPE VI; 2. Developer & other team members have extensive, recent & successful experience in planning, implementing and managing Capital Fund program projects; 3. LIHTCs are proposed and applicant, Developer or other Team members have relevant tax credit experience; and 4. Homeownership, rent-to-own, cooperative ownership or other major development components are proposed and applicant, Developer or other team members have relevant successful experience in such development activities. <p>b. Development Capacity of Applicant (5 points). This element looks at the development capacity of only the applicant. Full points awarded if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant has extensive, recent & successful experience in activities comparable to HOPE VI; 2. Applicant has extensive, recent & successful experience in planning, implementing and managing Capital Fund program projects; 3. Applicant demonstrates that physical development activities will proceed within 18 months of the grant award, and Applicant provides a program schedule. 	<p>Capacity</p> <p>23 points</p> <p>a. Criteria are the same but clarifies that this rating factor looks at the capacity of the development team SEPARATE FROM the applicant. Also, if homeownership, rent-to-own, cooperative ownership or other major development components are proposed then HUD will also look to see that the developer's and team member's experience is recent within the last 5 years.</p> <p>b. Same.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Same. 2. Same. 3. Deleted. <p>The following were added as 3rd and 4th criteria under this Rating Factor: If you propose development using low-income tax credits, your PHA staff, separate</p>

<p>Rating Factor 1 (Capacity)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.1</p>	<p>c. Capacity of Existing HOPE VI (only applies to applicants who have previously received HOPE VI grants for fiscal years 1993-2003 and excluding FY 2004, 2005, and 2006 grants): Remainder the same.</p> <p>Up to 5 points will be lost if grantee has failed to achieve adequate progress in relation to cumulative unit production goals as indicated in chart below:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>% OBLIGATED</th> <th>POINTS DEDUCTED</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Grants Awarded in FY 1993-1999</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less than 100</td> <td>5 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Grants Awarded in FY 2000</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>90-100 Percent</td> <td>0 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>80 -89 Percent</td> <td>1 Point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>75 -79 Percent</td> <td>2 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70 - 74 Percent</td> <td>3 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65 - 69 Percent</td> <td>4 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less than 65 Percent</td> <td>5 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Grants Awarded in FY 2001</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>80–100 Percent</td> <td>0 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70-79 Percent</td> <td>1 Point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60-69 Percent</td> <td>2 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50-59 Percent</td> <td>3 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40-49 Percent</td> <td>4 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less than 40 Percent</td> <td>5 Points</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	% OBLIGATED	POINTS DEDUCTED	<i>Grants Awarded in FY 1993-1999</i>		Less than 100	5 Points	<i>Grants Awarded in FY 2000</i>		90-100 Percent	0 Points	80 -89 Percent	1 Point	75 -79 Percent	2 Points	70 - 74 Percent	3 Points	65 - 69 Percent	4 Points	Less than 65 Percent	5 Points	<i>Grants Awarded in FY 2001</i>		80–100 Percent	0 Points	70-79 Percent	1 Point	60-69 Percent	2 Points	50-59 Percent	3 Points	40-49 Percent	4 Points	Less than 40 Percent	5 Points	<p>from your team, should have relevant tax credit experience; and If homeownership, rent-to-own, cooperative ownership, or other major development components are proposed, your PHA staff, separate from your team, has relevant, recent (within the last 5 years) and successful experience in development, sales, or conversion activities.</p> <p>c. Capacity of Existing HOPE VI (only applies to applicants who have previously received HOPE VI grants for fiscal years 1993-2004 and excluding FY 2005, 2006 and 2007 grants): Remainder the same.</p> <p>Up to 5 points will be lost if grantee has failed to achieve adequate progress in relation to cumulative unit production goals as indicated in chart below:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>% OBLIGATED</th> <th>POINTS DEDUCTED</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Grants Awarded in FY 1993-2000</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less than 100</td> <td>5 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Grants Awarded in FY 2001</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>90-100 Percent</td> <td>0 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>80 -89 Percent</td> <td>1 Point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>75 -79 Percent</td> <td>2 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70 - 74 Percent</td> <td>3 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65 - 69 Percent</td> <td>4 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less than 65 Percent</td> <td>5 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Grants Awarded in FY 2002</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>80–100 Percent</td> <td>0 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70-79 Percent</td> <td>1 Point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60-69 Percent</td> <td>2 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50-59 Percent</td> <td>3 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40-49 Percent</td> <td>4 Points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less than 40 Percent</td> <td>5 Points</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	% OBLIGATED	POINTS DEDUCTED	<i>Grants Awarded in FY 1993-2000</i>		Less than 100	5 Points	<i>Grants Awarded in FY 2001</i>		90-100 Percent	0 Points	80 -89 Percent	1 Point	75 -79 Percent	2 Points	70 - 74 Percent	3 Points	65 - 69 Percent	4 Points	Less than 65 Percent	5 Points	<i>Grants Awarded in FY 2002</i>		80–100 Percent	0 Points	70-79 Percent	1 Point	60-69 Percent	2 Points	50-59 Percent	3 Points	40-49 Percent	4 Points	Less than 40 Percent	5 Points
% OBLIGATED	POINTS DEDUCTED																																																																					
<i>Grants Awarded in FY 1993-1999</i>																																																																						
Less than 100	5 Points																																																																					
<i>Grants Awarded in FY 2000</i>																																																																						
90-100 Percent	0 Points																																																																					
80 -89 Percent	1 Point																																																																					
75 -79 Percent	2 Points																																																																					
70 - 74 Percent	3 Points																																																																					
65 - 69 Percent	4 Points																																																																					
Less than 65 Percent	5 Points																																																																					
<i>Grants Awarded in FY 2001</i>																																																																						
80–100 Percent	0 Points																																																																					
70-79 Percent	1 Point																																																																					
60-69 Percent	2 Points																																																																					
50-59 Percent	3 Points																																																																					
40-49 Percent	4 Points																																																																					
Less than 40 Percent	5 Points																																																																					
% OBLIGATED	POINTS DEDUCTED																																																																					
<i>Grants Awarded in FY 1993-2000</i>																																																																						
Less than 100	5 Points																																																																					
<i>Grants Awarded in FY 2001</i>																																																																						
90-100 Percent	0 Points																																																																					
80 -89 Percent	1 Point																																																																					
75 -79 Percent	2 Points																																																																					
70 - 74 Percent	3 Points																																																																					
65 - 69 Percent	4 Points																																																																					
Less than 65 Percent	5 Points																																																																					
<i>Grants Awarded in FY 2002</i>																																																																						
80–100 Percent	0 Points																																																																					
70-79 Percent	1 Point																																																																					
60-69 Percent	2 Points																																																																					
50-59 Percent	3 Points																																																																					
40-49 Percent	4 Points																																																																					
Less than 40 Percent	5 Points																																																																					

<p>Rating Factor 1 (Capacity)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.1</p>	<p><i>Grants Awarded in FY 2002</i></p> <p>60–100 Percent 0 Points</p> <p>50-59 Percent 1 Point</p> <p>40-49 Percent 2 Points</p> <p>30-39 Percent 3 Points</p> <p>20-29 Percent 4 Points</p> <p>Less than 20 Percent 5 Points</p>	<p><i>Grants Awarded in FY 2003</i></p> <p>60–100 Percent 0 Points</p> <p>50-59 Percent 1 Point</p> <p>40-49 Percent 2 Points</p> <p>30-39 Percent 3 Points</p> <p>20-29 Percent 4 Points</p> <p>Less than 20 Percent 5 Points</p>
	<p><i>Grants Awarded in FY 2003</i></p> <p>25–100 Percent 0 Points</p> <p>20 -24 Percent 1 Point</p> <p>15 - 19 Percent 2 Points</p> <p>10 - 14 Percent 3 Points</p> <p>5 - 9 Percent 4 Points</p> <p>Less than 5 Percent 5 Points</p>	<p><i>Grants Awarded in FY 2004</i></p> <p>25–100 Percent 0 Points</p> <p>20 -24 Percent 1 Point</p> <p>15 - 19 Percent 2 Points</p> <p>10 - 14 Percent 3 Points</p> <p>5 - 9 Percent 4 Points</p> <p>Less than 5 Percent 5 Points</p>
	<p>d. CSS Program Capacity (3 points). Point distribution is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Successful, recent in-house CSS experience (if applicant proposes to run program in-house) or Team member proposed to run CSS program has qualifications & experience. (2 points) 2. Demonstration by existing HOPE VI grantee (if applicable) that proposed CSS Team will be adequate to implement a new program without weakening existing Team or applicant has no existing HOPE VI grant and will automatically receive point. (1 point) 	<p>d. Same.</p>
	<p>e. Property Management Capacity (3 points) Point distribution is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Past Property Management Experience. (2 points) (2) Submission of detailed Property Management Plan. (1 point) 	<p>e. Same.</p>
	<p>f. PHA or MTW Plan (1 Point). Your PHA Plan or MTW Annual Plan must indicate your intent to pursue HOPE VI Revitalization Grant and the public</p>	<p>f. Same.</p>

<p>Rating Factor 1 (Capacity)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.1</p>	<p>housing development for which it is targeted.</p> <p>g. Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) (2 points).</p> <p>(1) Rated high performer – 2 points. (2) Rated standard performer – 1 point. (3) Rated troubled – 0 points. (4) MTW PHAs will be rated on their compliance with their MTW agreements. In compliance with MTW agreement – 2 points. Not in compliance with MTW agreement- 0 points.</p> <p>h. Regular Maintenance (2 points)</p> <p>1) If the projected number of regular maintenance defects per unit has, compared to the previous year (based on PHAS score)</p> <p>a) decreased --2 points. b) not decreased - 0 points.</p> <p>2) MTW PHAs will be rated on their compliance with their MTW agreements. In compliance with MTW agreement, 2 points. Not in compliance with MTW agreement – 0 points.</p> <p>i. Section 8 Management Assessment System (SEMAP) (2 points).</p> <p>(1) Rated high performer – 2 points. (2) Rated standard performer – 1 point. (3) Rated troubled – 0 points. (4) MTW PHAs - In compliance with MTW agreement – 2 points. Not in compliance with MTW agreement- 0 points.</p>	<p>g. Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) (3 points).</p> <p>(1) Rated high performer – 3 points. (2) Rated standard performer – 1 point. (3) Rated troubled – 0 points. (4) MTW PHAs will be rated on their compliance with their MTW agreements. In compliance with MTW agreement – 3 points. Not in compliance with MTW agreement- 0 points.</p> <p>h. Deleted. Regular Maintenance is no longer a rating factor.</p> <p>i. Section 8 Management is now lettered (h). This Rating Factor has the same criteria but is now worth 3 points.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 2 (Need)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.2</p>	<p>Need</p> <p>20 Points</p> <p>a. Severe Physical Distress of PH Development (6 points).</p> <p>1. Infrastructure, systems, settlement, and other HQS deficiencies (2 points). 2. Poor soil conditions, inadequate drainage, deteriorated laterals & sewers, and/or inappropriate topography (2 points). 3. Major design deficiencies, including</p>	<p>Need</p> <p>20 Points</p> <p>a. Same.</p>

<p>Rating Factor 2 (Need)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.2</p>	<p>isolation, indefensible space, inappropriate density or room/unit configurations, significant utility expenses, and inaccessibility for disabled (2 points).</p> <p>b. Severe Distress of Surrounding Neighborhood (3 points). Evaluates the impact of the distressed surrounding neighborhood on the public housing site.</p> <p>c. Obligation of Capital Funds (4 points). Large amounts of available Capital Funds indicate that revitalization could occur without a HOPE VI grant. Point distribution is as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">% Unobligated Capital Funds balance compared to amount of HOPE VI funds requested (Points Awarded)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Up to 20 percent (3 points)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">21 – 45 percent (2 points)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">46 – 80 percent (1 point)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">> than 80 percent (0 points)</p> <p>d. Need for Affordable Accessible Housing in the Community (3 points). Measured by Housing Choice Voucher Program utilization rates and public housing occupancy rates, excluding the public housing site targeted for revitalization.</p> <p>e. National funding Priority (5 points)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">In Go Zone 5 points</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Outside GO Zone 0 points</p> <p>Go Zones designated for hurricanes Katrina, Rita, or both.</p>	<p>b. Same.</p> <p>c. Same.</p> <p>d. Same.</p> <p>e. Deleted. National Funding Priority is no longer a Rating Factor.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 3 (Leveraging)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.3</p>	<p>Leveraging</p> <p>16 points</p> <p>a. Development Leveraging (7 points). HUD will evaluate the strength of the commitment and add the amounts that are acceptably documented. HUD will then calculate the ratio of the amount of HUD funds requested to the amount of funds that HUD deems acceptably documented.</p> <p>b. CSS Leveraging (5 points). Amount of Leveraged Resources: Full point value awarded if ratio of HOPE VI funds</p>	<p>Leveraging</p> <p>16 points</p> <p>a. Same.</p> <p>b. Same.</p>

	<p>requested to other leveraged CSS resources is 1:2 or higher. Requirements for documentation of development leveraging is detailed at § III(C)(4)(I)</p> <p>c. Anticipatory Resources Leveraging (2 points). Full point value awarded if ratio of documented anticipatory resources to HOPE VI funds requested for physical development activities (not CSS or administration) is 1:0.1 or higher.</p> <p>d. Collateral Investment Leveraging (2 points). Full point value if ratio of documented collateral resources to HOPE VI funds requested for physical development activities (not CSS or administration) is 1:1 or higher.</p>	<p>c. Same.</p> <p>d. Same except that collateral investment activities must be completed by April 1, 2013.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 4 (Stakeholder Involvement)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.4</p>	<p>Resident & Community Involvement 3 points</p> <p>b(1) Communication (1 point). Demonstration of regular & significant communication with affected residents & members of surrounding community about actions related to the Revitalization Plan.</p> <p>b(2) Efforts (1 point). Efforts, past & proposed, to make communications about HOPE VI available.</p> <p>b(3) Training (1 point). Description of plans to provide affected residents with training on the general principles of HOPE VI Revitalization so they may participate meaningfully in the development & implementation process.</p>	<p>Resident & Community Involvement 3 points</p> <p>Same.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 5 CSS</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.5</p>	<p>Community & Supportive Services (CSS) 12 points</p> <p>a. Case Management (2 points). Applicants will receive 2 points if they are currently providing case management services, and 1 point if they will be able to provide case management within 30 days from date of grant award execution.</p> <p>b. Needs Assessment and Results (3 points).</p>	<p>Community & Supportive Services (CSS) 12 points</p> <p>Same</p>

	<p>(1) Full points awarded to applicants if a comprehensive resident needs assessment is the basis for the CSS program proposed in the application; and (2) only 2 points will be awarded to applicants with a comprehensive resident needs assessment that is not clearly linked to the CSS program.</p> <p>c. Transition to Housing Self-Sufficiency. (5 points). In order to receive total points, CSS programs should :</p> <p>(a) provide measurable outcomes;</p> <p>(b) relate other CSS and FSS activities to the transition to housing self-sufficiency; and</p> <p>(c) address grassroots, community-based, and faith-based organizations that will assist in this endeavor.</p> <p>d. Quality and Results Orientation in CSS Program (2 points). Full points will be awarded for a comprehensive CSS program that is based on a case management system and provides services/programs to meet the needs of all resident groups.</p>	
<p>Rating Factor 6 (Relocation)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.6</p>	<p>Relocation 5 points</p> <p>Full points for Relocation Plan that:</p> <p>(1) Includes specific activities that have/will minimize displacement of residents who wish to remain/return to development;</p> <p>(2) Includes specific activities that will prioritize existing residents; and</p> <p>(3) Includes specific CSS activities to be provided to residents prior to relocation.</p>	<p>Relocation 5 points</p> <p>Same.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 7 (Fair Housing)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.7</p>	<p>Fair Housing & Equal Opportunity 6 points</p> <p>a. FHEO (3 points).</p> <p>Accessibility. Applicants will receive 2 points if they have a detailed plan to provide accessible units, modifications relocated tenants, and other design changes.</p> <p>Universal Design. Applicants will receive</p>	<p>Fair Housing & Equal Opportunity 6 points</p> <p>a. Same.</p>

	<p>1 point if they have a specific plan to meet adaptability and visitability standards adopted by HUD.</p> <p>b. Fair Housing (1 point). Full point value awarded for description of affirmative marketing efforts to attract families with a broad range of incomes and to target groups least likely to know about these housing opportunities.</p> <p>c. Section 3 Plan (2 points). Full point value awarded if the application demonstrates a feasible plan to implement Section 3 that exceeds the minimum requirements of Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 and its implementing regulations at 24 CFR 135.</p>	<p>b. Fair Housing and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (1 point).</p> <p>Full point value for a statement on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) that: (a) Describes barriers to fair housing choice in your public housing program and, based on the applicable Analysis of Impediments, in your service area; (b) specifies reasonable activities to address barriers to fair housing choice; and (c) describes how records of AFFH needs and activities will be maintained and accessible to the public and HUD. The statement should also include specific steps you plan to take through your proposed activities to affirmatively further fair housing.</p> <p>c. Section 3. Factor revised to split the points between two areas and provides guidance on meeting the Section 3 Plan requirement. Points are allotted as follows:</p> <p><i>Section 3 Plan (1 point).</i> Full point value awarded if Applicant demonstrates that the Section 3 Plan addresses a majority of the factors listed in (a)-(g) of this Section. If the Applicant does not demonstrated that a majority of factors are present, then zero points will be awarded.</p> <p><i>Section 3 Compliance (1 point).</i> Full point value if Applicant demonstrates compliance with Section 3 requirements during the most recent fiscal year. Zero points for not demonstrating compliance or providing sufficient data to evaluate compliance. Evidence may include (a) a copy of the most recent Section 3 Annual Summary Report (form HUD 60002); (b) a description of effort that were taken by the Applicant to comply with Section 3, results achieved, and factors that prevented the Applicant from meeting the minimum numerical goals in 24 CFR 135.30, if applicable.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 8 (Functioning Communities)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.8</p>	<p>Well-Functioning Communities 8 points</p> <p>a. Affordable Housing (3 points). This factor creates a definition for “need for affordable housing” and then creates targets for the number of “project-based affordable housing units.”</p> <p>b. Off-Site Housing (1 point). Location of off-site housing in neighborhoods with low</p>	<p>Well-Functioning Communities 8 points Same, except as noted.</p> <p>a. Clarifies that units completed as of the application deadline cannot be counted.</p> <p>b. Clarifies that all information must be</p>

	<p>concentrations of poverty and/or minorities. Threshold: evidence of site control by applicant, not developer, of any off-site housing must be submitted with HOPE VI application. Point value awarded only if the site has been acquired and site meets all environmental, and site and neighborhood standards. Also, land cannot suffer from any known or suspected environmental hazards or open issues or uncertainties related to public policy (such as sewer moratorium), proper zoning, availability of utilities or clouds on title.</p> <p>c. Homeownership Housing (4 points). Full points if you propose and describe a feasible well-defined plan for homeownership.</p>	<p>demonstrated in the narrative. Site control must be demonstrated in Attachment 18 as well.</p> <p>c. Clarifies that Homeownership Units already completed by the application deadline cannot be counted.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 9 (Soundness of Approach)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.9</p>	<p>Soundness of Approach 30 points</p> <p>a. Quality and Consistency of Application (2 points)</p> <p>b. Appropriateness and Feasibility of the Plan (5 points). Full points will be awarded if the revitalization plan (1):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is appropriate and suitable in accordance with the Appropriateness of Proposal threshold in III.C; 2. Fulfills the needs that the application demonstrated in V.A.2. above; 3. Is marketable; 4. Includes an independent assessment of the demand for residential market-rate units, if any; 5. Is financially feasible; 6. Does not propose to use public housing funds for non-public housing purposes; 7. Extraordinary site costs, if any, are certified in the proposal; 8. Describes cost controls that will be used; and 9. Includes a completed TDC/Grant Limitations Worksheet. <p>c. Neighborhood Impact and Sustainability</p>	<p>Soundness of Approach 30 points</p> <p>Same.</p>

<p>Rating Factor 9 (Soundness of Approach)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.9</p>	<p>of the Plan (5 points).</p> <p>d. Project Readiness (7 points). Full point value awarded if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Project is completely vacant (2 points). (2) Site is already cleared (2 points). (3) Master Development Agreement has been developed & is ready for submission to HUD (1 point). (4) Preliminary site design is complete (1 point). (5) Applicant has held 5 or more public planning sessions leading to resident acceptance of the Revitalization Plan.(1 point). <p>e. Program Schedule (5 points). Full points will be awarded if the program schedule meets the following timelines/milestones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Submit Supplemental Submissions within 90 days of HUD’s written request; (2) Submit CSS work plans within 90 days of execution of the grant agreement; (3) Start construction within 12 months of HUD’s approval of the Supplemental Submissions; (4) Submit the first development proposal within 12 months of grant award; (5) Close on the first phase of development within 15 months of the grant award; (6) Complete construction within 48 months of HUD’s approval of Supplemental Submissions <p>f. Design (3 points)</p> <p>g. Energy Star (1 point). Uses Energy star labeled products, promotes Energy Star design of replacement units, and includes Energy Star in homeownership counseling.</p> <p>h. Evaluation (3 points). Full points if HOPE VI application includes letter(s) from an institution(s) of higher learning or foundation committing to work with applicant to evaluate the HOPE VI Revitalization Plan and its impact.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Rating Factor 10 (Regulatory Barriers)</p> <p>2007 NOFA Section V.A.10</p>	<p>Regulatory Barrier Removal 2 points</p> <p>Based on responses to Form HUD-27300 (Point distribution is described in Section V.A.10.b of the NOFA.</p>	<p>Regulatory Barrier Removal 2 points</p> <p>Same</p>
--	--	--