

**DRAFT 2010 HOPWA RATING SHEET**

**PROJECT NAME**  **PROPOSAL #**

All proposals are to be ranked in categories A,B,C which are common to all City Consolidated Plan HUD grant programs. Partial points can be awarded; explain in comments.

|  | <b>MAXIMUM POINTS</b> | <b>EARNED POINTS</b> | <b>COMMENTS</b> |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <b>A. PLANNING AND GENERAL CRITERIA</b>  |                       |                      |                 |
| 1. Incompatible with comprehensive development plans, policies and priorities (of local government/area of impact)   | -20                   |                      |                 |
| 2. Can be accomplished under existing, broader program   | -10                   |                      |                 |
| 3. Evidence of NPU/APAB opposition (If applicable, in City only)   | -10                   |                      |                 |
| 4. Evidence of other community opposition  | -10                   |                      |                 |
| 5. Provides for significant environmental benefits   | 10                    |                      |                 |
| 6. Other Considerations: _____   | -15/+15               |                      |                 |
| <b>B. FISCAL CRITERIA</b>  |                       |                      |                 |
| 1. Necessary to protect previous City investment   | 20                    |                      |                 |
| 2. Lacks evidence that other sources of funds were sought (outside agencies)   | -15                   |                      |                 |
| 3. Commits City to significant future funding obligation to attain eligibility   | -15                   |                      |                 |
| 4. Latest audit/monitoring includes significant unresolved findings/ Federal monitoring compliance outstanding   | -15 / -25             |                      |                 |
| 5. Is in default or untimely payment on outstanding loan   | -15                   |                      |                 |
| 6. Written financial/management procedures are insufficient to ensure management controls  | -15                   |                      |                 |
| 7. Administrative costs exceed 7%  | -15                   |                      |                 |
| <b>C. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY/<br/>PROJECT MANAGEMENT CRITERIA</b>   |                       |                      |                 |
| 1. <u>Organizational Capacity:</u>   |                       |                      |                 |
| a. General stability & track record of organization  | 12                    |                      |                 |
| b. Applicant has demonstrated success in effective service delivery/desired outcomes   |                       |                      |                 |
| i. in proposed activity  | 20                    |                      |                 |
| ii. in similar activity  | 10                    |                      |                 |
| c. Applicant lacks capacity to implement expeditiously   | -15                   |                      |                 |
| 2. <u>Project Management:</u>  |                       |                      |                 |
| a. Lacks evidence of need _____  | -10                   |                      |                 |
| b. Project completion schedule:  |                       |                      |                 |
| 1) Funds expended within 2 years of funds availability   | 10                    |                      |                 |
| 2) Funds expended in over 2 years of funds availability  | -10                   |                      |                 |
| c. Lacks documentation of other support or City requirements critical for project implementation ( <i>zoning/special use permit, other resources, etc.</i> ) _____ | -20                   |                      |                 |

All HOWPA proposals are to be ranked, according to the following HOWPA specific criteria. Partial points may be given with explanation in Comment section.

**D. HOPWA SPECIFIC CRITERIA**

1. Match Funding (leveraged resources): Provides documented non-HOPWA match to HOPWA \$:
  - a. 25% or more match
  - b. No match resources
2. Does the project provide housing?
  - 1 to 4 units
  - 5 to 10 units
  - 11 to 20 units
  - 21 or greater
3. Activity serves priority population: (award all that apply)
  - a. Medically frail/AIDS related dementia
  - b. Families
  - c. Substance abuse recovery
  - d. Chronic Mental Illness
4. Evidence of significant partnerships/collaborations in AIDS care network
5. Provides unique niche in housing services in filling needs
6. Impact of project/service on clients:
  - a. Critical (meeting urgent health/safety needs)
  - b. Comprehensive (providing five or more significant services)
  - c. Major (benefit of lasting impact, significance)
  - d. Moderate
  - e. Minor

| MAXIMUM POINTS | EARNED POINTS | COMMENTS |
|----------------|---------------|----------|
| 10             |               |          |
| -10            |               |          |
| 5              |               |          |
| 10             |               |          |
| 15             |               |          |
| 25             |               |          |
| 10             |               |          |
| 10             |               |          |
| 10             |               |          |
| 10             |               |          |
| 10             |               |          |
| 15             |               |          |
| 15             |               |          |
| 10             |               |          |
| 5              |               |          |
| -5             |               |          |

**HOPWA PROJECT TOTAL POINTS** \_\_\_\_\_