

# 2021 AHTF Home Repair Application Scoring

Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted By: \_\_\_\_\_

Scored By: \_\_\_\_\_

First Time Applicant

Returning Applicant

Is this project recommended for funding?     Yes     No

Project Request Amt \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Admin Request Amt \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Total:                    \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Has application fee been paid?     Yes     No

## Scoring Summary

	<u>Max. Possible Points:</u>	<u>Points Awarded:</u>
Capacity Scorecard	(Point Deduction)	_____
Fair Housing	(Point Deduction)	_____
Threshold Requirements	(Point Deduction)	_____
Program Design	86	_____
Financial Design	40	_____
Ready to Proceed	40	_____
KHC Analysis	(Point Deduction)	_____
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	_____

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Final Score: \_\_\_\_\_/166= \_\_\_\_\_%

# 2021 AHTF Home Repair Application Checklist

## Applicants must have the following attachments:

- Summary of Sources and Uses Spreadsheet
- IRS 501 (c)(3) Determination Letter
- AHTF Certifications and Assurances
- Additional Funding Sources Commitment Letters/ Supporting Documents
- Resume of ONE staff person working with program
- Resume of construction manager, if applicable

## SECTION ONE: CAPACITY SCORECARD

1. KHC Capacity Scorecard (deductions up to -10 pts. max)

Total Point Deduction \_\_\_\_\_

2. Fair Housing: Applicant described each impediment of fair housing that was selected (deductions up to -5 pts. max)

Total Point Deduction \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION TWO: THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS

1. Did the applicant meet all KHC Threshold Requirements?
- Yes
  - No
2. If no, did the applicant provide sufficient explanation to be allowed to proceed with application?
- Yes (-15 pts.) Application can proceed with Threshold Requirements failure deduction
  - No Application is rejected

Total Point Deduction \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION THREE: PROGRAM DESIGN- 86 Max. Points

(PD Question 1) Applicant described organizations experience with home repair projects (including rate of success with project completion, with unit completion totals.) (10 pts. max)

- 10 pts. Applicant has over 5 years demonstrated success administering a home repair program
- 7 pts. Applicant has 3 to 5 years demonstrated success administering a home repair program
- 3 pts. Applicant has 1 to 3 years demonstrated success administering a home repair program
- 0 pts. Applicant has less than 1 year demonstrated success administering a home repair program

(PD Question 2) Applicant demonstrated home repair production capacity via a reported average yearly production rate (8 pts. max)

- 8 pts. Average of 20+ units rehabbed per year
- 5 pts. Average of 15-20 units rehabbed per year
- 3 pts. Average of 6-10 units rehabbed per year
- 1 pt. Average of 1-5 units rehabbed per year
- 0 pts. No demonstrated past unit production

(PD Question 3-3a) Applicant described why they are targeting the specific population(s) that they have selected and how this population will be made aware of the program.

\_\_\_\_\_ pts. (5 pts. max)

(PD Question 4) Applicant described project, including information about the targeted geography and surrounding neighborhood, characteristics, and other relevant program information (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Applicant described
- 3 pts. Applicant somewhat described
- 0 pts. Applicant's description lacked sufficient detail

(PD Question 5) Applicant discussed agencies methods of evaluating potential Home Repair clients, evaluation of housing conditions, and execution of repair work write ups (20 pts. max)

- 20 pts. Applicant described
- 10 pts. Applicant somewhat described
- 0 pts. Applicant's description lacked sufficient detail

(PD Question 6) Applicant describes how assisted homes will meet Minimum Habitability Standards (MHS) (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Applicant described
- 3 pts. Applicant somewhat described
- 0 pts. Applicant's description lacked sufficient detail

(PD Question 7) Is number of units proposed reasonable given applicant's production capacity as demonstrated by past unit production history? (3 pts. max)

- 3 pts. Yes
- 0 pts. No

(PD Question 8) Percentage of units in a rural area(s) as designated by USDA Rural Development? **(Not Scored-for informational purposes only)**

(PD Question 10) Applicant described other partners who will be assisting with this project, and their relationship with the agency, including name of partnering agency, contact person, and how they will assist. (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Applicant described
- 3 pts. Applicant somewhat described
- 0 pts. Applicant description lacked sufficient detail

(PD Question 11) Applicant identified additional funding streams for their Home Repair program (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Applicant identified additional funding streams
- 0 pts. No additional funding streams identified

(PD Question 12) Applicant has documented commitment of additional funds from funding sources for their Home Repair program (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. 10% or more in additional funds
- 3 pts. 5% - 9.9% in additional funds
- 1 pt. 1%- 4.9% in additional funds
- 0 pts. Less than 1% OR no committed additional funding identified

(PD Question 16) Applicant attached documentation of additional funds from non-KHC funding sources for their Home Repair program if applicable (5 pts)

- 5 pts Applicant attached documentation for non-KHC funding sources or did not have additional non-KHC funding sources
- 0 pts Applicant identified additional funds from non-KHC sources but did not include attachments

(PD Question 17-17a) Applicant described and explains in detail the counseling process for the Home Repair program, including a step-by-step process for working with homeowners and provided supporting documents, such as process descriptions, flyers, etc. (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Applicant described and explained
- 3 pts. Applicant somewhat described and explained
- 1 pt. Applicant did not describe or explain
- 10 pts. Applicant does not have a counseling program

(PD Question 18) Applicant described pre-construction conference process, including participants and topics discussed (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Applicant described
- 3 pts. Applicant somewhat described
- 0 pts. Applicant's description lacked sufficient detail

## SECTION FOUR: FINANCIAL DESIGN- 40 Max. Points

(Summary of Sources and Uses attachment) Applicant's Summary of Sources and Uses appears to be correct (20 pts. max)

- 20 pts. Summary of Sources and Uses appeared correct; appears to be sufficient funds budgeted to undertake the project
- 10 pts. Summary of Sources and Uses contained minor errors or inconsistencies with application narrative
- 0 pts. Summary of Sources and Uses contained significant errors or discrepancies OR reveals there may not be sufficient funds to undertake the project.

(FD Question 1) Applicant uses KHC's imposed cap of \$15,000 per unit OR applicant explained why there is a cap less than \$15,000 per unit (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Applicant does not have a cap less than KHC OR gives adequate explanation of why a cap less than the KHC imposed amount is implemented by the agency
- 3 pts. Somewhat explained reason(s) for having a cap less than KHC's imposed amount of \$15,000 per unit
- 0 pts. Applicant did not describe or explain

(FD Question 2-3) Applicant has documented a line of credit of sufficient organizational capital to cover costs in excess of \$15,000 of construction costs per unit. (10 pts. max)

- 10 pts. Applicant has documented access to credit or capital to cover excess costs at an amount over 10% of requested funding
- 7 pts. Applicant has documented access to credit or capital to cover excess costs at an amount 7.5%-10% of requested funding
- 5 pts. Applicant has documented access to credit or capital to cover excess costs at an amount 5-7.4% of requested funding
- 2 pts. Applicant has documented access to credit or capital to cover excess costs at an amount 1-4.9% of requested funding
- 0 pts. Applicant does not have access to credit or capital to cover excess costs

(FD Question 4) Applicant describes how they are able to initiate the construction of the first unit and included plans for sustaining operations while waiting reimbursement (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Applicant described
- 3 pts. Applicant somewhat described
- 0 pts. Applicant did not describe OR description lacked sufficient detail

## SECTION FIVE: READY TO PROCEED- 40 Max. Points

(RTP Question 1-1a) Applicant has an existing waiting list and describes the make-up of the list, including average incomes, and special populations. (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Applicant has an existing waiting list and described the make-up of the list
- 3 pts. Applicant has an existing waiting list and somewhat described the make-up of the list
- 0 pts. Applicant does not have an existing waiting list OR did not sufficiently describe the make-up of the list

(RTP Question 1b) If applicant does not have an existing waiting list, applicant explains when a waiting list will be started and how the applicant will find participants to add to the list. (3 pts. max)

- 3 pts. Applicant has an existing waiting list OR described how they would implement a waiting list
- 0 pts. Applicant did not adequately describe

(RTP Question 2) Applicant described marketing/outreach plan for the AHTF Home Repair Program, including target audiences, strategies, and how applicant will identify eligible candidates. (10 pts. max)

- 10 pts. Applicant described
- 5 pts. Applicant somewhat described
- 0 pts. Applicant's description lacked sufficient detail

(RTP Question 3-3a) Applicant identified the primary person responsible for the day-to-day administration of the project and explained their responsibilities and experience administering this type of activity. (12 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Person identified and described with resume submitted
- 3 pts. Person identified and somewhat described with resume submitted
- 0 pts. Person not identified or described and/or resume not submitted
  
- 5 pts. Person has more than 2 years of experience administering a home repair program
- 3 pts. Person has 1-2 years of experience administering a home repair program
- 1 pt. Person has less than 1 year of experience administering a home repair program
- 0 pts. Person has no experience administering a home repair program
  
- 2 pts. Person has experience administering KHC HOME and/or AHTF projects
- 0 pts. Person has no experience administering KHC HOME and/or AHTF projects

(RTP Question 4-4a) Applicant identified the construction manager and explained their responsibilities and experience managing this type of activity. (5 pts. max)

- 5 pts. Person identified and described with resume submitted or explained how program manager fulfills this role
- 3 pts. Person identified and somewhat described with resume submitted
- 0 pts. Applicant did not describe or explain

(RTP Question 5) Has the applicant had staff turnover in the past 24 months in their housing programs or administrative/executive staff? (**deductions** up to 5 pts. max)

- Yes Determine point deduction based on answer to question 4a
- No No point deduction

(RTP Question 5a) If yes to question 7, did the applicant describe in detail what position(s) were affected, list name(s) of replacement(s), and describe their past housing experience? (**deductions** up to -5 pts. max)

- \_\_\_\_pts. If applicant sufficiently described, deduct up to -5 pts. based on assessment of organizational capacity
- 5 pts. Applicant did not describe OR description lacked sufficient detail

(RTP Question 6) Applicant described any non-compliance issues with any KHC funding source within the past 5 years. (**deductions** up to -5 pts. max)

- 0 pts. Applicant has not had any home repair compliance issues within 5 years
- \_\_\_\_pts. Applicant sufficiently explained, deduct up to 5 pts. based on assessment of description
- 5 pts. Applicant did not describe OR description lacked sufficient detail

## KHC ANALYSIS

Applicant followed project naming convention per application guidelines

- Yes No point deduction
- No -2 point deduction

KHC's evaluation of past agency performance, capacity, and monitoring results. (**deduction** up to -10 pts.)

Comments:

---

---

---

**Total Point Deduction** \_\_\_\_\_