



# Oregon

## Housing and Community Services

John A. Kitzhaber, MD, Governor

North Mall Office Building  
725 Summer St NE, Suite B  
Salem, OR 97301-1266  
PHONE: (503) 986-2000  
FAX: (503) 986-2020  
TTY: (503) 986-2100  
[www.ohcs.oregon.gov](http://www.ohcs.oregon.gov)

April 11, 2013

### NOFA Update: Scoring Methodology

On Friday, April 5<sup>th</sup>, OHCS held a small partner worksession to review the possible competitive scoring elements for the LIHTC NOFA. We are thankful for the active participation from those who attended, and want to take this opportunity to provide a brief update and encourage feedback from stakeholders statewide.

The draft of the proposed LIHTC competitive scoring elements discussed at the worksession is available online [here](#). This is very much a working draft of concepts and has not been edited or refined.

In this competitive scoring framework, OHCS has aimed to provide a structure for equitably evaluating projects within each region based on features related to need and community impact, while not being prescriptive about what project elements are required; acknowledging that so much of what makes strong and effective project design come from the specifics of the community and the populations being served.

**We hope to finalize the competitive scoring framework within the next two weeks and encourage you to send any feedback or recommendations to OHCS by April 16<sup>th</sup>. You can email comments to [David.Castricano@hcs.state.or.us](mailto:David.Castricano@hcs.state.or.us).**

In particular, we seek feedback and recommendations around the Cost/Impact Assessment: The intent of this element is not to specifically act as a cost containment measure, but rather, since we understand that there are increased costs inherent in meeting multiple public policy goals, this measure is to represent the extent to which the community benefits a project offers substantiate the cost of the project.

For more information on partner feedback received, a worksession overview is presented below.

**Partner Worksession (4/5/13) overview:** Clear support shown for making funding decisions based on the goal of identifying those projects that are the best use of public funds. Constructive feedback offered for helping the scoring framework achieve that goal and limit unintended consequences.

Some of the highlights:

- **Review Process:**
  - Need for training and facilitation for scoring workgroups.
  - Acknowledge the significant commitment this will be for reviewers.
  - Support for including project presentations.



- **Needs:**
  - OHCS will publish known data for all regions, counties, and cities. Local or customized data is able to be submitted as well where it relates specifically to the project's population or community.
  - OHCS should construct a standard table for capturing and presenting the required data elements around affordable housing supply.
- **Impact:**
  - Include the established maximum length of affordability under the Population / Type section.
  - Proximity to jobs to be listed as an example under the Location & Building section.
  - "Comprehensive Community Development" section description has metro bias given the narrative focus on documented planning efforts and local resources; this will be re-tooled to represent more flexible "Community Impact" which includes less formalized efforts.
  - Preservation should specifically be listed in Community Impact.
  - Leverage language should be updated to reflect leverage from any entity not just "jurisdictions".
  - Resident Services should be listed as an example under the Population / Type section.
- **Cost to Impact Assessment:**
  - Total project costs per unit - Debate whether this should exclude acquisition costs, should just be construction costs, or just requested state resources per unit.
  - Currently lists only urban versus rural cost categories; debate over whether these cost categories should be specific to project type (how many stories, construction type, acquisition / rehab versus new construction).
  - Currently 25 points - Debate over whether this is too much weight on this measure.
  - Uses a prescribed point distribution - Debate over whether this could be subjectively judged by panel in the same way as other competitively scored elements.