

2023-5 9% LIHTC NOFA - New Construction / Acquisition Rehab Scoring Breakdown

NOFA Reference Section 3.3.1

1. * Projects considered under Federally Required Non-Profit Set-Aside.
2. ** Projects considered under Culturally Specific Set-Aside.
3. Shaded projects were recommended for funding.

Set Aside Category	Project Name	Location	(A)				(B)				(C)		(D)			(E)			(F)			(G)			Maximum Possible Score (93)
			Permanent Supportive Housing	Family Sized Units	Special Populations	Disaster Area Preference	Location Need	Location Opportunity	inefficiency	Gentrification	AFHMP	Resident Services	Serving Lowest Incomes	Project Based Subsidy	General Federal Preferences	HOME Leverage (Apts)	HTF Leverage (Not Offered)	Cost Effectiveness	LIHTC Effectiveness	Financial Viability	Operating Pro Forma Review	Readiness to Proceed	MWESB/SDVBE Capacity	Development Team Experience	
			State Priorities (14 points)	Location Factors (17 points)	Partnerships (14 points)	Federal Preferences (12 points)	Funding Efficiency (8 points)	Project Readiness (16 points)	Development Team Capacity (12 points)	Project Total Score															
METRO	ALSO Apartments **	Gresham	9.00	13.00	14.00	3.00	8.00	15.75	12.00	74.75															
METRO	Lombard Apartments **	Portland	4.00	13.00	13.00	3.00	0.00	15.00	7.00	55.00															
Non-Metro PJ	Voyagers Village * **	Salem	5.00	10.00	13.75	7.00	4.00	16.00	7.00	62.75															
Tribal	Klamath LIHTC #1	Chiloquin	5.00	9.00	13.75	7.00	4.00	16.00	9.00	63.75															
BOS - Urban	Nine Peaks	Bend	9.00	9.00	14.00	5.00	7.00	16.00	12.00	72.00															
BOS - Urban	Allen Creek Crossing	Grants Pass	6.00	13.00	12.00	5.00	5.00	16.00	12.00	69.00															
BOS - Urban	Colonia del Valle Prospero * **	Albany	9.00	9.00	12.75	5.00	5.00	16.00	10.00	66.75															
BOS - Rural	Wickiup Station Apartments *	La Pine	9.00	11.00	14.00	6.00	8.00	15.00	12.00	75.00															

Oregon Housing and Community Services
 Affordable Rental Housing Division
 2023-5 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credit NOFA
 Score Release

2023-5 9% LIHTC NOFA - Preservation Scoring Breakdown

NOFA Reference Section 3.3.2

1. Shaded projects were recommended for funding.

Set Aside Category	Project Name	Location	(A)	(B)				(C)			(D)	(E)		(F)				(G)			(H)				Maximum Possible Score (103)
			Risk of Expiration	Tenant Displacement	Extremely Low Income	Rent Assisted Units	Tenant Protections	Rent Burden	Mismatch Housing Stock	Disaster Area Preference	Resident Services	Serving Lowest Incomes	General Federal Preferences	HOME Leverage (Apts)	HTF Funds (Not offered)	Cost Effectiveness	LIHTC Effectiveness	Financial Viability	Operating Pro Forma Review	Project Readiness	MWESB/SDVBE Capacity	Development Team Experience	Portfolio Compliance Criteria	Portfolio Viability Criteria	
			Risk of Expiration (20 points)	Tenant Impact (21 points)				Location Need (8 points)			Partnerships (7 points)	Federal Preferences (9 points)		Funding Efficiency (8 points)				Project Readiness (16 points)			Development Team Capacity (14 points)				Project Total Score
PRESERVATION	Burlwood Apartments	Portland	10.00	21.00				3.00			6.25	6.00		4.00				16.00			14.00				80.25
PRESERVATION	Majestic Garden Apartments	Redmond, Veneta, Harrisburg, Junction City	7.00	21.00				3.00			6.00	6.00		0.00				16.00			13.00				72.00