

APPENDIX 27

PROCEDURES FOR RANKING SECTION 8 MODERATE REHABILITATION APPLICATIONS

If the contract authority indicated in the Invitation, combined with any additional contract authority which may subsequently be made available for the allocation area by the Field Office, is insufficient to fund all approvable applications, the approvable applications will be ranked in order to select those which are superior.

1. Each approvable application shall be assigned numerical ratings on the basis of its merits relative to the merits of the other applications for assistance within the same allocations area.
 - (a) Numerical ratings are to be assigned for each of the following criteria:
 - (1) The demonstrated capacity of the PHA and/or its subcontractor(s) to provide the rehabilitation technical assistance to Owners.
 - (2) The availability of financing resources as demonstrated through statements from financing agencies.
 - (3) The PHA's experience with the Section 8 Existing Housing Program and/or the PHA's overall administrative capacity.
 - (4) Potential of achieving, as expeditiously as possible, the rehabilitation and leasing of housing units.
 - (5) Overall feasibility of the proposed program.
 - (b) The numerical ratings are to be assigned by the MHR. The ratings are as follow:
 - (1) Excellent = 5
 - (2) Good = 3
 - (3) Fair = 1
 - (4) Poor = 0
 - (c) In assigning a rating for each application for Criterion (1) - Rehabilitation expertise, the MHR shall take into account the ratings from the following, as well as his/her own independent evaluation:
 - (1) HM, if the PHA is providing the rehabilitation technical assistance.

(2)A&E, if the subcontractor proposed is a private rehabilitation firm.

(3)CPD, if the subcontractor proposed is the CDA or other local government agency.

(d)In assigning a rating for each application for Criterion (2) - Financing, the MHR shall consider his/her own evaluation and the rating from CPD, If CD-funded financing resources are proposed.

(e)In assigning a rating for each application for Criterion (3) - Administrative capability, the MHR shall consider the rating from HM.

(f)In assigning a rating for each application for Criterion (4) - Rehabilitation and leasing rate, the MHR shall consider ratings from the following, including his/her own evaluation:

(1)HM

(2)CPD, if a CDA or other local government agency will be the subcontractor providing rehabilitation technical assistance.

(g)The MHR shall transmit a copy of the Technical Review Checklists to the Housing Director, who shall assign a rating for Criterion (5) - Overall Feasibility. The Housing Director shall prepare a memorandum, documenting the reason(s) contributing to his/her rating of overall feasibility, to be included in the project file.

2.Each reviewing office will rank each approvable application by assigning a point valued of 0, 1, 3, or 5 to the component of the application (i.e., the "ranking criterion") it is evaluating. The MHR shall then average the points awarded by the applicable reviewing offices for each of the 5 ranking criteria. For example, a PHA is proposing to subcontract with the CDA to provide rehabilitation technical assistance to owners. In assessing the PHA's potential for achieving expeditious rehabilitation and leasing, the following points were assigned: MHR-3, CPD-5, and HM-3. The average rating for this criterion would be 3.8 (11/3=3.8). In lieu of the above procedure, the MHR may conduct a group ranking session attended by each of the reviewing offices. This session will allow the participating offices to discuss the ranking criteria prior to assigning an evaluative number. If the reviewing offices do not reach a consensus with respect to the ranking criteria, the MHR will follow the above procedure and determine the numeric value to be assigned to each ranking criterion based on the average of the points assigned by each office.

APPENDIX 27

3. After point values are assigned to the five criteria, either as a result of averaging the ratings provided by the appropriate reviewing office(s) or as a result of a group ranking session (except for Criterion (5), which will be rated by the Housing Director), the score must reflect the relative degree of importance placed on each of the ranking criteria. This will be done by assigning specific weight factors to each criterion, in accordance with the following example.

Criterion	Point Value	Weight Factor	Score
(1) - Rehabilitation expertise	5	3	15
(2) - Financing	3	1	3
(3) - Administrative capability	1	2	2
(4) - Rehabilitation and leasing rate	0	1	0
(5) - Overall feasibility	3	3	9

The weight factors shown above are those to be assigned to each criterion and must be used regardless of the specific point values developed for the criteria (point values shown above are for example only). In the above example, the application would have received a total score of 29 based on all five criteria.

4. The Field Office may, at its discretion, select either the application which received the highest total score or distribute the units to two or more applications if such action is considered desirable in order to provide for a broad choice of housing opportunities within the allocation area, or to provide for more efficient program implementation. If the Field Office chooses to approve more than one application, it must observe the order in which the applications were ranked and select accordingly. For example, it may not select the first and third ranked applications and omit the second.