



Homeless Supportive Housing Developer Selection QUALIFICATIONS REVIEW

Instructions:

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN YOUR SCORES AT THE END OF THE MEETING ON NOVEMBER 15

That attached scoring sheet is for the **EVALUATION AND SELECTION** of a development partner for homeless supportive housing. The Homeless Housing Selection Subcommittee is asked to fill out the attached sheet for each submitted proposal.

As indicated on the scoring sheet, each section of qualifications is assigned a weight that will influence its overall affect on the total score for each team. The Review Committee is asked to rank each section of each proposal on a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 being the highest (see chart below for guidelines). The top two scoring proposers will be considered for recommendation.

RATING GUIDELINE		
Points	Description	Explanation
10 - 9	Excellent	Meets/exceeds requirements and expectations.
8 - 7	Very Good	Above average response. Few if any offsetting weaknesses
6 - 5	Good	Average response. Adequately addresses all criteria and meets all requirements.
4 - 3	Fair	Below average. Minimally addresses all requirements.
2 - 1	Poor	Mostly noncompliant. Serious doubts exist about ability to perform work.
0	Unacceptable	Fails to meet baseline requirements



Homeless Supportive Housing Developer Selection QUALIFICATIONS REVIEW

Agenda

12:00 – 12:30	Review of scoring criteria
12:30 – 1:15	Stonehouse
1:30 – 2:15	Heartland Housing
2:30 – 3:15	CommonBond
3:30 – 4:15	Horizon/Porterfield Consulting
4:15 – 5:00	Discussion (Closed Session)

Format

10-15 minute overview of the organization and relevant experience (projector and screen will be provided)

Staff will ask the following questions:

1. What will be the most challenging aspect of obtaining tax credits for this project?
2. What has been your most successful project and why?
3. What is the key to a successful public/private partnership?
4. What is the key building design criteria for serving our target population of chronically homeless adults?

The subcommittee will be allowed to ask follow-up and clarifying questions

		CommonBond	Heartland Housing	Stonehouse	Horizon/Porterfield Consulting	
RFQ SECTION		RATING (1-10)				Notes
20%	Section 42 Tax Credit Experience					Obtaining Section 42 Tax Credits AND working with WHEDA
20%	Public/Private Partnership Experience					Working in partnership with city, state, or local governments
20%	Development Experience (multifamily, permanent supportive housing)					Developing multifamily housing of a similar scale AND for a similar target population
20%	Range of Services					Directly providing or partnering to provide services for the target population
15%	Financial Strength					Summary of references and guarantees from staff
5%	Local Preference					City of Madison local purchasing preference

Use the space below to provide any additional comments on each of the proposals. In addition, based on the interview, indicate if there is a mitigating factor not covered by the scoring criteria that warrants additional consideration.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
<div>CommonBond</div> <div>Should this proposer be given additional consideration? Y / N</div>
<div>Heartland Housing</div> <div>Should this proposer be given additional consideration? Y / N</div>
<div>Stonehouse</div> <div>Should this proposer be given additional consideration? Y / N</div>
<div>Horizon</div> <div>Should this proposer be given additional consideration? Y / N</div>