

# SSHA<sup>3</sup>P

## SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Housing Capital Fund Capital Fund Committee

### Meeting Agenda

3602 Pacific Ave Tacoma, WA 98418

Dial: 253-215-8782 Meeting ID: 938 1481 3741

Webinar Link: <https://piercecountywa.zoom.us/j/93814813741>

November 15, 2024, 8:30 a.m.

---

VACANT (City of Auburn)

Taylor Jones (City of Fife)

Heather Moss (Pierce County)

Ryan Windish (City of Sumner)

VACANT (City of Auburn – Alternate)

Derek Matheson (City of Fife – Alternate)

John Barbee (Pierce County – Alternate)

Jason Wilson (City of Sumner – Alternate)

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

---

#### II. REVIEW AGENDA/AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

---

#### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ATTACHMENTS:      07-19-2024 Fund Committee Meeting Minutes  
                                 07-22-2024 Fund Committee Meeting Minutes  
                                 09-27-2024 Fund Committee Meeting Minutes

[Document Link](#)

[Document Link](#)

[Document Link](#)

---

#### IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

The Capital Fund Committee meeting can be heard by dialing 253-215-8782 or through Zoom at <https://piercecountywa.zoom.us/j/93814813741> and entering the Meeting ID 938 1481 3741. Written comments may be submitted to [jason.gauthier@piercecountywa.gov](mailto:jason.gauthier@piercecountywa.gov). Comments will be compiled and sent to the Fund Committee.

---

#### V. PRESENTATIONS/ACTION

##### A. Updated Scoring Criteria

**Purpose:** Review of updated *Unit Production* and *Timely Delivery of Proposal* scoring criteria for draft 2025 NOFA.

ATTACHMENTS:      Unit Production Scoring Criteria  
                                 Timely Delivery of Proposal Scoring Criteria

[Document Link](#)

[Document Link](#)

##### B. Discussion of Policy Statement on SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Capital Fund Usage

**Purpose:** Discussion and direction for development of SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Capital Fund usage policy statement, with focus on geographic prioritization.

---

#### VI. UPDATES/COMMENTS OF THE FUND COMMITTEE

---

#### VII. ADJOURN

---

---

# Capital Fund Committee Meeting

Friday, July 19, 2024

---

---

**Members Present:** Heather Moss (Pierce County), John Barbee (Pierce County - Alternate), Ryan Windish (Sumner), Taylor Jones (Fife)

**Members Excused:** Derek Matheson (Fife - Alternate), Jason Wilson (Sumner - Alternate)

Members Absent: None

**SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Staff:** Jason Gauthier, Mary Connolly

**Pierce County Staff:** Bryan Schmid, Jared Wright

**Guests:** Ted Richardson

## Call to Order

Jason called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM.

## Roll Call

Jason called roll; a quorum was present.

## Agenda Modifications

There were no requests to modify the agenda.

## Approval of Minutes

Heather moved to approve the meeting minutes from February 27, 2024. Ryan seconded the motion. The motion carried with 3 in favor and 0 against.

## Public Comment

There were no public comments during the meeting. No written comments were received.

## Review and Discussion of 2024 NOFA Applications

Jason provided a brief presentation on the 3 applications to the 2024 SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Housing Capital Fund Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and the timeline for making awards. A description of the 3 applications can be found in the table below.

<b>Developer</b>	CJK Community Homes	CJK Community Homes	Urban Black Community Development
<b>Project Name</b>	1 and 2 Bedrooms	Microunits	Rialto/Exley/St. Helens
<b>Address</b>	1902-1910 S Wilkeson Tacoma	3565 E McKinley Tacoma	311 S 9 <sup>th</sup> St Tacoma
<b>Project Type</b>	Acquisition Only	Acquisition Only	Acquisition – Rehabilitation
<b>Funding Requested</b>	\$342,000	\$330,000	\$1,000,000
<b>Total Units</b>	40	17	78

Bryan gave a broad overview of the Pierce County’s procurement process and the role of Pierce County as the Administering Agency.

Jared discussed the fiscal risk assessments conducted by Pierce County. The Committee will receive these assessments after the meeting. CJK Community Homes was rated a moderate risk. Urban Black Community Development did not provide fiscal documentation, so staff could not conduct the risk assessment at this time.

Jared discussed the budgets provided by the applicants in the Combined Funders Application (CFA). In reviewing these applications, one of his impressions was that the development budgets and pro formas in the CFA were not thoroughly completed. Pierce County is going to consider how to better support applicants in completing the CFA for future NOFA cycles.

Ryan asked if CJK Community Homes has a history of developing properties. Jared said that it appears they have experience acquiring units to keep them affordable but don’t have experience as a developer of new construction. Their application indicates they have a developer partner. Bryan said that Pierce County has not funded CJK Community Homes with capital dollars. John said Pierce County has awarded the organization operations funding for homelessness services.

Ryan asked if the applications indicate that the organizations are leveraging other private and public funds. Jared said that CJK Community Homes’ application does not indicate leverage of other fund sources. Urban Black Community Development’s application indicates other funding sources.

Heather asked if materials could be acquired from Urban Black Community Development to conduct the pre-award risk assessment if the organization were awarded funding. Jared said yes.

Heather asked if they have asked Urban Black Community Development if they would accept an award less than their request of \$1,000,000. Jared said it would be possible to offer them less than their request. Heather asked if the applicants also applied to the Pierce County rental housing NOFA for these projects. Jared and Bryan said they did. Bryan said it is common for developers to not be awarded what they ask for and identify alternative funding sources.

Heather noted that CJK Community Homes has a short and long-term plan for one of its projects. She asked if they are supposed to evaluate the project based on what will happen

soon, or what might happen one day? Jason said that it is difficult to evaluate acquisition only projects for this reason. He asked staff from Tacoma for feedback on the projects:

- CJK Community Homes, 1 and 2 Bedrooms – The proposed use is not currently allowable and depends on passage of a land use change in the future.
- CJK Community Homes Microunits – This project is fully permitted.
- Urban Black Community Development – This project doesn't add or remove units, but the project would be the highest and best use of the land.

Heather and Ryan expressed disappointed that all 3 projects are in Tacoma.

Ryan said provided some comments on each of the projects. He likes that the CJK Community Homes Microunits project is fully permitted. He doesn't think it is a good idea to award funds to a project that depends on a zoning change. He loves the location of Urban Black Community Development's project, thinks that it would be great to rehab 78 units, and would also hope to see commercial space on the ground floor to support Black businesses. He said that his initial scores for all three projects were all low.

Jason said that Committee members should complete their scoring by Monday.

Heather asked how important is it that dollars awarded this year. Bryan said that for Pierce County, it's not optimal for affordable housing dollars to sit. However, it would be an option to keep the fund balance and put another NOFA out next year.

Ryan noted that Urban Black Community Development's project is not creating any new units, so according to the scoring guide, the project should score low for unit production. He asked if he is looking at this the right way. Jason said that there are some other ways to consider this criterion. He noted that it wouldn't be economically viable to knock down these buildings. The project does maximize units that can be on the property in the current context. The project also keeps these units affordable and keeps them from being redeveloped into market-rate units.

Heather noted that Pioneer currently owns and runs the building. She asked for more information. Bryan said that Pioneer has been trying to sell the building for years. Tacoma Housing Authority (THA) has some project-based vouchers in the building. Pioneer would like to keep the building as affordable housing if possible. The City of Tacoma does not have interest in putting funding into the building.

Taylor asked why the building hasn't been bought yet. Bryan thinks that the concern is the cost of the capital needs of the buildings. Jared said that they did not provide a Capital Needs Assessment (CNA) in their application. Bryan noted that if they were awarded funding, Pierce County would follow up to acquire a CNA. Jason noted that a CNA was completed in February of 2024.

Jared noted that the Urban Black Community Development Project's application would require a technical correction to ensure, because currently the \$1,000,000 requested is listed as funding non-residential uses of the building.

Ryan asked what the CNA includes? Bryan said that the CNA is conducted by a third party entity and gives a comprehensive overview of the capital needs of the building, including the lifecycle of all components.

Taylor asked that after a decision is made with conditions attached, does the Fund Committee or the County determine that the conditions have been met? Bryan said that a conditional award is made, and before contracting, the organization would have to satisfy the conditions. Pierce County evaluates if the conditions have been met.

Taylor asked what happens if an award is funded but the organization does not secure enough financing for the project. Bryan said the conditional award includes conditions regarding financial commitments from other funders.

Taylor asked what happens to the funding if conditions in the conditional award aren't met. Bryan said that the funding would go into the next NOFA cycle.

The Fund Committee will meet again on Monday to review scores and potentially take action on award recommendations. Jason requested members' scoring sheets by 10 AM on Monday at the latest.

### **Updates/Comments of the Capital Fund Committee**

No updates or comments from the Committee.

### **Adjournment**

Jason adjourned the meeting at 10:02 AM.

---

# Capital Fund Committee Meeting

Monday, July 22, 2024

---

**Members Present:** Heather Moss (Pierce County), Jason Wilson (Sumner – Alternate), Taylor Jones (Fife)

**Members Excused:** Ryan Windish (Sumner), Derek Matheson (Fife - Alternate), John Barbee (Pierce County - Alternate)

**Members Excused:** None

**SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Staff:** Jason Gauthier, Mary Connolly

**Pierce County Staff:** Bryan Schmid, Jared Wright

**Guests:** Kim Mahoney

## Call to Order

Jason called the meeting to order at 12:34 PM.

## Roll Call

Jason called roll; a quorum was present.

## Agenda Modifications

There were no requests to modify the agenda.

## Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the last meeting were not prepared in time to approve at this meeting.

## Public Comment

There were no public comments during the meeting. No written comments were received.

## Review 2024 NOFA Applications Scoring

Jason presented the Capital Fund Committee members' scores for the three applications to the SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Capital Fund. The scores can be found in the table below.

Scorer	CJK - Micro Units	CJK 1 and 2 BDRs	UBCD - Rialto - Exley - St. Helens
City of Sumner (Ryan Windish)	45	53	71
City of Fife (Taylor Jones)	45	34	59
Pierce County (Heather Moss)	69	71	75
TOTAL POINTS	159	158	205
AVERAGE SCORE	53	52.66	68.33
MEDIAN SCORE	45	53	71

Jason Gauthier presented 3 options for the Capital Fund Committee to consider:

- Motion to recommend funding award
- Motion to not recommend any projects for funding
- If there are questions that can't be answered today, this process can be extended

Heather said she is not feeling enthusiastic about the projects and that they are not what the Committee hoped for for these dollars.

Taylor agreed with Heather. She also noted that both of CJK Community Homes' applications are for STEP housing (emergency shelter, emergency housing, transitional housing, and/or permanent supportive housing). Taylor said her understanding is that SSHA<sup>3</sup>P's intent and goal has been to stay distinct from homelessness/direct services and focus on subsidized/affordable units.

Jason Gauthier confirmed that what Taylor said is in alignment with the Executive Board's direction in the past. He also noted that CJK's scores are very low and that it might make more sense to focus discussion on the Urban Black Community Development (UBCD) project.

Heather asked what happens if the Committee chooses not to fund the UBCD project. Jason Gauthier answered that the most obvious choice would be to roll over this year's funding into a future NOFA (Notice of Funding Availability) or RFP (Request for Proposals).

Heather said she imagines it would be disappointing if funding isn't awarded, but it would be equally disappointing if a project were funded in inner city Tacoma.

Jason Gauthier provided some additional context by noting that in prior Committee meetings, there was disagreement on whether projects in Tacoma should be eligible for funding, which is how the Committee landed on having 3 tiered geographic priorities. Derek Matheson, the City Administrator of Fife, said that projects in Tacoma should be eligible for funding due to the City's proximity to Fife.

Jared asked if there was a preference for new construction or preservation. Jason Gauthier said that neither were identified as a priority in the NOFA.

Jason Wilson said that in discussion with Ryan Windish, they discussed that rehabilitating housing does not increase the net stock of housing. He also said that he and Ryan are disappointed that the applications are Tacoma-centric. After talking to the Mayor of Sumner, it feels like they would be checking a box by awarding funding instead of using it meaningfully.

Heather said that maybe if the Committee has more to spend next year, they might receive more proposals. Bryan Schmid agreed.

Jason Gauthier said it would be OK to not award funding because UBCD's project, which received the highest scores, has an average score below 70. He also said that

not awarding funding would give the Committee the opportunity to refine their priorities in the future.

**Jason Wilson moved that the Fund Committee does not make a formal funding recommendation to the Executive Committee.<sup>1</sup> Heather seconded the motion.**

Discussion on the motion:

- Taylor agreed and provided some thoughts on how to best communicate this decision to the Executive Board.
- Bryan suggested that it may be valuable for the SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Capital Fund to have its own procurement timeline separate from the Pierce County affordable rental and homeownership NOFAs. This might allow SSHA<sup>3</sup>P's fund to be better differentiated.

**The motion passed with 3 in favor and 0 against.**

Jason Gauthier said that at the Executive Board's August 2 meeting, he will provide an overview of the Committee's decision and will ask Committee members to attend to provide their perspective.

### **Updates/Comments of the Capital Fund Committee**

There were no additional updates or comments from Committee members.

### **Adjournment**

Heather made a motion to adjourn. Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed with 3 in favor and 0 against. The meeting was adjourned at 12:59 PM.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jason Wilson was referring to the SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Executive Board here.



---

# Capital Fund Committee Meeting

Monday, September 27, 2024

---

**Members Present:** Heather Moss (Pierce County), Taylor Jones (Fife), Ryan Windish (Sumner), John Barbee (Pierce County - Alternate)

**Members Excused:** Jason Wilson (Sumner - Alternate), Derek Matheson (Fife - Alternate)

**Members Excused:** None

**SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Staff:** Jason Gauthier, Mary Connolly

**Pierce County Staff:** Bryan Schmid

**Guests:**

## Call to Order

Jason called the meeting to order at 8:35 AM.

## Roll Call

Jason called roll. Two members were present at that time, which does not constitute a quorum.

## Agenda Modifications

There were no requests to modify the agenda.

## Consent Agenda

Heather Moss moved to approve the consent agenda. Ryan Windish seconded the motion. Two voted in favor and 0 voted against. (Taylor Jones had not yet joined the meeting.)

Because there was not yet a quorum present, the consent agenda was not approved.

## Public Comment

Taylor Jones joined the meeting. A quorum was present for the rest of the meeting.

There were no public comments during the meeting. No written comments were received.

## Review 2024 NOFA Process and Discussion of 2025 NOFA

Jason Gauthier provided a presentation on:

- The 2024 SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), including allowed use of funds, fund priorities, and outcomes
- The affordable housing pipeline in Pierce County

The Committee discussed 2025 priorities for the fund, including:

- How to differentiate SSHA<sup>3</sup>P's NOFA from other affordable housing NOFAs

- Whether the fund should serve as first-in or last-in funding
- The possibility of releasing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a specific project
- Scoring criteria, including geographic priority and timely acquisition of housing

At the next Capital Fund Committee meeting in October, staff will bring the following items for discussion:

- A draft policy statement on the use of Request for Proposals (RFPs) to fund specific projects
- Refined NOFA priorities and scoring matrix, including options for scoring geographic priorities and updated scoring for different project types

SSHA<sup>3</sup>P staff will continue discussions with staff from the Cities of Puyallup and Tacoma about considering contributing to the SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Capital Fund and will invite them to attend future Committee meetings.

### **Updates/Comments of the Capital Fund Committee**

There were no additional updates or comments from Committee members.

### **Adjournment**

Ryan made a motion to adjourn. Heather seconded the motion. The motion passed with 3 in favor and 0 against. The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 AM.



## Housing Capital Fund Scoring Guide

### Priority: Unit Production

The SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Housing Capital Fund will prioritize project proposals that propose to maximize unit production on the project site(s). Acquisition-only project proposals should provide proposed development scope as part of application to allow for complete consideration in the Unit Production priority area.

---

#### Tier 1: Exceptional Maximization of Unit Production 16 - 20 Points

1. **Density:** Project achieves the highest possible density permitted by zoning regulations.
2. **Utilization:** Site is used to its maximum potential, with innovative design and construction techniques employed to optimize space.
3. **Overall Unit Production:** Project proposes to produce or preserve a very high number of units.

#### Tier 2: High Maximization of Unit Production 11-15 Points

1. **Density:** Project achieves a high density, close to the maximum allowed by zoning regulations.
2. **Utilization:** Site is well-utilized, though there may be minor limitations in design or construction that prevent full maximization.
3. **Overall Unit Production:** Project proposes to produce or preserve a high number of units, though slightly less than Tier 1 projects.

#### Tier 3: Moderate Maximization of Unit Production 6 - 10 Points

1. **Density:** Project achieves moderate density, with some potential for higher unit production under different conditions.
2. **Utilization:** Site utilization is adequate but leaves room for improvement in terms of space optimization.
3. **Overall Unit Production:** Project proposes to produce or preserve a moderate number of units, though less than Tier 2 projects.

#### Tier 4: Minimal Maximization of Unit Production 0 - 5 Points

1. **Density:** Project achieves low density, with significant room for increased unit production within zoning regulations.
2. **Utilization:** Site is underutilized, with inefficient use of available space.
3. **Overall Unit Production:** Project proposes to produce or preserve a lower number of units.



## Housing Capital Fund Scoring Guide

### Priority: Unit Production

The SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Housing Capital Fund will prioritize project proposals that propose to maximize unit production on the project site(s). Acquisition-only project proposals should provide proposed development scope as part of application to allow for complete consideration in the Unit Production priority area.

---

### Notes for Evaluators

1. **Zoning Regulations:** Consider the local zoning regulations and the extent to which the project maximizes the allowed density and usage.
2. **Innovation:** Look for innovative design and construction techniques that maximize space and unit production or preservation without compromising quality.
3. **Comparative Analysis:** Compare the project to similar projects in the area to gauge average unit density.



## Housing Capital Fund Scoring Guide

### Priority: Timely Completion of Proposal

The SSHAP<sup>3</sup>P Housing Capital Fund will prioritize projects that can demonstrate the ability to advance quickly to achieve activities proposed in the project application. Staff will evaluate a project's readiness, sponsor track record, and organizational commitment to timely delivery.

---

### Tier 1: Exceptional Readiness and Rapid Delivery 16 - 20 Points

#### 1. Project Readiness:

- a. **Site Control:** Project site is owned by the applicant or applicant has secured site control through a fully executed and legally binding purchase and sale agreement with all contingencies met.
- b. **Development Stage:** Project is in the advanced stages of development, with clear timelines and milestones. \*

#### 2. Financing Commitments:

- a. **Secured Funding:** All necessary financing commitments are secured, with executed agreements and term sheets.
- b. **Financial Stability:** Project demonstrates strong financial planning and risk mitigation, with contingency plans in place.

#### 3. Sponsor Track Record:

- a. **Experience:** Sponsor has a proven track record of successfully completing similar projects on time and within budget.
- b. **Reputation:** Sponsor has a strong reputation for reliability and efficiency in project delivery.
- c. **Past Performance:** Evidence of past performance includes completed projects, references, and performance metrics.

#### 4. Organizational Commitment:

- a. **Dedicated Team:** A highly experienced and dedicated project team is in place, with clear roles and responsibilities.
- b. **Resource Allocation:** Organization has allocated sufficient resources to ensure project success.
- c. **Operational Capacity:** High operational capacity and streamlined processes are in place to support rapid project delivery.

\*Not applicable to Acquisition-only proposals



## Housing Capital Fund Scoring Guide

### Priority: Timely Completion of Proposal

The SSHAP<sup>3</sup>P Housing Capital Fund will prioritize projects that can demonstrate the ability to advance quickly to achieve activities proposed in the project application. Staff will evaluate a project's readiness, sponsor track record, and organizational commitment to timely delivery.

---

### Tier 2: High Readiness and Rapid Delivery **11 - 15 Points**

#### 1. Project Readiness:

- a. **Site Control:** Project has secured site control through a fully executed and legally binding purchase and sale agreement.
- b. **Development Stage:** Project is in the mid to advanced stages of development, with established timelines and milestones. \*

#### 2. Financing Commitments:

- a. **Pending Funding:** Most necessary financing commitments are secured, with some agreements pending finalization.
- b. **Financial Planning:** Project demonstrates good financial planning and risk mitigation, with some contingency plans in place.

#### 3. Sponsor Track Record:

- a. **Experience:** Sponsor has a solid track record of completing similar projects, with occasional minor delays or budget overruns.
- b. **Reputation:** Sponsor is generally regarded as reliable and efficient in project delivery.
- c. **Past Performance:** Evidence of past performance includes several completed projects, references, and performance metrics.

#### 4. Organizational Commitment:

- a. **Experienced Team:** An experienced project team is in place, with defined roles and responsibilities.
- b. **Resource Allocation:** Organization has allocated adequate resources to support project success.
- c. **Operational Capacity:** Good operational capacity and processes are in place to support project delivery.

\*Not applicable to Acquisition-only proposals



## Housing Capital Fund Scoring Guide

### Priority: Timely Completion of Proposal

The SSHA<sup>3P</sup> Housing Capital Fund will prioritize projects that can demonstrate the ability to advance quickly to achieve activities proposed in the project application. Staff will evaluate a project's readiness, sponsor track record, and organizational commitment to timely delivery.

---

### Tier 3: Moderate Readiness and Rapid Delivery 5 - 9 Points

#### 1. Project Readiness:

- a. **Site Control:** Project is in the process of securing site control with a site identified, but no legally binding purchase and sale agreement has been signed.
- b. **Development Stage:** Project is in the early to mid-stages of development, with preliminary timelines and milestones. \*

#### 2. Financing Commitments:

- a. **Partial Funding:** Some necessary financing commitments are secured, with several agreements still pending.
- b. **Financial Planning:** Project demonstrates basic financial planning and risk mitigation, with few contingency plans in place.

#### 3. Sponsor Track Record:

- a. **Experience:** Sponsor has some experience with similar projects, but with several instances of delays or budget overruns.
- b. **Reputation:** Sponsor is regarded as moderately reliable and efficient in project delivery.
- c. **Past Performance:** Evidence of past performance includes a few completed projects, with mixed reviews and performance metrics.

#### 4. Organizational Commitment:

- a. **Competent Team:** A competent project team is in place, with some roles and responsibilities defined.
- b. **Resource Allocation:** Organization has allocated some resources to support project success, but they may be insufficient.
- c. **Operational Capacity:** Moderate operational capacity and processes are in place, with room for improvement.

\*Not applicable to Acquisition-only proposals



## Housing Capital Fund Scoring Guide

### Priority: Timely Completion of Proposal

The SSHA<sup>3P</sup> Housing Capital Fund will prioritize projects that can demonstrate the ability to advance quickly to achieve activities proposed in the project application. Staff will evaluate a project's readiness, sponsor track record, and organizational commitment to timely delivery.

---

### Tier 4: Minimal Readiness and Rapid Delivery **0 - 4 Points**

#### 1. Project Readiness:

- a. **Site Control:** Project has not secured site control with no site identified.
- b. **Development Stage:** Project is in the initial stages of development, with tentative or undeveloped timelines and milestones. \*

#### 2. Financing Commitments:

- a. **Lacking Funding:** Few to no necessary financing commitments are secured, with many agreements pending.
- b. **Financial Planning:** Project demonstrates poor financial planning and risk mitigation, with no contingency plans in place.

#### 3. Sponsor Track Record:

- a. **Experience:** Sponsor has limited to no experience with similar projects, with a history of delays or budget overruns.
- b. **Reputation:** Sponsor is regarded as unreliable or inefficient in project delivery.
- c. **Past Performance:** Little to no evidence of past performance, with few or no completed projects.

#### 4. Organizational Commitment:

- a. **Inexperienced Team:** An inexperienced or under-resourced project team is in place, with undefined roles and responsibilities.
  - b. **Resource Allocation:** Organization has allocated minimal resources to support project success.
  - c. **Operational Capacity:** Low operational capacity and processes, with significant room for improvement.
- 

\*Not applicable to Acquisition-only proposals





## Housing Capital Fund Scoring Guide

### Priority: Timely Completion of Proposal

The SSHA<sup>3</sup>P Housing Capital Fund will prioritize projects that can demonstrate the ability to advance quickly to achieve activities proposed in the project application. Staff will evaluate a project's readiness, sponsor track record, and organizational commitment to timely delivery.

---

### Notes for Evaluators

1. **Project Readiness:** Assess the current stage of the project, including site control, entitlement process, and permitting status.
2. **Financing Commitments:** Evaluate the extent of secured financing commitments and the readiness of funds for deployment.
3. **Sponsor Track Record:** Consider the sponsor's experience, reputation, and past performance in completing similar projects.
4. **Organizational Commitment:** Review the organization's commitment, including the experience of the project team, resource allocation, and operational capacity.
5. **Documentation:** Require supporting documentation, such as site control agreements, entitlement approvals, permit status, financial commitments, and evidence of past performance.