



COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 8TH, 2024

5PM

ROOM 208 - NASHUA CITY HALL, 229 MAIN STREET, NASHUA, NH

Members Present: Matt Sullivan, Liz Hannum, Kristy Besada, Kyle Schneck, William Dolan, Shoshanna Kelly

Guests Present: Tim Cummings

1. Call to Order

M. Sullivan called the meeting to order at 5:04PM.

2. Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) Update

M. Sullivan provided an update on the Notice of Funding availability and its release date.

3. Discussion of Pre-Development Application/Scoring Criteria

M. Sullivan left the meeting at 5:10PM and L. Hannum facilitated as Chair.

The Committee continued its review and discussion of the pre-development application draft and two scoring methodology options (Topics of discussion are shown in the attached document as comments on the draft documents). Topics included the following:

- Scoring Criteria
 - Preference to Scoring Option #1
 - Prioritization of projects that can create units quickly
 - Inclusion of a scoring measure of funding requester per affordable unit created
 - Increasing the scoring weight of the "Project Innovation" category
 - Inclusion of a neighborhood impact measure within or outside of the "Community Engagement" category
 - Creation of additional bonus categories as follows:
 - Nashua-based firms
 - BIPOC firms
 - Environmental efficiency in construction
 - Removal of the "Applicant Capacity"
- Pre-Development Application
 - Include a "Construction Quality" category
 - Environmental efficiency standards
 - HUD/Fannie Mae standards

4. Next Meeting

The Committee agreed to meet on January 22nd, 2024 at 5PM.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30PM.





City of Nashua
 Community Development Division
 City Hall, 229 Main Street, PO Box 2019
 Nashua, New Hampshire 03061-2019
 www.nashuanh.gov

Community Development 589-3095
 Planning and Zoning 589-3090
 Building Safety 589-3080
 Code Enforcement 589-3100
 Urban Programs 589-3085
 Conservation Commission 589-3105
 Transportation 880-0100
 Sustainability 589-3092

APPLICATION SCORING CRITERIA

The following point scoring system shall be used to score applications for Fund resources. **The maximum application score is 100 points.**

SCORING OPTION #1

Commented [SM1]: This scoring format is preferred over Scoring Option #2.

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	MAXIMUM SCORE	SCORE
Development Team Capacity	The applicant shows successful history of completing similar projects and demonstrates the ability to obligate funds and undertake funds in a timely manner. The applicant is capable of financing, developing projects and managing projects successfully after completion and occupancy and has completed several development projects of similar scale and scope of the proposed project.	20	
Development Feasibility and Project Readiness	The applicant has demonstrated that they have obtained, or have the ability to obtain, site control within six months upon executing a funding agreement with the City of Nashua. Proposed projects seeking development funding have received zoning and other public approvals already or have clearly articulated the timeline to receive said approvals.	10	
Financial Feasibility	The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed project is financially feasible and leverages other public and/or private funding sources. The applicant includes strong evidence of financing commitments and identifies sufficient financing sources for all project uses. A project that has already received a LIHTC award and other state/federal funds will be prioritized for development funding.	10	
Project Timeline	Proposed projects must be started by XXXX and completed with occupancy (for applicants seeking development funding) by XXXX. The proposed timeline (including dates by which commitments will be obtained, the closing will take place, construction start-up, etc.) is realistic and achievable.	10	
Project Affordability	The proposed project will create new affordable housing opportunities that target lower income households. At a minimum, units subsidized with Trust Fund support must be affordable at 80% AMI or lower, however projects serving lower income households (i.e. 60%, 50%, 30% AMI), and those that provide a greater portion of total project units affordable targeted to lower income households will receive higher evaluation scores.	10	
Other Housing Objectives	The proposed project includes additional affordable housing commitments, programming or otherwise serves targeted populations that seek to maximize access to affordable housing. Other affordability considerations include length of deed	10	

Commented [H,L2]: This category should be clear about prioritizing how fast a project can be completed and have units on the market. How much time/unit will it take? And how much are you spending per unit? This may need to be split into multiple categories.

	restriction, targeted or preference for disadvantaged households, wrap around services by a qualified provider, or family housing. Other general considerations include green building practices, the inclusion of spaces that benefit members of the general public and local hiring/workforce development opportunities.		
Project Innovation	The proposed project promotes diverse housing types, unique funding models and/or ownership opportunities. This may include limited equity Housing Innovation cooperatives, community land trusts or other housing types that may not currently exist in Nashua.	10	
Community Engagement	The applicant has conducted community engagement or a plan for community engagement activities that reflect the scale and complexity of the proposed project. The applicant has also demonstrated project support from Nashua organizations and residents as appropriate.	10	
Bonus Point Opportunities	The project includes rental units that are affordable to households at or below 50% of Area Median Income (AMI)	10	
	Projects that propose the creation of affordable housing residents for current residents of Nashua <u>or those who are working with a local agency to be placed in housing</u>	10	
	Projects that provide housing to vulnerable populations and offer supportive services	10	

Commented [H,L3]: Increase weight of this category

Commented [H,L4]: Add Neighborhood Impact Category prior to this

Commented [H,L5]: New Bonus Point Categories:
 -Nashua based Business
 -Projects by BIPOC owned businesses
 -Environmental upgrades for efficiency

SCORING OPTION #2

Policy Objectives: Maximum of 50 Points

DRAFT

Alignment with City of Nashua Goals and Objectives: Maximum of 26 Points

- 1) Market Demand– 2 points
 - a) 2 points - high demand
 - b) 1 point - moderate demand
 - c) 0 points - does not demonstrate sufficient market demand
- 2) Zoning Compliance- 10 points
 - a) 10 points - development requires no zoning amendments or variances
 - b) 7 points - development requires a zoning amendment or variance which is consistent with the City's Master Plan
 - c) 0 points - development requires a zoning amendment that is not consistent with the City's Master Plan
- 3) Economic Diversity - 4 points
 - a) 4 points - creates housing options which promote economic diversity in the neighborhood in which the development is located
 - b) 0 points - does not promote economic diversity
- 4) Non-Profit Status (IRS Certified) - 4 points
 - a) 4 points - developer and owner are both controlled by non-profit
 - b) 2 points - either developer or owner are controlled by non-profit
 - c) 0 points - neither developer nor owner are controlled by non-profit
- 5) City Subsidy - 6 points
 - a) 6 points - investment from City is or <\$10,000/Unit

- b) 5 points - investment from City is > or = \$10,000 and <\$12,000/unit
- c) 4 points - investment from City is > or = \$12,000 and <\$14,000/unit
- d) 3 points - investment from City is > or = \$14,000 and <\$16,000/unit
- e) 2 points - investment from City is > or = \$16,000 and <\$18,000/unit
- f) 0 points - investment from City is > or = \$18,000/unit

Neighborhood Impact: Maximum of 24 Points

Commented [H,L6]: Create a category for this in option 1

- 1) Site Selection - 7 points
 - a) 7 points - fully appropriate for use,
 - b) 5 points - generally appropriate, some concerns
 - c) 0 points - significant concerns
- 2) Exterior Design - 5 points
 - a) 5 points - the design is fully consistent with neighborhood design characteristics
 - b) 3 points - the design is an adequate fit with the neighborhood design
 - c) 0 points - the design is incompatible with the neighborhood
- 3) Amenities and Unit Design -- 7 points
 - a) 7 points - amenities & unit design are well thought out and appropriate for residents
 - b) 5 points - amenities & unit design are adequate
 - c) 0 points - amenities and unit design raise significant concerns that resident needs will not be adequately addressed
- 4) Environmental -- 5 points
 - a) 5 points - Phase I identifies no environmental issues
 - b) 3 points - Phase I identifies an environmental issue, but a Phase II shows a feasible economically viable resolution which is included in the budgets
 - c) 0 points - there are significant unresolved environmental issues, and Phase II does not show a feasible, economically viable resolution which is included in the budget

Underwriting Criteria: Maximum of 50 Points

Applicant Capacity: Maximum of 20 Points

- 1) Development Budget and Sources and Uses - 10 points
 - a) 10 points - EVERY line item within the development budget complies with the HTF underwriting guidelines AND all other line items are reasonable and customary
 - b) 8 points - ONE line item falls outside HTF guidelines or outside the standard of "reasonable & customary"
 - c) 6 points - TWO line items item falls outside HTF guidelines or outside the standard of "reasonable & customary"
 - d) 0 points - more than two line items fail to meet HTF guidelines or fall outside "reasonable and customary"
- 2) Operating Pro Forma - 10 points
 - a) 10 points - EVERY operating pro forma line item within the development budget complies with the HTF guideline AND all other line items are reasonable and customary
 - b) 8 points - ONE operating pro forma line item falls outside of the HTF guideline or outside the standard of "reasonable & customary"
 - c) 6 points - TWO operating pro forma line item falls outside of the HTF guideline or outside the standard of "reasonable & customary"

- d) 0 points - more than two operating pro forma line items falls outside of the HTF guideline or fall outside "reasonable and customary"

Applicant Capacity: Maximum of 30 Points

- 1) Readiness to Proceed - 10 points
 - a) 10 points - at least one letter of commitment or interest is included and ALL projected sources are projected at terms and conditions consistent with the City's prior experience with the funder
 - b) 5 points - all projected sources of funding include letters of commitment, letters of interest, or, if no letter is included, are projected at terms and conditions consistent with the City's prior experience with this funder
 - c) 0 points - one or more sources are projected on terms that are not consistent with the City's prior experience with the funder and are not documented by letter(s) from funder(s)
- 2) Experience of Development Team - 10 points
 - a) 10 points - all development team members have a successful track record with this type of project and at this scale
 - b) 7 points - the majority of development team members have a successful track record with this type of project and at this scale; one development team member has relevant experience but at a smaller scale or not of this project type
 - c) 3 points - some development team members, while having relevant experience, have limited experience with this type of project or this scale of development
 - d) 0 points - the development team does not meet the criteria above
- 3) Current Capacity of Development Team - 10 points
 - a) 10 points - development team members have exceptional depth of human and financial resources to complete this project
 - b) 8 points - development team members have the human and financial resources to complete this project
 - c) 3 points - development team has a staffing gap in a significant role and a plan to address that gap, OR there are some concerns about the financial resources of the team to move the development forward
 - 0 points - the development team does not meet the criteria described above

Commented [H,L7]: This category should be removed.



City of Nashua
 Community Development Division
 City Hall, 229 Main Street, PO Box 2019
 Nashua, New Hampshire 03061-2019
 www.nashuanh.gov

Community Development	589-3095
Planning and Zoning	589-3090
Building Safety	589-3080
Code Enforcement	589-3100
Urban Programs	589-3085
Conservation Commission	589-3105
Transportation	880-0100
Sustainability	589-3092

PRE-DEVELOPMENT FUNDING APPLICATION

1. Project Overview:

Applicant: _____
 Applicant Contact Person Name & Title: _____
 Applicant Telephone: _____
 Applicant Mailing Address: _____
 Applicant E-mail Address: _____
 Applicant Signature (or attached letter of authorization): _____

Property Owner of Record: _____
 Property Owner Contact Person Name & Title: _____
 Property Owner Telephone: _____
 Property Owner Mailing Address: _____
 Property Owner E-mail Address: _____
 Property Owner Signature (or attached letter of authorization): _____

2. Budget Summary:

Project/Program Name: _____
 Project Location: _____
 Project Street Address: _____
 Assessor's Map & Lot#: _____
 Total Pre-Development Funds Requested: _____
 Total Project Cost: _____
 Total Existing Units: _____
 Total Proposed Units: _____
 Total Proposed Affordable Housing Units (<80% of AMI): _____
 Total Proposed Affordable Housing Units (<60% of AMI): _____
 Total Proposed Affordable Housing Units (<40% of AMI): _____
 Total Pre-Development Cost Per Proposed Affordable Unit (<80% of AMI): _____

3. Project Summary and Alignment with Housing Needs:

Please summarize the proposed project for which predevelopment funds are being requested. Include any available details about the location, size, and affordability of the proposed housing. All narratives should include a description of how the proposed project addresses the City's of Nashua's housing needs as identified in the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA).

4. Construction Quality

- a. HUD/Fannie Mae Standard Compliance (Y/N)
- a.b. Environmental Standards

Commented [SM1]: This requires further discussion. Are we asking them to meet a higher standard than current energy codes? If so, this will create costs.

4.5. Development Team Overview

Owner(s)	
Development Consultant(s)	
Developer	
Architect	
Attorney(s)	
Engineer(s)	
Management Partner	
Service Provider(s)	
Contractor (s)	
Construction Manager	
Guarantor	
Other _____	
Other _____	
Other _____	

5.6. Development Capacity and Experience:

Please provide an overview of the relevant experience and background of project team members that demonstrate the capacity of the organization to successfully execute the proposed project. Resumes for key project team members shall be attached.

DRAFT 2024.01.21

6.7. Funding Sources:

Please check all sources for the project identified that apply, including the dollar amount, and the status of funds. This shall apply to predevelopment funds *only*.

Source	Amount (\$)	Status (Committed/Identified/Award Pending)
City of Nashua Trust Fund	\$	
Developer Equity	\$	
1 st Mortgage	\$	
Bridge Loan	\$	
Other Private Bank Loan	\$	
Other Public Funding Source	\$	
Other _____	\$	
Other _____	\$	
Other _____	\$	
Other _____	\$	

7.8. Funding Uses:

Please complete for all components for which funding is being requested. Quotations for all funding uses shall be provided as an attachment to the application.

Use	Amount (\$)	Consultant Name (if selected)
Feasibility Study	\$	
Appraisals	\$	
Architecture	\$	
Engineering	\$	
Legal	\$	
Environmental Review	\$	
Other _____	\$	
Other _____	\$	
Other _____	\$	

8.9. Required Application Attachments:

- A. Organizational overview document
- B. Legal evidence of site control
- C. Consultant Quotations
- D. Development Team Resumes
- E. Title Review for subject property
- F. Property map including at a minimum: property lines, existing/proposed building footprint (if applicable), parking, and other possible site improvements.

Please direct application questions to:

Matt Sullivan, Community Development Director
Phone: 603-589-3095 Email: sullivanm@nashuanh.gov

DRAFT 2024.01.21