



CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
“A Great Place to Live for All of Our Citizens”

City Manager’s Office of Community Solutions (OCS)

To: City Council
From: Antoine Williams, Housing Program Manager, OCS
Date: March 22, 2024
Re: Award of FY24 Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) and FY25 Housing Operations and Program Support (HOPS)
CC: Sam Sanders, City Manager
Alex Ikefuna, Director, OCS
FY2023-2024 CAHF Committee Members:

In furtherance to the first-reading initial assessment of the Award for the FY24 Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) and FY25 Housing Operations and Program Support (HOPS), held on March 18, 2024:

Attached, you will find detailed schedules outlining the activities carried out by the OCS housing staff and the CAHF committee in response to the feedback and queries raised by the Council. These attachments include minutes from committee discussions, distinct from the formal minutes, as well as a breakdown of funding recommendations for both the CAHF and HOPS funds. Note that the enclosed document contains unadopted discussion minutes compiled from staff notes, summarizing the proceedings of the CAHF Committee spanning multiple sessions held on January 11, 18, 22, 25, and 29, 2024, with an additional meeting on February 5, 2024.

Notably, the minutes from the January 29th session reference specific metrics/question numbers related to the grant applications. For additional context, a PDF containing the sample FY2023-FY2024 metrics/questions has been included.

Background

As a reminder, the City Council of Charlottesville established the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) Committee through resolution #R-22-039 on April 4th, 2022. The committee's mandate includes recommending priorities for utilizing CAHF funding and reviewing the city administration's recommendations for awarding such funds. Furthermore, the Council charged the CAHF committee with providing general oversight and input on the administration and effectiveness of the CAHF funding mechanism, including any associated limitations or issues.

The FY 2024-2025 CAHF Committee members are as follows:

- LD Perry (Affordable Housing Beneficiary)
- Philip d'Oronzio (At-large Representative)
- S. Lisa Herndon (At-large Representative)
- Richard Fravel (At-large Representative)
- Chris Cullinan, City of Charlottesville, Director of Finance
- Misty Graves, City of Charlottesville, Director of Human Services
- Taylor Harvey-Ryan, City of Charlottesville, Grants Program Manager

Staff Contacts: Antoine M. Williams, City of Charlottesville, Housing Program Manager – Committee Liaison, or the following Office of Community Solutions (OCS) staff:

- Alex Ikefuna, City of Charlottesville, Director of OCS
- Madelyn Metzler, City of Charlottesville, Housing Compliance Coordinator
- Alan Peura, City of Charlottesville, Grants Coordinator

About the Notice of Funding (NOFA):

The Notice of Funding (NOFA) for affordable housing activities for the fiscal year 2024-2025 was released and published on September 12, 2023. This document outlined the general program criteria, estimated funding amounts, and the funding availability date for the City's FY2024 CAHF Grant Program and FY2025 Housing Operations and Programs Support (HOPS) Grant Program. Interested parties were given a minimum of 30 calendar days to review the NOFA.

The application period for HOPS, previously a funding category within the City's Vibrant Community Fund (VCF) Grant Program, opened for FY2025 applications as advertised in the FY2023 NOFA. Applications were accepted from September 14, 2023, to October 16, 2023. It is also important to note that applicants were granted a 2-week extension due to technical issues with the designated email for submissions. It is also pertinent to note that the FY2024 CAHF Grant Program, separate from the VCF Grant Program, opened its application period for FY2024 applications as advertised in the FY2023 NOFA. Applications for the CAHF Grant Program were accepted from October 12, 2023, to November 16, 2023.

In Service,

Antoine M. Williams
Housing Program Manager

Attachments:

- FY2023-2024 CAHF Meeting Discussion Unadopted Minutes
- Attachment B: FY2023-2024 CAHF (24)/HOPS (25) Reviewer Criteria Metrix

Attachment A

The following document comprises unadopted meeting minutes prepared from staff notes, capturing the proceedings of the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) Committee across multiple sessions held on January 11, 18, 22, 25, and 29, 2024, and February 5, 2024. Throughout these discussions, CAHF committee members demonstrate their dedication to transparency, fairness, and strategic decision-making in the distribution of funds to support impactful affordable housing initiatives.

January 11, 2024

Attendees: Phil d'Oronzio, Taylor Harvey-Ryan, S. Lisa Herndon, Misty Graves, Richard Fravel

Staff: Antoine Williams, Alan Peura, Madelyn Metzler

Discussion Points:

- **Long-term Goals:** Discussed establishing Standard Operating Procedures, Policies, and Processes for the CAHF Committee.
- **Review Process:**
 - The previous cycle involved splitting applications into A, B, and C groups.
 - Group A: Complete applications.
 - Group B: Applications needing clarification.
 - Group C: Applications deemed ineligible or substantially incomplete.
 - Consensus reached to repeat this process.
- **Incomplete Applications:** Agreed to notify all applicants about missing information.
 - Deadline set for submitting missing information: Close of business Tuesday, January 16.
 - Committee to categorize applications into groups A, B, and C at the next meeting.
 - No scoring for Group C applications; only categorization.
- **Questions and Clarifications:**
 - No favoritism based on previous submissions; all applicants are given equal opportunity.
 - No appeal process in place.
 - Council can receive recommendations for additional funding recipients.
 - Committee to prioritize CAHF applications initially.
 - Funding decisions based on scores, with consideration of past performance.
 - Scores not sent in advance to allow for discussion.
- **Proposed Timeline for Future Meetings:**
 - January 18: Complete CAHF groupings.
 - January 22: Complete HOPS groupings.
 - January 25: Score CAHF applications and start scoring HOPS.
 - January 29: Score HOPS applications and make funding decisions.

January 11, 2024 – Continued

Action Items:

- Antoine Williams, Housing Program Manager, will notify all applicants about missing information by the close of business on Tuesday, January 16.
- Committee members will categorize applications into groups A, B, and C at the next meeting.
- Staff will prepare additional surge protectors for laptops.
- Arrange seats in a square for better discussion facilitation.

Future Meetings and Scheduling Notes:

- The location for the following meetings is to remain at CitySpace.
- Ms. Herndon will note her conflict with the January 18 meeting.
- The January 29 meeting is to be extended until 4:00 pm.

Meeting adjourned: at 1:35 pm.

January 18, 2024

Attendees: Phil d’Oronzio (PdO), LD Perry (LDP), Misty Graves (MG), Taylor Harvey-Ryan (THR), Chris Cullinan (CC), Richard Fravel (RF)

Staff: Antoine Williams, Alan Peura, Madelyn Metzler, Alex Ikefuna

Discussion Points:

- **Introduction:** Today's meeting aims to categorize CAHF applications into three groups as a collective effort.
 - The committee established an initial ranking system with three categories:

Category A

Definition: Proposals in this category are highly aligned with the committee's funding priorities and are deemed to have significant impact and feasibility.

Criteria: Applications in this category typically clearly align with the city's goals, offer innovative solutions to housing challenges, and show a high likelihood of successful implementation.

Examples: Applicants in this category are those whose proposals are considered highly impactful and feasible. They may have clear project plans, address critical community needs, and have a strong track record of success or effectiveness in similar initiatives.

Category B

Definition: Proposals in this category have merit but may require additional scrutiny or adjustment before full funding can be justified.

Criteria: Applications in this category may show promise, but some aspects need further clarification, refinement, or validation. They could address essential needs but may have some uncertainties or risks that need to be addressed before proceeding with total funding.

Examples: Applicants in this category may have strong project ideas but need more details on their implementation plans, budgetary considerations, or alignment with city priorities. They might also require additional information or evidence to demonstrate their potential impact or feasibility.

Category C

Definition: Proposals in this category are either unclear, provide limited benefit or alignment with the city's goals, or have significant concerns that raise doubts about their viability.

Criteria: Applications in this category may lack clarity in their objectives, implementation plans, or expected outcomes. They might also show limited alignment with the city's housing priorities or have significant issues undermining their feasibility or potential impact.

Examples: Applicants in this category might have unclear project goals, insufficient evidence of effectiveness, or significant challenges that raise doubts about their ability to achieve the desired outcomes. They might also lack alignment with the city's strategic objectives or fail to address pressing housing needs in the community.

- **Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP):**
 - The committee consensus assigned this application to **Category B**
 - The committee discussed the specificity of project details and allocation of funds.
 - Questions were raised regarding staff support allocation and project prioritization, and clarification was requested on whether the funding is solely for personnel.
 - Questions about the number of households supported and the allocation of funds were noted, and inconsistencies in the budget table and clarification on the allocation of funds were needed.

- **Charlottesville Redevelopment Housing Authority (CRHA):**
 - The committee consensus assigned this application to **Category C**.
 - Concerns were raised about inconsistencies in project details and funding source appropriateness.
 - Discussion about potential conflicts of interest and the need for accountability.
- **Community Services Housing, Inc. (CSH):**
 - The committee consensus assigned this application to **Category A**.
 - Applauded for detailed project plan and budget clarity.
 - Concerns were raised regarding the criticality of proposed repairs.
- **Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville:**
 - The committee consensus assigned this application to **Category A**.
 - Discussion on project scalability and current grant project status.
- **Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA):**
 - The committee consensus assigned this application to **Category A**.
 - Discussion on project affordability and community engagement.
- **Virginia Supportive Housing (VSH):**
 - The committee consensus assigned this application to **Category B**.
 - Discussion about existing funding commitments and project specificity.

Questions for Applicants:

- Various questions were posed to applicants regarding project specifics, previous funding, and fiscal records.

Action Items:

- Follow-up with AHIP regarding staff support allocation and project prioritization details.
- Review CRHA application for potential conflicts of interest and accountability measures.
- Seek clarification from CSH regarding the criticality of proposed repairs.
- Investigate PHA's ability to increase the number of affordable units.
- Obtain detailed budget and funding comparison from VSH.

Questions about Next Steps:

- Decision pending on scoring applications in Category C.
- Agreement to score CSH due to potential impact on funding amount.

Meeting Adjourned: 1:40 pm.

January 22, 2024

Attendees: LD Perry (LDP), Misty Graves (MG), Taylor Harvey-Ryan (THR), Chris Cullinan (CC), Richard Fravel (RF), S Lisa Herndon (SLH)

Staff: Antoine Williams, Alan Peura, Madelyn Metzler

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 12:13, focusing on reviewing various grant applications.

- **Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP)**

Program: Charlottesville Critical Rehab and Repair

Request: \$300,000

- Discussion ensued regarding inconsistencies in AHIP's applications concerning its budget and the allocation of funds.
- Questions were raised concerning the number of households to be supported and whether the entire sum was designated for personnel.
- The application was categorized as "B."

- **Blue Ridge Area Coalition for the Homeless (BRACH)**

Program: Homeless System of Care Coordination

Request: \$50,000

- Members THR and MG recused themselves.
- The application was categorized as "A" by the remaining members.
- Some discussion was held on the applicant's continuity planning, previous award/program outcome, and continuum of care programmatic aspects.

- **Central Virginia Legal Aid Society (CVLAS)**

Program: Charlottesville Housing Outreach Attorney

Request: \$113,600

- Concerns were raised about the disparity in funding requests from different municipalities and potential overlaps with similar organizations' services.
- Questions were posed regarding the requested position's nature and exclusivity for city residents.
- The application was categorized as "C."

- **Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA)**

Program: CRHA Resident Services Program

Request: \$150,000

- Discussions revolved around the necessity and clarity of the proposed funding, especially considering existing staff and grants.
- Questions focused on CRHA's budget breakdown and alignment with organizational goals.
- The application was categorized as "C."

-
- **Community Services Housing, Inc. (CSH)**
Program: Community Services Housing
Request: \$78,620
 - Queries were raised regarding the justification for the requested amount considering the organization's surplus budget.
 - The application was categorized as “B.”
 - **Georgia’s Friends, Inc.**
Program: Transitional Living Services Pilot Program
Request: \$25,000
 - Discussions centered on the program's uniqueness and potential overlaps with existing services.
 - Queries were made concerning revenue-expenditure discrepancies and the nature of the proposed pilot.
 - The application was categorized as “A”.
 - **Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville (HFH Charlottesville)**
Program: HFH Charlottesville Homeownership Program
Request: \$75,000
 - No questions were raised, and the application was categorized as 'B.'
 - **Local Energy Alliance Program, Inc (LEAP)**
Program: Reducing Energy Burdens (REB)
Request: \$85,000
 - Discussions concerning the necessity of the requested funds and the organization's financial outlook.
 - Queries were made regarding revenue-expenditure disparities and program expansion plans.
 - The application was categorized as “C.”
 - **Legal Aid Justice Center (LAJC)**
Program: Housing Legal Services
Request: \$50,000
 - Questions were posed regarding LAJC’s uniqueness and financial standing.
 - The application was categorized as “C.”
 - **New Hill Development, Inc.**
Program: New Hill Affordable Housing Initiative
Request: \$50,000
 - Queries were raised regarding program specifics, collaborations, and budget details.
 - The application was categorized as “C.”

- **People and Congregations Engaged in Ministry (PACEM)**

Program: PACEM Case Management

Request: \$100,000

- Queries were made regarding the organization's administrative support and past reporting practices.
- The application was categorized as “B.”

- **Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA)**

Program: Charlottesville Affordable Housing Program

Request: \$185,000

- Queries were raised concerning revenue-expenditure disparities and program specifics.
- The application was categorized as “B.”

- **Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR)**

Program: PHAR Internship Program

Request: \$45,000

- Queries focused on differentiating the ask from other applications and ensuring city resident focus.
- The application was categorized as “B.”

- **Restoration And Hope House LLC**

Program: Restoration and Hope House Program

Request: \$150,000

- Discussions revolved around revenue-expenditure disparities and budget breakdowns.
- The application was categorized as “B.”

- **The Haven at First & Market Inc (the “Haven”)**

Program: Vital Housing Services

Request: \$110,000

- No questions were raised, and the application was categorized as “A.”

- **The Haven at First & Market Inc (the “Haven”)**

Program: The Haven Day Shelter

Request: \$110,000

- No questions were raised, and the application was categorized as “A.”

Action Items:

- Group members were to email scores for PHAR and BRACH.

Meeting adjourned: at 1:40 pm.

Attendees: Phil d’Oronzio (PdO), LD Perry (LDP), Misty Graves (MG), Taylor Harvey-Ryan (THR), Chris Cullinan (CC), S Lisa Herndon (SLH), Richard Fravel (RF)

Staff: Alan Peura, Madelyn Metzler, Alex Ikefuna

Agenda Item 1: BRACH HOPs Applications

- **Discussion:** CC requests clarification on the distinction between the two BRACH programs.
- **Action:** PdO explains that one application is for fully staffing the hotline, while the other is for staffing capacity for coordination.
- **Category:** A

Agenda Item 2: PHAR HOPS Application

- **Discussion:** MG provides context from the previous year's application process. Questions arise regarding the effectiveness and impact of the internship program.
- **Action:** The committee seeks clarification from the applicant regarding the role of interns and the engagement of program graduates.
- **Category:** B

Agenda Item 3: Funding Strategy Discussion

- **Discussion:** SLH suggests inquiring about VCF funding in future applications. The committee discusses funding allocation strategies given budget constraints.
- **Action:** THR proposes using numerical scores and sets a deadline for scoring completion before the next meeting. Another meeting is scheduled to finalize decisions.
- **Category:** Funding Strategy

Additional Meeting Scheduled

- Another meeting is set for Monday, February 5 from 11am-2pm to finalize awards.
- **Action:** Committee members are encouraged to input their scores into the provided spreadsheet on Teams before the next meeting.
- **Category:** Logistics

Meeting Adjourned: 1:06 pm

January 29, 2024

Attendees: Phil d’Oronzio (PdO), Misty Graves (MG), Taylor Harvey-Ryan (THR), Chris Cullinan (CC), S Lisa Herndon (SLH), Richard Fravel (RF)

Staff: Alan Peura, Madelyn Metzler, Antoine Williams

Meeting begins: 12:28

Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP)

- **Project Name:** AHIP Critical Home Rehab Projects
- **Request:** \$210,000
- **Initial Average Score:** 76

Questions to Discuss:

- Question 19: Clarification is needed on the information provided.
- **Average Score after Discussion:** 77.3

Overall Comments:

- Next time, specify not needing audited financial statements.

Charlottesville Redevelopment Housing Authority (CRHA)

- **Project Name:** CRHA Homeownership Program
- **Request:** \$550,000
- **Initial Average Score:** 67.5

Questions to Discuss:

- Questions 13, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 29, 30
- **Average Score after Discussion:** 68

Overall Comments:

- Question rewording suggested for clarity.
- CAHF may not be the best funding source.

Community Services Housing, Inc. (CSH)

- **Project Name:** Rehabilitation Repairs to Preserve Community Services Housing Properties
- **Request:** \$74,054
- **Initial Average Score:** 91.8

Questions to Discuss:

- Questions 9, 19, 22, 28
- **Average Score after Discussion:** 91.8

Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville

- **Project Name:** Habitat Core 2024
- **Request:** \$525,000
- **Average Score:** 97.8

Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA)

- **Project Name:** 501 Cherry Ave
- **Request:** \$375,000

Questions to Discuss:

- Questions 3, 5, 8, 20, 25
- **Average Score after Discussion:** 89.3

January 29, 2024 – Continued

VSH

- **Project Name:** Premier Circle PSH
- **Request:** \$483,278
- **Average Score:** 83

Questions to Discuss:

- Questions 2, 8, 15, 19
- **Average Score after Discussion:** 83

Action:

- Reach out to LDP for scores.
- Focus on questions with discrepancies at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 2:50 pm.

February 5, 2024

Attendees: Misty Graves (MG), Taylor Harvey-Ryan (THR), Chris Cullinan (CC), Richard Fravel (RF)

Staff: Alan Peura, Madelyn Metzler, Antoine Williams

Meeting Commencement:

The meeting begins at 11:10 AM.

Decision:

The committee votes to proceed without LD Perry's (LDP) scores, as they have not been received by today's meeting. All members are in favor.

Discussion on CAHF Funding Allocation:

- THR suggests allocating 81% to the top two applicants and around 30% to the next three, with no funding for CRHA.
- CC agrees with not funding CRHA and suggests that CAHF might not be the appropriate funding source for their request.
- PdO concurs, noting that CAHF might not be suitable for CRHA's needs.
- The committee discusses other applicants that might require full funding to proceed.
- After deliberation, a motion is proposed by PdO to allocate funding to AHIP, CSH, Habitat, and PHA. THR seconds the motion and passes unanimously.

Secondary Recommendations:

- PdO suggests that the council find another funding avenue for VSH due to the size of their project and other available funding sources.
- The committee also decides to recommend against funding CRHA due to the inability to measure progress effectively.

Future Considerations:

- The committee discusses potential improvements to the application process and scoring tool, including requesting interim financials instead of audits.
- Plans are made to schedule meetings during the summer to address changes to the application process and scoring criteria.

Discussion on HOPS Funding:

- THR recommends funding the top eight applicants based on their scores, with different percentages allocated to each tier.
- Concerns are raised about missing scores from SLH.
- It's agreed to hold off on finalizing HOPS funding until SLH's scores are received.

Drafting Recommendations:

- RF proposes language for the CAHF memo to the council, outlining the reasons for not recommending funding for CRHA and VSH.
- A motion is made and passed to adopt RF's language for the memo.

Conclusion:

- A motion is passed to finalize HOPS funding based on THR's recommendation, with staff authorized to make minor adjustments.
- A motion is also passed to adopt RF's language for the CAHF memo to the council.

Final Ranking:

CAHF- \$835,000 available

A	Community Services Housing, Inc. (CSH)	\$74,054
	Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville	\$525,000
	Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA)	\$375,000
	<i>Category A Total</i>	<i>\$974,054</i>
B	Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP)	\$210,000
	Virginia Supportive Housing (VSH)	\$483,278
	<i>Category B Total</i>	<i>\$693,278</i>
C	Charlottesville Redevelopment Housing Authority (CRHA)	\$550,000
	<i>Category C Total</i>	<i>\$550,000</i>
Total requested in applications		\$2,217,332

HOPS- \$835,000 available

A	Blue Ridge Area Coalition for the Homeless (BRACH)- System of Care Coordination	\$50,000
	Blue Ridge Area Coalition for the Homeless (BRACH)- Homeless Information Line	\$40,000
	Georgia's Friends, Inc.	\$25,000
	The Haven- Vital Housing Services	\$110,000
	The Haven- Day Shelter	\$110,000
	<i>Category A Total</i>	<i>\$335,000</i>

February 5, 2024 - Continued

Final Committee Award Recommendations:

B	Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP)	\$300,000
	Community Services Housing, Inc. (CSH)	\$78,620
	Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville	\$75,000
	People and Congregations Engaged in Ministry (PACEM)	\$100,000
	Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA)	\$185,000
	Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR)	\$45,000
	Restoration And Hope House LLC	\$150,000
	<i>Category B Total</i>	<i>\$933,620</i>
C	Central Virginia Legal Aid Society (CVLAS)	\$113,600
	Charlottesville Redevelopment Housing Authority (CRHA)	\$150,000
	Legal Aid Justice Center (LAJC)	\$50,000
	Local Energy Alliance Program, Inc (LEAP)	\$85,000
	New Hill Development, Inc.	\$50,000
	<i>Category C Total</i>	<i>\$448,600</i>
Total requested in applications		\$1,717,220

After careful consideration and discussion of all applications, the CAHF Committee recommended the following awards of CAHF funding:

- AHIP's Charlottesville Critical Rehabilitation Program: \$117,196
- Community Services Housing, Inc.'s Rehabilitation Repairs to Preserve CSH Properties: \$74,054
- Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville's Habitat Core 2024: \$393,750
- Piedmont Housing Alliance's 501 Cherry Avenue: \$250,000

After careful consideration and discussion of all applications, the CAHF Committee recommended the following awards of HOPS funding:

- BRACH's Homeless System of Care Coordination Program: \$35,000
- BRACH's Homeless Information Line Program: \$28,000
- Community Services Housing's Community Services Housing Program: \$55,034
- Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville's Homeownership Program: \$65,250
- PACEM's Case Management Program: \$70,000
- Piedmont Housing Alliance's Charlottesville Affordable Housing Program: \$148,000
- The Haven's Vital Housing Services Program: \$95,716
- The Haven's Day Shelter Program: \$88,000

Adjournment:

The meeting is adjourned at 1:30 PM.

Attachment B

CAHF(FY24) HOPS(FY25) REVIEW CRITERIA	
#	Description
1	The applicant is a 501© (3) government entity, experienced housing developer, or public housing agency
2	The proposed project activities are within the city.
3	The program presents local data to describe the need addressed for the program.
4	The program demonstrates a good understanding (using local data) of the specific needs and strengths of beneficiaries
5	The program addresses the impact if all or some of the funds requested are not received
6	The program strategies specifically and directly address the identified needs and promote equity
7	The program strategies utilize best practices research or evidence-based practices.
8	The program implements an evaluation plan with program-appropriate metrics.
9	The program collaborates with other organizations to address an identified need
10	The application addresses the applicant's administrative, financial, and personnel capacity in relation to its ability to provide the program
11	The program has strategies for outreach to underserved populations
12	The program effectively engages underserved populations
13	Program beneficiaries are involved in program planning and governance
14	Participant involvement has been used to improve programming
15	The program reports on outcomes that are used to improve practices.
16	The application addresses the overall priority of promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion and the applicant has an adopted DEI statement
17	The application explains how the program addresses the City Council priorities of Affordable Housing and Equity
18	The program and organization are fiscally sound
19	The quality of programming and effectiveness of outcomes

Attachment B

20	The organization's staff and board represent the community served
21	The affordability level of the programs or services the organization typically provides
22	Capacity—The organization has completed the application and has no known issues (financial, capacity, etc.).
Bonus 1	For previous applicants, Projected FY23 program outcomes were achieved.
Bonus 2	The project exceeds criteria to the greatest degree (Merit of application)

DO NOT COPY