## **Draft 2014 Qualified Allocation Plan Public Hearing Comment Summary**

October 16, 2013 North Raleigh Hilton Raleigh, NC

Comments are listed in the order made. This document is not a transcript but rather a summary of the speakers' main points as noted by NCHFA staff. Not all comments are listed. Please contact Chris Austin <a href="mailto:claustin@nchfa.com">claustin@nchfa.com</a> with questions about your remarks.

*Larry Jarvis* – Objects to Metro counties receiving their per-capita share of credits; would like the return of points for commitment of local funds; suggested going back to the 2012 QAP.

*Ned Fowler* – Historic adaptive re-use provide double or triple benefits and Agency policies should support these type of projects; requested Amenities distance be expanded to two miles for adaptive re-use projects.

Frankie Pendergraph – Government shutdown could prevent projects from receiving Certificate of Occupancy and that should not be held against developer in return of credit allocation.

*Dale Hunter* – Spoke about the importance of fire prevention; cooking is #1 source of preventable fires; temperature limiting controls are important; seven states have adopted fire prevention policies; current policies are reactive; there are two companies who provide fire prevention technology.

David Levy – Read letter from Affordable Housing Management which can be found in the 2014 QAP Comments section of our web site.

*Tracy Mosley* – Group promotes fire prevention devices; City of Wilson passed resolution for tax supported housing having fire prevention technology; reemphasized Dale Hunter's point; 56% of fires in North Carolina are caused by unattended cooking.

George Carr – Thanks for restoring Guilford County to the Metro; likes counties getting their share of credits; should have additional Amenities points for being within ¼ to ½ mile; walking distance is important for seniors projects; including RPP in tiebreaker is an improvement; commitment of local government funds should get a point advantage.

*Tom Urquhart* – Tiebreaker may result in a bad real estate deal; easy to go too far with the numbers; suggested an additional test of tax credits per-bedroom and average the two similar to Virginia; make senior projects more competitive as they will have a greater need in the future.

*Lucius Jones* – Spoke on behalf of small towns; tax credit program is designed to serve need, to spread housing around and not concentrate it in metropolitan areas; State Tax Credit is to assist housing in small towns which is easier to do in metro areas; don't discriminate against small towns because they have less money.

Steve Sprecher – Suggested going to a 200 point system in 2015 to eliminate ties; include point categories like development experience; 20% nonprofit cap is not good policy and should be removed; 500 feet from a railroad should be measured from the building and not the parcel; supports earlier comment of two mile Amenity distance for adaptive re-use; in state developer requirement should not apply to federal tax credits but is fine for RPP; tiebreaker should be tax credits per bedroom; QAP should explain what lines 5 and 6 of the application are as it relates to the cost per unit calculation.

Sean Brady – Reiterated relationship between Amenities proximity and tiebreaker; going to a mile is good because land is more expensive if closer to amenities; difference between ½ mile and one mile is negligible.