



TO: NCHFA Staff

FROM: Tim Morgan

SUBJECT: 2024 QAP Comments

DATE: October 12, 2023

The following comments are made in reference to the first draft of the 2024 QAP:

1. Request the agency continue waiving cost restrictions and negative points related to construction costs. There are adequate caps in place already (meaning maximum credit and RPP amounts).
2. Request the credit cap be increased to \$1.4M. The current limit of \$1.2M is not adequate to get anywhere near the unit cap of 120 in metro and 84 in the other regions due to persistent high construction costs and interest rates.
3. Change bus/transit criteria to 5 days a week service vs current requirement of six.
4. The proposed secondary amenities scoring will greatly decrease the number of senior proposals being submitted due to the lack of senior centers. Developers will be forced to submit family proposals because of the public-school amenity being more plentiful in communities which result in a higher site score as a family proposal.
5. Required Site Amenities (Appendix B) under Senior, suggest "Covered Patio/Porch or Gazebo" be added as a required amenity. It can be difficult finding space on a site to put the gazebo as well as having to ensure its ADA compliant.
6. Appendix B II A 1: Define width associated with the "Wide window and door trim must be used to better accent siding."
7. Appendix B II A 19: Include clarification that 1<sup>st</sup> Floor is considered the lowest floor as opposed to basement or ground floor (thinking of a ¾ split building).
8. Appendix B II C 12: Add clarification "except at interior unit entry doors".
9. Appendix B II C 17: Clarify is the interior stair handrails mounted on a continuous "exposed" wood backer board.
10. Appendix B II H 6: Clarify handrail is permitted to be mounted either on concealed wood blocking or surface mounted backer board.
11. Appendix B II F 4: Is there a requirement on the amount of clear floor space at the pantry and if so, is it centered on the door or on the door handle.
12. Tiebreaker Criteria: Remove the proposed Third Tiebreaker, it does nothing to enhance the end user, the resident. I suggest the following tiebreaker criterias:
  - (a) First: County with highest cost burden low-income renters.
  - (b) Second: Project with lowest average income targeting at time of **FULL APPLICATION**.
  - (c) Third: Project with highest percentage of non-agency/non-related funding.
  - (d) Fourth: Tenants with Children
  - (e) Fifth: Tenant Ownership



Equal Housing Opportunity

*This institution is an equal opportunity provider and employer*