

Tara Hall

From: Tim Morgan <Tim@eccmgt.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 3:07 PM
To: Tara Hall; Scott Farmer
Subject: Second Draft QAP Comment

Tara/Scott

I appreciate the agency's attempt at coming up with a way to differentiate scores but believe the introduction of a walk score this late in the process is not good. Especially since only one comment out of 48 received and posted on the agency's website, mentioned walkability as a possible way to incorporate a difference. And I do not recall it being mentioned during the public hearing held on 10/27. I fully understand we all take risks, but I negotiated a contract (for a third time submittal) and had to pay \$10,000 hard money in order to incentivize the seller to allow me one more try. That was done on October 22, after the first draft release on 9/17, and its walk score is 34. I would not have put hard money up knowing what I know now. Especially since its in a county that will see some of the same sites resubmitted that have better walk scores.

Likewise I paid \$70,000 hard money to convince Lidl to let me try for a second time in Apex. That payment was made October 15, again after the first draft release. I got lucky with its walk score but the point is, there are development groups spending considerable sums of money with applications and to bring a new element as a walk score (as a point category) this late in the process is not good.

If staff wants to have some element of a walk score involved for 2022, at most let it be a tie breaker, but not as a scoring category. Likewise, If staff is adamant about introducing this as a point category, give the development community heads up and tell us it will be in the 2023 QAP.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

Timothy G. Morgan - Vice President
Evergreen Construction Company
7706 Six Forks Road - Raleigh, NC 27615
Ph: 919-848-2041, ext. 201
www.evergreenconstructionco.com

