

Tara Hall

From: Craig Stone <craig@wynnefieldforward.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2023 6:15 PM
To: Tara Hall; Davis Ray - WynnefieldForward
Subject: Comments for the 2023 QAP

Tara:

I wanted to send in a comment to the latest draft of the of the QAP to address an item we do not support. We do not support the current 3rd tie break. We see no value to the program, nor to the state of NC with this tie break. Our overall concern is we are moving away from the strengths of the program; for the citizens of NC, and we are now looking at tie breaks which have no real benefit and value to the people we all serve and our state. The 4th tie break: being moved to the 3rd tie break, would be a much more beneficial tie break scenario for the program, and for the citizens of NC we all are charged to serve. Again, of the options in the current QAP drafts, the 4th tie break appears to be a much more aligned benefit to all involved. In addition, what assurances would the NCHFA IT staff have should the current proposed tie break play itself out at 12:01 on New Years eve? Will the NCHFA be providing staff to help with issues at 12:01 via email or phone call given the impact of this tie break? Our concern is that the NCHFA's site will crash, leading to problems with how to monitor the submissions and then how would this be policed and or fairly handled? Our program regularly communicates to others several benefits related to the additional jobs the work we do helps support. What message is this sending to those professionals whose lives will be impacted as well during the holidays. The program moved the submittal of the preliminary QAP away from the holidays to a later date in January for this very reason. We ask that you consider all the families involved on the opposite side of the table from the NCHFA staff and what the current date and time would mean. We agree producing a beneficial tie break to all is difficult however, this is not the best we can do as a program. We need more tie breaks that result in better deals and the most units for the state of NC and its citizens. If the 4th tie break is used, we also ask that the QAP give clarity to when the tie break criteria will be applied. What this especially means is will the preliminary numbers used in each application be applied or will the final submission numbers be used to decide the tie break?

Lastly, we ask that monies used in the second tie break be further clarified and defined. Our concern is that this tie break will be used negatively. We think more clarity around this tie break is needed. We see the potential of monies earmarked in the deal to be used and or converted to funds which might be used for this tie break. Our ask is for further language around the 2nd tie break monies so that everyone will know how this money will be underwritten, and how it will be policed by the NCFHA. Is the intent of these funds to be only funds supplied by a local municipality or exactly what is the intent?

Best regards,

Craig Stone