

Johnson, Leanne 6-9248

From: Nicholson, Laura 6-9190
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 3:48 PM
To: Johnson, Leanne 6-9248
Subject: FW: Comments on 2017-2018 SC QAP

Please add to the 2017 QAP comment section.



Laura Nicholson, Development Director
300-C Outlet Pointe Blvd. I Columbia, SC 29210
Phone: 803.896.9190 | Fax: 803.551-4925
www.SCHousing.com

From: Thompson Gooding [<mailto:t.gooding@oracledesign.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 11:15 AM
To: Nicholson, Laura 6-9190
Subject: Comments on 2017-2018 SC QAP

Laura,

Thanks for hosting the QAP Roundtable last week. I am sorry it has taken me a little while to follow up, but I would like to offer the following comments as you continue to develop the final QAP for 2017-2018:

- I would suggest that you consider reducing the focus on site distance to various community amenities. I completely support the intent here, and even support adding a few new categories (see daycare centers below), but this has essentially become the sole determinant in award selection. It ignores many other important factors in making a successful project (quality schools, access to jobs, public transport, quality services, etc.). Certainly keep these points, just add some other categories to balance it out.
- Please take a look at the quality of your third-party site reviewers. Ours made some questionable decisions, such as interviewing a gas station attendant for information on nearby detrimental site characteristics. This question should have been directed to someone with some authority, such as the local government, fire marshal, etc.
- Could you please issue a searchable version of the QAP? The manual was issued in searchable format, but the QAP was not. Searchability makes it much easier to find a specific section or keyword.
- I support the comment that was made at the roundtable about adding points for proximity to (licensed) daycare centers.
- I support the comments about removing state-specific experience points. Overall experience is obviously critical, but in-state experience really adds nothing to the quality of the project. The sole comment at the

meeting against this suggestion was a weak point about avoiding NIMBY-ism. This is prevalent in affordable housing regardless of the developer.

- As you consider the state-designated basis boost, I would suggest looking at justification and need for the boost. If a project can demonstrate need (other than just eliminating debt altogether), the boost should be awarded, but holding back or reducing the boost for projects that don't truly need it will allow you to fund more deals.
- I support the comment from the roundtable that urban projects with city land, Section 8, etc, may be better candidates for 4% deals, not a set aside for 9%.
- I support the comments for a more electronic application submission process. I think just submitting everything on a flash drive in .pdf would make everyone's life so much easier. You do not need a sophisticated online portal, just get rid of the paper.

Thanks so much, and we look forward to participating again this year,
Thompson

Thompson Gooding
Vice President
Oracle Consulting Services
(229) 251-6399

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.