

From Quinn Gormley to Everyone: 10:05 AM

Love the streamlining and making technical review touchpoints

From David Wohl to Everyone: 10:16 AM

One issue with the amenity scoring as it is written now - if a project is closer to many amenities, the aggregate distance could be higher than one with fewer amenities. Project A could be within one mile of three different amenities (aggregate score of 3), while Project B is within half a mile each of seven amenities (aggregate score of 3.5). Project A has a better competitive score.

I'll have a comment to ADOH in greater detail about this.

From Maryann Beerling to Everyone: 10:17 AM

What determined the 2012 LIHTC start date? Why doesn't it include projects still within the 15 years? Will you please look at this again?

From fredrick watahomigie to Everyone: 10:17 AM

Mohave county needs to be added

From Thomas Bly to Everyone: 10:19 AM

Is scoring for Rehab projects the same as scoring for New Construction?

From Scott Puffer to Everyone: 10:20 AM

Approximately 1 out of 6 sites searched in the Opportunity 360 tool have "NO DATA" for at least one of the criteria utilized for scoring.

From Brandon Delk to Everyone: 10:24 AM

Please confirm minimum scoring requirements apply to 4% deals. Please also confirm that a new construction 4% deal must have an average income and rent restriction equal to 50% AMI or lower.

From Patrick Nguyen to Everyone: 10:25 AM

Can you please circle around the scoring regarding Proximity to Amenities? Is there only one Application scoring the maximum 30 points?

From David Wohl to Everyone: 10:25 AM

An underwriting question: the draft QAP appears to require a 10% vacancy rate. As I will detail in detail in a forthcoming comment, this is inconsistent with history since the 2008 recession and also will almost certainly conflict with lender/investor underwriting.

From Quinn Gormley to Everyone: 10:26 AM

There are several subjective scoring items here. Applications can cost 100K plus at risk. A QAP that is prescriptive rather than subjective allows applicants to better gauge exactly how the proposed development will fare at application submission.

From David Wohl to Everyone: 10:26 AM

I completely agree with Quinn's comment regarding subjectivity.

From Daryn Murphy to Everyone: 10:28 AM

Can you discuss the concept of recycled applications again?

From Quinn Gormley to Everyone: 10:28 AM

Underwriting should follow AHIC (Affordable Housing Investor Council" tools

https://ahic.org/Tools___Resources

From fredrick watahomigie to Everyone: 10:32 AM

mohave county hualapai tribe

thank you

From Scott Puffer to Everyone: 10:32 AM

Piggy backing on Quinn's comments and the costs for preparing an application, the scoring method for 60 out of 210 of the total points are unknown at submission (opportunity and amenities) resulting in applications that are impossible to self-score. Also, suggest the individual criterion (ie grocery, hospital etc.) be scored individually against a objective distance like giving 5 points for 7 criteria with a max point score of 30. IE, if a site is within close proximity to 6 out of 7 criterion but one happens to be far away, does that make that site a bad site for affordable housing in practice? will comment more and provide suggestions by 9/15

From David Wohl to Everyone: 10:34 AM

Here's a completely shoot-from-the-hip idea that may not work. Maybe a pre-qualification round that doesn't require market study and other 3rd party costs to see how various projects compete with each other.

The highest scoring projects are then invited to submit a complete application.