



2024 QAP General Listening Session 1

Overview of Changes Under Consideration

Revisiting State Priorities

This section refers to internal discussions thus far regarding updating (Core Plan) State Priorities.

Priorities to Keep

The following are likely to remain as high priorities, though defining language will be updated:

- **Quality Developments**
- **Health Outcomes for Residents**
- **Preservation of Existing Affordable Housing**

Priorities to Reframe

- **Integrated Housing Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities** may become a subset of a new, broader priority that speaks to increasing housing opportunities for those facing barriers to housing beyond income.
- **Geographic Distribution** may be reframed to incorporate “housing needs” as an additional lens for allocating resources.
 - “Need” in the QAP would be broadly defined for this purpose (e.g., jobs concentration, population growth, housing cost).
 - Geographic distribution would include the following sub-priority: “Balanced allocations between ‘high opportunity areas’ and ‘revitalizing communities.’”

New Priorities to Consider

The following may be added or emphasized as sub-priorities:

- Economic Mobility for Residents
- Deeper Targeting
- Effective Use of Resources

Priorities to Reevaluate

Internal dialogue suggests “Innovation” may be removed as a standalone priority or significantly reframed.

Overview of Major Policy Questions and Goals for 2024 QAP

The following is a non-exhaustive list of QAP topics under consideration.

Homelessness and Supportive Housing

- What QAP requirements should DCA impose to ensure all properties serve high priority populations in some capacity?
- What are best practices in permanent supportive housing (PSH)? How can the QAP provide a competitive advantage to applications best positioned to deliver PSH effectively?
- How can the QAP facilitate increased PSH capacity in communities around the state that currently face significant barriers to doing so?

Geographic Distribution & Site Selection Policies

- Incorporate new Scoring Criteria that cover “housing need,” broadly defined. For example: jobs concentration, housing cost burden, population growth.
- Assess collective impact of all site-based Scoring Criteria to ensure points do not direct developers to too few areas.
- Adjust Scoring Criteria to better balance “revitalizing” and “high opportunity” areas.

Preservation & Long-Term Affordability

- Does the QAP currently allocate too much or too few credits towards Preservation?
- Do the current set aside structure and Scoring Criteria prioritize the right properties?
- What steps can we take to maintain quality and minimize resident displacement at existing Housing Credit properties?
- Currently considering changing “New Supply Competition” to “New Affordability Competition,” removing the current disqualification of certain developments (e.g., NOAH rehabilitation).

4% Credits/Bonds Allocation

- What major issues did DCA partners observe on the ground in DCA’s implementation of the first 4%/Bonds Competitive Round?
- In what ways can DCA more effectively prioritize “readiness to proceed”?

Qualifications Determination

- How can DCA simplify the process of approving development team qualifications?
- What is the appropriate balance of...
 - ...maintaining a high bar for development team qualifications, and...
 - ...minimizing barriers to entry?

Deeper Targeting

- How can DCA expand housing opportunities for extremely low-income households beyond what is currently in **(Scoring Criteria) Deeper Targeting**?

Efficient Use of Resources

- If there were no per-property limitations on credits, bonds, and developer fees, how large of properties would be built on average for each DCA resource by QAP “geographic pool”?
- Given the above and related DCA goals, what should the appropriate limits be for 9% credits, tax-exempt bonds, and developer fees per property or development team?
- What other major issues does DCA need to consider for purposes of using scarce 9% credits and bonds optimally?

QAP and Competitive Round Structure Priorities

- Current expectation is that the next QAP will be a “2024-2025” 2-year QAP.
- Consider changing competitive round structure to “Scoring review happens first. Threshold review happens after competitive selection.”
 - To mitigate the risks of removing Threshold from competitive selection, DCA is considering adding a broader “Readiness to Proceed” Scoring section.
- Is Application Completeness currently more stringent than it should be?
- What other changes can be made to achieve efficiency in round administration?

Simplifications

- DCA hopes to simplify the following sections: Previous Projects, Community Transformation, Revitalization/Redevelopment Plans, Exceptional Nonprofit/PHA
 - What other sections should be highlighted for simplification?
- DCA wants to identify any sections for which we are asking for more Minimum Documentation than is needed.