

2017 QAP & Guide Listening Sessions Southern Maryland Comments

Date:	Wednesday, June 14, 2017
Time:	6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Location:	Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development 7800 Harkins Road Lanham, MD 20706
Attendees:	21

1. 2016 QAP had a strong preference toward Communities of Opportunity (COOs), would like to see more balance. What type of preference can we expect to see from the next Guide?
2. Are there a lot of buildable sites in COOs? There may have been a lot of available land because it was a new preference. The sites may have been low hanging fruit. It may become harder to find buildable sites as Rounds continue.
3. Give higher amount of points to projects that rent at 20% AMI as opposed to 30% AMI.
4. Require projects to reserve 5% of units for persons with disabilities where the need is strongest.
5. Give more points to projects with units reserved for persons with disabilities. Also give more points for projects with 1br units.
6. Make sidewalks and paratransit services mandatory.
7. Paratransit, even in metro areas, isn't always reliable or cost effective.
8. There is a project in Montgomery county where the locality and Developer work together to provide a bus to help with transportation. They paid for their own bus and the more residents use it, the more cost effective it becomes.
9. Developers could share a bus between communities to help offset costs of assisting residents with mobility.
10. The range for operating expenses is large. How does the Department gauge how much debt a project can take on? How does the Department standardize operating costs?
11. Virginia leverages 9% projects by giving points for 9% & 4% working in conjunction. One project came close to producing almost 200 units because of working in conjunction.
12. Will the Department standardize leveraging in underwriting? Developers are stressing projects because underwriting is incentivizing it. The Department should keep the playing field level for all.
13. Will the Department shift scoring or consider set-asides for seniors?
14. Could meet the needs of seniors and persons with disabilities together by creating family housing that is universally designed and accessible.
15. State-wide market study may help determine the need for different types of housing & where it should be located.
16. In order to gain more seniors, the capture rate may have to tighten.
17. If possible, don't fund the same markets in the following round to help with saturation.
18. Clarification of bonus points so applicants would know when their project is eligible for bonus points.

2017 QAP & Guide Listening Sessions Southern Maryland Comments

19. Give points for projects with more accessibility features (roll-in showers, etc.); also give points to projects creating more UFAS units than mandatory.
20. Very clearly lay out what would be considered universal design and prorate applications that include universal design. Virginia has a place to include a universal designer on project application. Look at Virginia, Delaware, and NC State.
21. Would like to review other people's submissions. Can full applications be published online?
22. When the Round starts, if equity is harder to come by, etc. try looking at value engineering to assist.
23. Once funding is secured, are we pushing viability commitment?
24. Change viability commitment to 120 days from 90. Also include an interim progress point.
25. Use set-asides as an easy way to reach specific housing goals. Could be used for Non Profits, Qualified Census Tract, senior, etc. Or consider a hybrid, have a competition for points but 50% is set-asides to reach certain housing goals.
26. Just set minimums for types of properties in priority categories. Developers don't like set-asides.