

**2012 Qualified Allocation Plan/HOME/Program
Public Hearing**

May 5, 2011

New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority
Bedford, NH

<u>Attendee Name</u>	<u>Agency or Organization</u>
Robert Felder	Felder Development
Justin Dextrateur	Hartland Group
Keith Thibault	SW Cap
John Anton	Northern New England Investment Fund (NNEIF)
Steve Schuster	LACLT
Mike LaFontaine	NH Community Loan Fund (NHCLF)
Max Makaitis	Tri County Cap
Tim Kleiner	SLI Management
Steve Lewis	Developer
Tom Krebs	NeighborWorks Greater Manchester (NGM)
Tony Moreno	NeighborWorks Greater Manchester (NGM)
Robert Tourigny	NeighborWorks Greater Manchester (NGM)
Jennifer Vadney	NeighborWorks Greater Manchester (NGM)
Rosemary Heard	CATCH
Mike Reed	CATCH
Ignatius McClellan	Northern New England Investment Fund (NNEIF)
Craig Welch	NH Community Loan Fund (NHCLF)
Ken Viscarello	Sheehan, Phinney, Bass & Green, PA

Staff: Chris Miller, Dick Weaver, Mark Koppelkam, Ted Wilkinson, Jim Menihane, Melanie Toscano, Ted Wilkinson, Gloria Paradise, Bill Guinther.

Chris Miller introduced the public hearing. He noted that changing of the 2012 application cycle to the fall of 2011 is the major change in this year's draft QAP/HOME rules.

Public comments:

1. Mike LaFontaine, NHCLF
 - Dislikes the 3 points for land ownership... too much cost to get to that point.
 - Reconsider CHODO points...should be worth more.
 - Re-evaluate tenant services to families...increase from 5 to 10 points.
 - Add 3 points for having an unsuccessful application in the previous round.
 - Add 3 points for developer "experience".
 - The "advanced projects" section has too much emphasis
 - Increase the minimum set-aside for senior projects.

2. Steve Schuster
 - Would prefer two application rounds.
 - If the Land Trust buys land for "ownership" points, it can't later sell that land if project is not approved.
 - Wants tenant services better articulated.

3. Steve Lewis
 - Wants to reward communities that put new workforce housing emphasis into effect.
 - Wants points for “super-green” building practices.
 - Wants clarity on language about site plan approval, as some Town Planning Boards require additional approvals all through the building process.
4. Tony Moreno, NGM
 - Concerned that “advanced points” forces developers to take excessive risk in order to secure points
5. Robert Tourigny, NGM
 - Tenant services points for families “has been neutered.”
 - Reward towns that “want” affordable housing.
 - Add more than 2 points for comprehensive plans.
 - Add more points for CHODO involvement, e.g. 3 points as sponsor, 3 as general partner.
6. Ken Viscarello, SPB&G
 - Asked for clarification on footnote 23, regarding “same entity.” Obviously the limited partnership for different phases will almost always be different.
7. Ignatius Maclellan, NEIF
 - Regarding the site plan approval footnote, he agreed w/ Steve Lewis that some towns do require developers to go back to the Planning Commission for minor administrative issues.
8. Justin Dextrateur, Hartland Group
 - Suggests that the town allocations of water and sewer capacity are critical steps in the approval process.
9. Robert Felder
 - Pointed out that private sector developers take more risk than nonprofits, as personal guarantees are required.
 - Says that the point spread for family tenant services is too great...need other steps.
 - We should provide an incentive for towns to package family and senior projects together in an LIHTC approval sequence.
10. Max Makaitis, Tri County Cap
 - Northern counties should get fair share of LIHTC.
11. Rosemary Heard, CATCH
 - Argued against adding additional point categories for tenant services for family projects, as that adds operational costs for credentialed staff, and is outside of CATCH’s primary mission.
 - More points for the “advanced projects” category leads to increased project costs and risk to developers/applicants.

12. Keith Thibault, Southwestern Community Action Program
 - The Zoning Board of Adjustment is really the biggest barrier to getting a proposal approved.
 - Clarify footnote #25...what is the purchase price when the land is being donated?
 - Regarding the floodplain language on page 10, he questions how the new language will be interpreted for Cheshire Brookbend and other future Keene projects. He suggests that the proposal should be OK if the floodplain fill is “fully compensated” (i.e. same amount of floodplain land).
13. Mike Reed, CATCH
 - Likes 2 points for comprehensive plan, as that is part of CATCH’s typical development process.
14. John Anton
 - We should put the emphasis on vetting critical path issues in the development process to measure “advanced projects.” “What can blow up?”

Written statements were received from:

- Mike LaFontaine

Staff has also received written comments about the draft 2011 QAP from:

- Otis Perry, Dover, LIHTC consultant
- Bill Caselden, Great Bridge Properties
- Bruce Pacht, Twin Pines

