

Changes made to the draft QAP

Section	Suggestion	Response
1.D	Expand concept of DOH’s role in furthering fair housing	Added DOH mission statement to the AFFH section. Continue to welcome partnership to affirmatively further fair housing
II.D	Clarify compliance monitoring fee is applicable for 15 or 30 years	Clarified that monitoring fee is collected for full affordability term (typically 30 years)
III.D.F	Reduce requirement for Architectural plans and specifications at Stage One	Adjusted to meet the architectural guidelines per the Architectural Technical Standards.
III.F	Clarify applicability of Supportive Services Plan	Added language to clarify that supportive services plan is required “as applicable” (e.g. PSH, Senior, etc.)
III.F	Allow exceptions to requirement for audited financials for orgs that do not have them	Added “or other financial statements acceptable to the City” to enable smaller/less established organizations to apply
III.F	Move market study from Stage I to Stage II requirement	Made change
III.F	Require architectural schematics rather than full drawings at Stage I	Made change
III.B (2)	Make CHA funding source more general	Made change
III.B (3)	Add potential loss of subsidy as rationale to fund preservation projects outside of round	Made change
III.F	Allow electronic submissions	Made change
III.J.3	Clarify Priority Tracts – revise Priority Tracts map	To address concern – 1) Added bullet stating that ‘Applicants should make determination’ as to which tract best describes their project; and 2) Removed language stating that DOH would evaluate applicants’ evidence and data regarding their Tract decision
III.J	Opportunity Areas Tract should not require 100% affordable units	Made change to state priority for projects with units for the lowest income tenants, vs “preference for affordable developments.”– goal is to emphasize affordable unit creation

III.J.3	Add “victims of domestic violence, etc. to criteria for “populations with special housing needs”	Added “or trauma related circumstances” to definition
III.J.4.A	Clarify what is meant by BIPOC-led	Clarified preference and noted that application will allow applicant to provide more detail on team composition
III.J.4.C	Clarify whether ETOD or TOD applies. ETOD Ordinance not yet passed	Removed reference to TOD ordinance, added language to reflect ETOD goals
III.J.4.D.c	Replace “social workers” with “supportive service staff” as evidence of tenant resources	Made change
III.J.4.G	Exempt supportive housing projects from homeownership preference	Made change
III.J.4.H	Clarify implications for projects that do not complete Stage Two Multifamily submissions prior to the next funding round	Changed from “will not be awarded credits” to “may not be awarded credits”

Additional suggestions

Section	Suggestion	Response
I.E	Confirm that 10% non profit set aside is floor not ceiling	Confirmed. QAP states it is a minimum.
II.B	Allow payment of reservation fee at closing	Allowed, done in practice.
II.F	Clarify that City doesn’t require lowest equity bid	QAP does not set that standard for syndicator selection
I.B(3)	Develop template for Tenant Selection Plan	<p>New in 2021, DOH is adding the Tenant Selection Plan as a formal application requirement</p> <p>New in 2021, and in the REIA, the QAP is more specific about targeting marginalized populations</p> <p>We are open to the idea of working with partners to draft a TSP template, but this is not a 2021 priority</p>

II.D	Only charge \$25 annual monitoring fee for LIHTC units	The City monitors LIHTC buildings, not just LIHTC units.
III.B	Clarify that TIF is not included as DOH Development subsidy	While in practice this may be the case (thereby allowing projects with 4% credits + TIF to be funded outside the Round), we did not highlight this in the QAP.
III.F	Allow LOI vs site control	Evidence of site control may include a deed, signed sales contract, option agreement, or trust agreement. If site control has not been secured, provide an explanation of current status and planned steps for attaining site control for both residential and parking.
III.J.2,3	Provide rationale for rating/scoring and clarity on hierarchy among Priority Tracts	There is no rating, scoring system, or any hierarchy for Priority Tracts. The goal is to achieve an equitable distribution across tracts, not to prioritize one over others.
III.J.3	Add Family-Sized units as priority criteria for Opportunity Areas	Priority is for affordable unit creation.
III.J.3	Under Preservation Tract, expand priority to projects with existing CHA debt (in addition to City debt)	The preservation tract is open for CHA and non city deals as well, specific attention will be paid to DOH subsidized projects that are nearing the end of their affordability terms.
III.J.4.E	Clarity on which projects are subject to Design Review	All projects are subject to design review
III.J.4.F	Add preference for 50 year affordability restriction	This is addressed as a Transitioning Area Priority Tract preference
III.J.4.F	Affordable housing loans should not carry interest	Generally, the city's loans are for a term of 30 years with 0% interest. The city will consider longer affordability and loan terms, and carry interest when appropriate.