

## 2026-2027 Qualified Allocation Plan Policy Proposals

This document shows a list of policy topic areas and proposals that DCA plans to prioritize for the 2026-2027 Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) update. Each topic is shown aligned with a current QAP Priority, as seen on page 12 of the 2024-2025 QAP. This list has been developed through extensive public input and policy evaluation. DCA encourages the public to provide feedback on these proposals, including whether additional topic areas should be considered, through the [2026-2027 QAP Outreach Survey](#).

This is not a comprehensive list of anticipated changes to the 2026-2027 QAP. DCA may add or remove proposals during the QAP drafting process, which will be open for public comment before publication of the final draft.

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>QAP Priority</b> | <b>Produce quality developments that bolster resident health outcomes</b>  |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Quality Education Areas</b>   |
| Problem/Goal        | Outdated CCRPI data due to COVID   |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incorporate new 2023 and 2024 CCRPI data (specifics of indicators used to be determined)</li> <li>2. Remove options B (Beating the Odds) and C (Increased scores over time)</li> </ol>   |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Enriched Property Services</b>  |
| Problem/Goal        | Resident access to childcare and healthcare  |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add incentive for childcare and healthcare facility:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 3 points for co-location of Quality Rated childcare or healthcare facility</li> <li>b. 2 points for Quality Rated childcare proximity and partnership (enrollment priority for residents)</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Solicit feedback: are adjustments needed to underwriting policies?</li> </ol> |
| Problem/Goal        | Same points incentive for commitment to accept services if available and for commitment to owner-provided services   |
| Proposal            | Adjust CORES services points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 2 points for owner-provided services or MOU with CORES-certified provider</li> <li>2. 1 point for commitment to accept services if available</li> </ol>  |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Compliance Performance</b>  |
| Problem/Goal        | Reliant on self-reporting of Successful Properties   |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update “Successful Properties” definition to include “no open or uncorrected noncompliance”</li> <li>2. Require closeout letters as minimum documentation for each Successful Property</li> </ol>  |

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| <b>QAP Priority</b> | <b>Broadly distribute resources; allocate resources efficiently</b>   |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Extended Affordability Commitment</b>  |
| Problem/Goal        | Risk of affordability loss of new and existing Housing Tax Credit properties  |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Move “Waiver of Qualified Contract Right” from Scoring to Threshold</li> <li>2. Either deduct points for or make ineligible for future awards Project Team members who have requested a Qualified Contract for a property in Georgia on or after 1/31/2025</li> <li>3. Solicit feedback: Are incentives or policy adjustments needed for purchase of property for sale under Qualified Contract?</li> </ol> |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Favorable Financing</b>  |
| Problem/Goal        | Factors that reduce operating costs are weighted less heavily than other sources  |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase point for Private Enterprise Agreement from .5 to 1 point</li> <li>2. Add point for land donation</li> </ol>   |
| Problem/Goal        | May be incentivizing low-cost financing that is not significant to deal, or that does not increase unit count or conserve resources   |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider increasing dollar threshold for points</li> <li>2. Solicit feedback: What other adjustments would make this incentive more meaningful?</li> </ol>  |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>DCA Underwriting Policies</b>  |
| Problem/Goal        | Need for post-award gap financing due to increased operating costs, insurance, etc.   |
| Proposal            | <p>Increase maximum developer fee for 4% deals and require any amount over \$4 million to be deferred</p> <p>Maintain policy that a maximum of 50% of developer fee may be deferred</p>   |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Readiness to Proceed/Competitive Rounds</b>  |
| Problem/Goal        | Delayed closing times, increase in requests for carry-forwards and credit exchanges   |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offer Readiness to Proceed points for building permits and/or schematic designs</li> <li>2. Solicit feedback: What else is holding up timelines, and how can we help deals move forward quickly?</li> </ol>   |
| Problem/Goal        | Challenges obtaining inducement resolutions   |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Move inducement resolution from Competitive Review requirement to Threshold or Readiness to Proceed</li> <li>2. Solicit feedback: Are there other ways to address this challenge?</li> </ol>  |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Desirable/Undesirable Activities</b>   |
| Problem/Goal        | Limited site options due to site scoring, resulting in increased land costs and environmental mitigation costs  |
| Proposal            | Slightly increase distances to amenities eligible for points  |
| Problem/Goal        | Require/include higher standards for points for childcare and colleges proximity  |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Require childcare to be Quality Rated Childcare</li> </ol>  |

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
|                     | 2. In addition to existing points for technical college, include schools in the University System of Georgia   |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Revitalization/Redevelopment Areas</b>  |
| Problem/Goal        | “Targeted area within a Local Government boundary” requirement may not be the best way to capture a concerted Community Revitalization Plan  |
| Proposal            | Solicit feedback on better way to capture a targeted area  |
| Problem/Goal        | Community Transformation requirements are complex and prescriptive, and require community members to commit to planning before guarantee of a development  |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do not require Community Quarterback Board members to be committed at Competitive Application: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Require at Threshold, or</li> <li>b. Combine with post-award responsibilities (60 days prior to PIS)</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Solicit feedback: Should any CQB involvement should be required prior to this timeline?</li> </ol> |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Economic Development Proximity</b>  |
| Problem/Goal        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improve differentiation between different levels of economic investment</li> <li>2. Difficult to obtain standard documentation from economic development authority</li> </ol>  |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tiered point system by number of jobs, and/or</li> <li>2. Only award points for major economic development projects state-awarded or announced by Department of Economic Development</li> <li>3. Solicit feedback: Any other way to demonstrate economic development investment?</li> </ol>  |
| <b>QAP Priority</b> | <b>Promote housing opportunities for those with barriers beyond income</b>   |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Integrated Supportive Housing</b>   |
| Problem/Goal        | Challenges obtaining MOUs with referring entities  |
| Proposal            | Continue working with referring entities to ensure smoother rollout  |
| Problem/Goal        | Language for minimum documentation for Referrals with Project-based Rental Assistance Contract may need clarification  |
| Proposal            | Update language to clearly address waitlist management requirements and required documentation   |
| <b>QAP Priority</b> | <b>Support redevelopment and rehabilitation of existing federally assisted or restricted housing</b>   |
| <b>QAP Section</b>  | <b>Preservation Scoring Criteria</b>   |
| Problem/Goal        | May not capture properties most in need of funding   |
| Proposal            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adjust occupancy lookback period to end 2 years prior to application, OR</li> </ol>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | 2. Replace Occupancy section with alternative measure, like housing vacancy from Census, as a measure of housing need |
|--|---|