



Geographic Distribution and Site Selection

Supplement for Listening Session Discussion

This document is intended to provide an overview of key questions, discussions, and changes under consideration relating to policies that influence geographic distribution and site selection.

Geographic Distribution

- Please provide any comments on the efficacy of the following:
 - Allocating 9% credits based on “Atlanta Metro,” “Other Metro,” and “Rural”
 - The current reserved amounts within the above (e.g., 35% to “Other Metro”)
 - Allocating 4%/Bonds based on population (currently using Congressional Districts)
 - The minimum associated with the above (ensuring 1 award per District)
- DCA over-allocates 9% credits to less populous areas and 4%/Bonds to more populous. Is the current balance where it should be? Please comment on the combined geographic distribution.

Barriers to Developing Where Housing is Needed

- What barriers do you face to building affordable housing where there is a need? Please address both barriers within and outside of DCA’s control.
- Is there anything DCA can do, within the QAP or not, to assist in instances of local opposition?

Threshold Criteria

Do any Threshold Criteria impact site selection in ways unintended given the requirement’s intent?

Considering New Scoring Criteria

Needs-Based Scoring Criteria

Staff anticipate adding new Scoring Criteria focused on identifying local needs for affordable housing. Examples include metrics for jobs concentration, population growth, and housing cost burdens.

Specifying Characteristics for Places that “Don’t Score Now, but Should”

It is common to receive public input conveying that there are communities “in need of affordable housing” that are not competitive under the current QAP. When providing such input, please specify what factors you are observing, either data or on-the-ground observation, that informs this perspective.

Naming Specific Communities and Sites is the Most Helpful

When describing an issue you believe new Scoring Criteria should address, please provide the name of at least one jurisdiction, neighborhood, or site (geocoordinates) that illustrate the issue. Specific examples allow us to connect your qualitative input to the data we are exploring for new criteria.

Identifying Priority Sections for Revision

Staff are in the process of identifying which site-based Scoring Criteria are most in need of adjustment. To help with this prioritization, please describe your perspectives on sections for which any of the below apply. Criteria that...

- ...do not meet their intent as effectively as they could.
- ...result in unintended consequences.
- ...have an outsize impact on overall Scoring at the expense of other priorities.
- ...are more complex than they need to be.

We welcome input on any criteria for which the above may apply. Staff have specifically requested comments and recommendations for one or more of the above for the following: Desirable Activities, Community Transportation Options, Previous Projects, Quality Education Areas, Revitalization/Redevelopment Plans, and Community Transformation.

Specific Changes Under Consideration

Community Transformation

Staff are considering removing the 5-award limit in this section and revising its content such that the points are based on eligibility, not comparative review (as is the case for most other criteria).

Quality Education Areas

Option C was intended as a temporary measure when the Department of Education (DOE) was unable to fully update its data. DCA may remove option C if DOE publishes full updates, which is our expectation.

Revitalization/Redevelopment Plans

- DCA intends to make changes to this section to ensure applicants claiming points have certainty comparable to those applying under other Scoring Criteria.
- DCA may remove the “financial commitment” option to avoid disadvantaging communities with fewer resources.

Balancing “High Opportunity Areas” and “Revitalization Areas” Awards

The current approach to balancing awards between “high opportunity areas” and “revitalization areas” involves equalizing maximum points between two “scoring tracks.” DCA welcomes comments on the efficacy of this approach and alternative methods of achieving balance.

Stable Communities

The Housing Needs Assessment includes an “Opportunity Index” that DCA may use to replace the current metrics for Stable Communities. DCA welcomes qualitative comments on the pros and cons of Stable Communities in its current form which may inform our deliberations around revising this section.