

State: HAWAII (QAP 2013/2014)	Hawaii Housing Finance and Development Corporation (HHFDC)
Measure	Evidence
HOUSING LOCATION: Site and Neighborhood Standards	
A1. Mandatory restrictions prohibiting increases in racial and economic (or low-income) concentration	No.
A2. Scoring that discourages racial and economic concentration.	No.
A3. Mandatory requirements for development in high-opportunity areas	No.
A4a. Scoring that encourages development in high-income areas.	[Not scoring but still a mechanism to strongly incentivize development in high-income areas] Newly constructed buildings located outside of DDAs or QCTs qualify as a high cost area. The additional LIHTC available from the 'basis boost' will be used to offset the high cost of construction and land throughout the state (p. 25).
A4b. Scoring that encourages development in high opportunity areas.	≈ Up to 8 points given for project location and market demand. One of the seven evaluation criteria for which points are awarded are proximity to employment opportunities, recreational facilities, shopping facilities, and medical facilities (no specific distance noted) as well as preference for projects in a county's urban district (over rural) (p. 9).
A5. Scoring or requirements that preference siting near high-quality schools.	No.
A6. Scoring that discourages development in distressed neighborhoods. ¹	(-) Up to 8 points for projects that are receiving, for the first time, project-based rental subsidies that would results in eligible tenants paying 30% of their income toward rent. 8 points if the entire project has project-based subsidies. If only a portion of a project has project-based subsidies, then scoring is based on this percentage (1-7 points) (p. 8). (-) See 1 point for projects located in QCT (see A8).
A7. Scoring or requirements that preference siting near mass transit.	No.
A8. Focus on and operationalization of a neighborhood revitalization plan.	≈ 1 points if project is located in a QCT. The project will redevelop existing housing which contributes to a concerted community revitalization plan as determined by HHFDC (e.g., site is located in an Enterprise Community, Empowerment Zone, or part of a County redevelopment plan). To receive consideration for this criteria, applicant must provide an explanation on how this project is in compliance with such

¹ Evidence of the inverse: preference for development in distressed neighborhoods (by overemphasizing QCT/DDA preference, preference for existing subsidized housing in distressed neighborhoods, preferences for low-income matched financing, etc.) should also be noted.

	plan and its benefit to the overall community. Applicant must provide a letter of interest or a binding agreement with the government agency administering the community revitalization plan (p. 14).
B1. Local participation in site selection is limited to statutory minimum. ²	No.
HOUSING ACCESS: Affirmative Marketing, Priority Groups	
C1. Mandatory requirements ensuring affirmative marketing.	No.
C2. Scoring that incentivizes affirmative marketing.	No.
C3. Scoring that incentives language access and marketing to non-English speakers.	No.
D1. Scoring that promotes Section 8 voucher access in high-opportunity areas.	<p>≈ ½ point awarded to projects that make all low-income units available to people on the public housing waiting list. Applicant must provide a copy of a letter sent to the HI public housing authority verifying this (p. 13). [Not a very strong provision – low point value and also makes it okay to not make units available to waitlist persons (albeit without points awarded)].</p> <p>≈ ½ point awarded to projects that make all low-income units available to people referred by the Department of Human Services that have successfully completed a transitional housing program and are ready to move into permanent rental housing (p. 13). This could also fall under provisions for special needs populations (O2) since it is primarily geared to homeless populations.</p>
D2. Requirements for monitoring Section 8 voucher access <i>in high-opportunity areas</i> .	No.
F1. Incentives for larger family units.	<p>≈ Up to 6 points for family projects that provide units that are 2+ bedrooms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5 pts. if 10%-19% of all units are 2+ bedrooms. • 3.0 pts. if 20%-29% of all units are 2+ bedrooms. • 4.5 pts. if 30%-39% of all units are 2+ bedrooms. • 6.0 pts. if 40% or more of all units are 2+ bedrooms.
F2. Incentives targeting families/families with children	No.
G1. Scoring that promotes units for lowest-income households (<i>outside high-poverty areas</i>).	<p>As noted in A6, points given for subsidy layering which could also make units more available for lowest-income HHs (p. 8).</p> <p>≈ Up to 4 points awarded if a greater percentage of low-income units are set-aside than is required under Section 42. Maximum points for projects that commit to set-aside all of its units to tenants earning 50% AMGI or less. A weighted lesser</p>

² Evidence of the inverse: preferences or requirements for local participation should also be noted.

	<p>point score awarded for projects that set-aside a portion of units for 50% AMGI tenants and/or for projects that set-aside units for 60% AMGI tenants. No points awarded for units set aside for tenants earning >60% AMGI (p.12).</p> <p>In order to comply with the low-income set-aside of Section 42 IRC requirements, applicant must either 1) set-aside 20%+ units to be occupied by tenants with ≤50% AMGI or 2) set-aside 40%+ units to be occupied by tenants with ≤60% AMGI (p. 17).</p>
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	
H1. Racial/demographic reporting requirements.	≈ [Under reporting requirements] Annual submission of required tenant data in accordance with the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (p. 22). [this implies reporting of demographic information, though is certainly not specific to this point].

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE: 121 (Scoring systems is such that points can only be gained.)

Fill this in.

Notes:

Up to 8 points awarded for projects that will be receiving a permanent below market loan or grant from a state or local governmental agency other than HHFDC or a below market lease or sale of property from a government agency (including HHFDC) (p. 8-9). Though this could potentially fall as a negative under B1 (for local support), it seems this criteria, though referenced a local government support, is actually at the state/county level and would have less to do with smaller localized jurisdictions.

The QAP defines special populations as persons for whom social problems, age, or physical or mental disabilities impact their ability to live independently, and for whom such ability can be improved by more suitable housing conditions. Persons with special housing needs may include the physically and mentally disabled and the homeless (p. 11).

OTHER CATEGORIES	
O1. Scoring that promotes units for persons with disabilities.	No.
O2. Scoring that promotes units for special needs populations.	<p>≈ Up to 6 points if projects commit to provide services that will enhance the livability of the project for tenant populations with special needs. Number of points awarded is based on the quantity and quality of services provided and the status of commitment (p. 11-12).</p> <p>See D1 for scoring to promote tenant moves from transitional housing programs.</p>
O3. Scoring to promote home ownership.	≈ 1 point awarded to projects offering tenants an opportunity for home ownership. Applicants must provide a feasibility analysis addressing the tenant's ability to purchase the project as well as a plan discussing how the project will offer the units for homeownership to tenants (p. 13).
O4. Provisions affirmatively furthering fair housing laws.	No.

