

State: VIRGINIA (QAP 2014)	Virginia Housing Development Authority
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.	≈ 25 points to any proposed elderly or family developments located in a census tract that has less than a 10% poverty rate with no other elderly/family tax credit units in such census tract (p. 12).
A4b. Scoring that encourages development in high opportunity areas.	No.
A5. Scoring or requirements that preference siting near high-quality schools.	No.
A6. Scoring that discourages development in distressed neighborhoods. ¹	No.
A7. Scoring or requirements that preference siting near mass transit.	≈ Up to 20 points for any development located within ½ mile of an existing commuter rail, light rail or subway station or ¼ mile of one or more existing public bus stops (p. 15).
A8. Focus on and operationalization of a neighborhood revitalization plan.	<p>≈ 30 points for projects that provide documentation in a form approved by the Authority from the chief executive officer (or the equivalent) of the local jurisdiction in which the development is to be located that the area in which the proposed development is to be located is a revitalization area and the proposed development is an integral part of the local government's plan for revitalization of the area (p. 12).</p> <p>≈ 5 points if the proposed development is located in a QCT and is in a revitalization area (p. 12).</p> <p>≈ 15 points to any proposed development listed in the top 25 developments identified by Rural Development as high priority for rehabilitation at the time the application is submitted to the Authority (p. 12).</p>
B1. Local participation in site selection is limited to statutory minimum. ²	≈ (-) Up to 40 points for any of the following: (i) firm financing commitment(s) from the local government, local housing authority, Federal Home Loan Bank affordable housing funds,

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.

	Virginia Housing Trust Fund, funding from VOICE for projects located in Prince William County and donations from unrelated private foundations that have filed an IRS Form 990 or Rural Development for a below-market rate loan or grant; (ii) a resolution passed by the locality in which the proposed development is to be located committing such financial support to the development in a form approved by the Authority; or (iii) a commitment to donate land, buildings or tap fee waivers from the local government (p. 12).
HOUSING ACCESS: Affirmative Marketing, Priority Groups	
C1. Mandatory requirements ensuring affirmative marketing.	No.
C2. Scoring that incentivizes affirmative marketing.	≈ See also G1 and O1.
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.	≈ 10 points to projects without Section 8 project-based assistance to give leasing preference to individuals and families on public housing waiting lists maintained by the local housing authority operating in the locality in which the proposed development is to be located and notification of the availability of such units to the local housing authority by the applicant (p. 12).
D2. Requirements for monitoring Section 8 voucher access.	No.
F1. Incentives for larger family units.	≈ In addition to the points noted in F2, an additional 0.75 points for each percent of the low-income units in the development with 3+ bedrooms up to an additional 15 points (p. 15-6).
F2. Incentives targeting families/families with children	≈ 15 points to projects that give a leasing preference to individuals and families with children in developments that will have no more than 20% of its units with one bedroom or less (p. 15-6).
G1. Scoring that promotes units for lowest-income households.	≈ 50 points for any development in which (i) the greater of 5 units or 10% of the units will be assisted by HUD project-based vouchers (as evidenced by the submission of a letter satisfactory to the Authority from an authorized PHA that the development meets all prerequisites for such assistance), or another form of documented and binding federal project-based rent subsidies, or equivalent assistance (approved by the executive director) in order to ensure occupancy by extremely low-income persons; and (ii) the greater of 5 units or 10% of the units will conform to HUD regulations interpreting the accessibility requirements of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act; and be actively marketed to persons with disabilities as defined in the Fair Housing Act in accordance with a plan submitted as part of the application for credits (p. 14-5). [Also applies to O1 and C2 .]

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

	≈ Up to 50 points to applicants that impose income limits on low-income housing units (including restricting rents to residents ≤30% or 40% of the AMGI) throughout the extended use period below those required by the IRC in order for the development to be a qualified low-income development (p. 18).
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	
H1. Racial/demographic reporting requirements.	No.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE: 1192 (Scoring systems is such that points can be gained or lost.)

Minimum required score is 425.

- *Aside from marketing requirements for marketing to persons with disabilities, no other affirmative marketing requirements.*
- *Few provisions around site and neighborhood standards.*
- *Since scale of total points possible is so much greater than those in other QAPs, ratings have been adjusted accordingly.*

Notes:

Set-aside pools include: non-profit (15%), local housing authority (15%), new construction (15%), Northern Virginia/Planning District 8 (Inner Washington MSA) (18.02%), Northwest/North Central Virginia Area (9.20%), Richmond MSA (11.63%), Tidewater MSA (17%), Balance of State (Geographic) (14.15%) (p. 2-3).

Up to 20 points for any proposed new construction development (including adaptive re-use and rehabilitation that creates additional rental space) that is located in a pool identified by the Authority as a pool with an increasing rent burdened population. Similarly, up to minus 20 points for developments located in a pool identified by the Authority as a pool with little or no increase in rent burdened population (p. 13). [Not entirely sure where this would fit.]

OTHER CATEGORIES	
O1. Scoring that promotes units for persons with disabilities.	See G1. ≈ 30 points to any development in which the greater of 5 units or 10% of the units (i) conform to HUD regulations interpreting the accessibility requirements of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act; and (ii) are actively marketed to persons with disabilities as defined in the Fair Housing Act in accordance with a plan submitted as part of the application for credits. 15 points if 5% of units are reserved for the same purposes (p. 15) (Also applies to C2).
O2. Scoring that promotes units for special needs populations.	No.
O3. Scoring to promote home ownership.	No.
O4. Provisions affirmatively furthering fair housing laws.	≈ Up to 25 point deduction for a letter in response to its notification to the chief executive officer of the locality in which the proposed development is to be located opposing the allocation of credits to the applicant for the development. In any such letter, the chief executive officer must certify that the proposed development is not consistent with current zoning or

	<p>other applicable land use regulations. Any such letter must also be accompanied by a legal opinion of the locality's attorney opining that the locality's opposition to the proposed development does not have a discriminatory intent or a discriminatory effect (p. 11).</p> <p>⌘ As part of annual compliance monitoring, owner must demonstrate that all units in the development were for use by the general public and that no finding of discrimination under the Fair Housing Act has occurred for the development (p. 27).</p>
--	--