

From: Card, Rachel
To: Pitts, TedTedPitts@gov.sc.gov
Veldran, KatherineKatherineVeldran@gov.sc.gov
Date: 12/10/2013 6:00:37 PM
Subject: Fw: SC Housing QAP

From: Chris Rogers [mailto:crogers@rogerslewis.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 05:57 PM
To: Card, Rachel
Subject: RE: SC Housing QAP

Yes. These are very similar and are causing problems in those states as well. But I think the difference is that they did not add the provisions without any opportunity for public comment in those states, as SC Housing did here.

From: Card, Rachel [mailto:RachelCard@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:27 PM
To: Chris Rogers
Subject: RE: SC Housing QAP

Hey Chris,

One quick question regarding other states that you may know the answer to – “Does the proposed QAP for SC have similar provisions to those NC and AL, when it comes to your concerns?”

Thanks.
Rachel

From: Chris Rogers [mailto:crogers@rogerslewis.com]
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 1:06 PM
To: Card, Rachel
Subject: SC Housing QAP
Importance: High

Rachel,

Per our phone discussion, I would like to bring an urgent issue to the governor’s attention. The SC State Housing Finance and Development Authority recently submitted a Qualified Allocation Plan for the Governor’s approval. This plan provides the process and scoring system by which competing developers will be selected to build low income housing in South Carolina using federal and state funding.

SC Housing normally holds public hearings for concerned individuals to express opinions and thoughts on the Agency’s proposed changes to that year’s QAP. However, this year SC made several substantial changes between the last draft and proposed final QAP and is not holding another public hearing for people to make comments (see below). The change which provides an unfair advantage to a small group of developers in the competition for federal money is the addition of points for having done Low Income Housing Tax Credit projects in SC that were placed in-service during the last 7 years. The QAP allows developers’ projects to qualify for 1 point for every project the applicant, or group of applicants associated with the project have developed in SC and placed in service since 1/1/2007 to 2/1/2014 up to a maximum of 3 points (3 projects).

Based on the last several years’ allocations of 9% credits, only a few developers (about 10 or so) have garnered awards consistently over the relevant period and will hold a competitive advantage over anyone who has not been so

fortunate. This means a developer will score more points on their application simply because they've done deals in SC previously, not because their deal is better, or more financially feasible than someone who hasn't garnered any, or as many projects in SC.

I understand that the final QAP hasn't been signed by the governor yet. I would very much appreciate it if you would make her aware of this issue before she signs the QAP. I appreciate your assistance and the Governor's consideration of this issue. Please don't hesitate to call me if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Chris Rogers

Christian L. Rogers

crogers@rogerslewis.com 803-403-8820 Direct Dial 803-252-3653 Fax



1330 Lady St., Suite 400, Columbia, South Carolina 29201
PO Box 11803 (29211)

The preceding email message (including any attachments) contains information that may be confidential, be protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE: To comply with requirements imposed by the United States Treasury Department, any information regarding any U.S. federal tax matters contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, as advice for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed therein.