

Wilbourne, Kim 9083

From: Josh Gill [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:53 AM
To: Wilbourne, Kim 9083
Subject: [External] 2026 SC QAP Draft Additional Comments

Hi Kim,

I'd like to add a few more comments.

1. In the Appendix C1, I think it makes sense if a deal is competing in the urban pool, it should not be eligible to receive USDA eligible points.
2. Additionally in the Appendix C1, in the other credits scoring criteria, remove the brownsfield clean up credit since this does not require approval from the city or county level and would only be supported by an attorney opinion letter.
3. In the Appendix C2 for bond deals, I think that allocating 30% of the bond ceiling to public housing authorities is too high. I recommend allocating 15% toward the public housing authority pool, and 65% towards new construction. This will ensure that public housing authorities will get an award, and any additional PHA applications not funded in the pool can compete in the new construction or rehabilitation pools.

Thank you for your consideration!

Best,

Josh Gill
Gill Development, LLC
4285 NC-24
Midland, NC 28107
[REDACTED]

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.