

Wilbourne, Kim 9083

From: Thomas S. Attridge [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:57 AM
To: Wilbourne, Kim 9083
Subject: [External] 2026 QAP Comments

Hi Kim – I hope you're well. A few more QAP comments:

1. Appendix C-2
 - a. I am not sure I follow the logic on why full application Total Development Costs cannot vary more than 5% from preliminary application. If costs varied, perhaps it was based on the developer seeking to put forth a more competitive application. Projects are ultimately expected to be scored after the full application, correct?
 - b. For item 8.d.: I am also a little confused here. Isn't the intent of the scoring system for developers to do their best to utilize State resources effectively? For example, if a project can submit at 30% tax exempt debt and it otherwise meets all other SC Housing underwriting requirements, is it not better for the developer to 'self-select' a lower bond amount, as opposed to being tied to the maximum permanent supportable debt if that otherwise made their application less competitive? This is seemingly a win-win situation – developers are responsible for requesting what is needed for their projects and incentivized to not ask for too much, and the Authority should have the ability to fund more projects.
 - c. I agree with the comments during the Public Hearing on the Public Housing Authority Set Aside. 30% is considerable, unless SC Housing decides to allocate a larger amount of its volume cap to the multifamily program going forward.
2. To reiterate Jenn Wilkinson's point, it would be very helpful if granted waiver requests were published to level the playing field for all ahead of full applications being due in each round.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

-Tommy



Thomas S. Attridge
Vice President, Acquisitions

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
www.standard-communities.com
Follow us on [LinkedIn](#)

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