# <u>Arcadia</u>

The Applicant failed to provide the required copy of the resolution adopted by the local governing body by which the Public Housing Authority was established as required in Section Five, Part A.3.a. of the RFP.

#### Avon Park

Pursuant to Section Four, Part B.1., the Applicant failed to provide the Response Fee of \$50.

The Applicant must provide evidence that the public housing units for which RFP funds are being requested are 30 years or older. The Applicant provided five (5) separate 2009 Notice of Proposed Property Taxes. These documents do not mention the ages of the properties requesting RFP Funding, nor do they reference the properties by address, name of development, etc. as required in Section Five, Part A.6 of the RFP.

The Applicant provided the Sources and Uses Chart, but failed to provide the Activity Chart which would indicate what activites the Applicant will perform using the requested funding, as required in Section Five, Part B.

Although the Applicant did not provide the Activity Chart as required, the Applicant did provide some additional language within documents presented at Exhibit 3 which describe Morel Roofing and a total cost of \$28,040. Using this cost plus the known fees associated with this RFP which total \$3,800 would create a Total Cost of \$31,840. Because the Applicant stated that its Total Sources would equal \$31,467, the Applicant has a shortfall of \$373. As provided in the Sources and Uses Chart in the RFP, Total Sources must be greater than or equal to Total Cost.

#### **Bartow**

The Applicant failed to provide the most recent published Integrated Assessment Subsystem Individual Agency Report from HUD as required in Section Five, Part A.3.b of the RFP.

Although the Applicant provided minutes from the Commissioners of the Housing Authority of Bartow dated January 5, 1953 accepting bids for two construction contracts, this does not demonstrate the actual age of the units. The Applicant failed to provide evidence from a tax collector, recorded legal documents or other written documents sufficient to confirm that the age of each public housing unit is a least 30 years old as required in Section Five, Part.A.6. The Applicant failed to provide corresponding construction estimates to document the costs of the proposed repairs and renovations to the public housing units as required in Section Five, Part B.

#### **Defuniak Springs**

The Applicant failed to provide the required copy of the resolution adopted by the local governing body by which the Public Housing Authority was established as required in Section Five, Part A.3.a. of the RFP.

## Fort Walton Beach

Pursuant to Section Four, Part B.1., the Applicant failed to provide the Response Fee of \$50.

As required in Section Five, Part B of the RFP, the Applicant must provide a copy of construction estimates. The estimates should describe and provide corresponding cost estimates or each proposed repair and renovation in connection with the work as described on the Activity Chart. The Applicant did provide a chart entitled Upcoming Projects, but it appears to be an internal document and not a construction estimate from a contractor or other third-party source.

The Applicant provided an Activity Chart at Exhibit 5 of the Proposal; however the Total Costs (\$40,130) exceed the Total Sources (\$36,330). Therefore, the Applicant has a shortfall of \$3,800. As provided in the Sources and Use Chart in the RFP, Total Sources must be greater than or equal to Total Cost.

## <u>Live Oak</u>

The Applicant failed to provide the most recent published Integrated Assessment Subsystem Individual Agency Report from HUD as required in Section Five, Part A.3.b.of the RFP.

The Applicant failed to provide any contact information as required in Section Five, Part A.4.

The Applicant failed to provide Addresses for each Development in which funds are being requested as required in Section Five, Part A.5.a. of the RFP.

One of the requirements of this RFP is that the funding be used for the preservation and rehabilitation of public housing units that are 30 years or older. The Applicant stated that it is installing hot water heaters in all 104 units of its three Developments; however, only 54 units appear to meet the requirement of being 30 years or older. Therefore, the Applicant did not correctly state the total number of public housing units within each development for which RFP Funds are being requested in Section Five, Part A 5.C. of the RFP.

One of the requirements of this RFP is that the Applicant must provide evidence that the public housing units for which RFP Funds are being requested are 30 years or older. The Applicant provided documents from HUD for 62 units that were built in 1963; however, this is not consistent with the statements made by the Applicant explaining that only 54 units were constructed in 1963. Further, the documents from HUD state that the development's name is McMullen Heights which is the development that the Applicant stated was constructed in 1980. Because of these discrepancies, none of the documents provided can be considered evidence to support that any of the units are at least 30 years old as required in Section Five, Part A.6. of the RFP.

The Applicant failed to provide the Activity Chart as required in Section Five, Part B.a. of the RFP.

As required in Section Five, Part C of the RFP, the Applicant failed to provide the grant request amount.

#### <u>Punta Gorda</u>

The Applicant failed to provide the most published Integrated Assessment Subsystem Individual Agency Report from HUD as required in Section Five, Part A.3.b.

#### <u>City of Stuart</u>

As required in Section Five, Part B.b of the RFP, the Applicant must provide a copy of Parts I and II of the 5 Year Plan that shows the need for the proposed activities identified in the Proposal. Although the Applicant did provide the required parts of the 5 Year Plan, those sections only reference repairs to doors in 4 units for a total of eight replacement doors, and not 13 units or 26 replacement doors.

## <u>Tarpon Springs</u>

Pursuant to Section Four, Part B.1., the Applicant failed to provide the Response Fee of \$50.

As required in Section Five, Part A.6 of the RFP, the Applicant must provide evidence that the public housing units for which RFP Funds are being requested are 30 years or older. The Applicant provided documents from the property appraiser records demonstrating the age of most of the units receiving funding, but not all. The age of the units located at 410 East Morgan Street, 450 East Morgan Street, 605 East Harrison Street, 425 East Lime Street has not been demonstrated. Although the Applicant made handwritten adjustments to the addresses on several pages from the property appraiser in an attempt to match these missing addresses, those changes were not accepted.

One of the requirements of this RFP is that the Applicant must provide a copy of Parts I and II of the 5 Year Plan that shows the need for the proposed activities identified in the

Proposal. Although the Applicant did provide the required parts of the 5 Year Plan, those sections do not reference installation of security surveillance system.

## Winter Park

Although the Applicant provided construction estimates from Corinthian Builders in the amount of \$4,889, this amount appears to include some charges that are on a per unit basis and some that are for the overall project. The Activity Chart describes per unit cost of \$3,600 and total project cost of \$293,340. Because of the differences in the calculations of the estimate and the Activity Chart costs, it is not known if the construction estimate describes each proposed repair and renovation in connection with the work described in the Activity Chart as required in Section Five, Part B.

Additional Information was not requested from the following:

Deerfield Beach Housing Authority Ocala Housing Authority Housing Authority of the City of Eustis New Smyrna Beach Housing Authority