

From: Adam Harden [mailto:Adam@dovetailproject.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2007 10:23 AM
To: Debbie Blinderman
Subject: Comments on 2008 Universal Cycle draft rules and application

Ms. Blinderman,

Good day! We found the December 7th board meeting and rule workshop informative. After thoughtful consideration, we offer the following comments for consideration as the 2008 rules are finalized.

1. We concur with the coalition position that Miami- Dade is limited by statute to competing for 22% of the available SAIL funds. In our opinion, the suggestion to run the funding calculations twice, allowing all counties to compete for the 22% statewide SAIL funds and then allowing eligible counties to compete for the remaining SAIL funds seems legal and equitable.
2. We also suggest that the SAIL tie breaker provisions, on page 87 of the 11/29/07 draft Application Instructions, be re-prioritized to avoid conflict with the express legislative intent in the SAIL statute. The provisions are summarized below for reference. Without modifying the text of the 11/29 draft Application Instructions we suggest that provision (c) *Proximity* be moved to immediately precedent to provision (g) *Lottery Number*, and the provisions then be re-lettered a-g accordingly.

Summary of 11/29 draft:

5. Tie-breakers will be applied in the following order.....

- a. Leveraging - Group A/Group B
- b. SAIL and MMRB Applications – preference to Application(s) not requesting Competitive HC
- c. Proximity to services and to Developments on the FHFC Development
- d. ELI Set-Aside commitment above the minimum –maximum of 10%
- e. SAIL leveraging as a percentage of Total Development Cost
- f. SAIL request amount per SAIL set-aside unit
- g. Lottery – Preference to Application with the lowest lottery number

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Adam M. Harden

Managing Member
Questus Capital llc
813-781-2558
adam@dovetailproject.com