

BEFORE THE FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION

SP WEST LLC
and SOUTHPORT DEVELOPMENT, INC.
d/b/a SOUTHPORT DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES, INC.,

Petitioners,

FHFC Case No.: 2017-098BP
RFA 2017-108

vs.

FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION,

Respondent.

**FORMAL WRITTEN PROTEST AND
PETITION FOR FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING**

Petitioners, SP West LLC and Southport Development, Inc. d/b/a Southport Development Services, Inc. (“Southport”) (collectively, “Petitioners”), by and through undersigned counsel, file this Formal Written Protest and Petition for Formal Administrative Hearing (“Petition”) pursuant to section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, Rules 28-110.004 and 67-60.009, Florida Administrative Code, and Section Six of Request for Applications 2017-108, SAIL Financing of Affordable Multifamily Housing Developments to Be Used in Conjunction with Tax-Exempt Bonds and Non-Competitive Housing Credits (“RFA”). This Petition challenges the intended decision of Respondent, the Florida Housing Finance Corporation (“Florida Housing”), to award State Apartment Incentive Loan (“SAIL”) funding in response to the RFA. In support, Petitioners state as follows:

Parties

1. Petitioner SP West LLC is a Florida limited liability company. Petitioner Southport is a Washington corporation authorized to transact business in Florida. Both are named in and

submitted the application for the Royal Arms Garden Apartments Development (Application No. 2018-038BS) (“Royal Arms”). For purposes of this proceeding, Petitioners’ address and telephone number are those of their undersigned counsel.

2. Florida Housing is the agency affected by this Petition. Florida Housing’s address is 227 N. Bronough Street, Suite 5000, Tallahassee, Florida 32301.

Statement of Ultimate Facts

Background

3. The Florida Legislature has provided Florida Housing with the power to underwrite state apartment incentive loans or loan guarantees to provide housing affordable to very low-income persons. § 420.5087, Fla. Stat.

4. On August 31, 2017, Florida Housing issued the RFA¹ seeking applications for the development of affordable multifamily housing using SAIL funding in conjunction with tax-exempt bond financing and non-competitive housing credits. [RFA Section One, p. 2].

5. The RFA states that Florida Housing expected to award \$87,320,000 of SAIL funding with \$24,570,000 distributed for Elderly Demographic Developments and \$62,750,000 distributed for Family Demographic Developments. [RFA Section One, p. 2]. The RFA further provides that the SAIL funding will be distributed across large, medium, and small geographic categories as follows: large counties—\$46,279,600 (53%); medium counties—\$32,308,400 (37%); and small counties—8,732,000 (10%). [RFA Section One, p. 2].

6. Pursuant to the RFA, each application is assigned a lottery number, which may be relevant to funding determinations as described in more detail in paragraph 8 below. [See RFA

¹ Florida Housing modified the RFA three times in 2017: on September 13, September 15, and October 3. While the modifications were primarily substantive, none of these modifications affect the issues raised in this Petition.

Section Three, p. 5].

7. Section Five of the RFA describes the process by which applications will be evaluated and points awarded by a Review Committee. [RFA Section Five, pp. 65-73]. Each application can receive a maximum of 15 points. [RFA Section Five, p. 68].

8. The funding selection process is set forth in Section Five B. of the RFA. Developments eligible for funding are limited to those that meet certain eligibility requirements described throughout the RFA. Those applications eligible for funding are then sorted and ranked in order from highest score to lowest score, with any tie scores separated as follows:

- (1) First, by the Application's eligibility for the Proximity Funding Preference (which is outlined in Section Four A.5.e. of the RFA) with Applications that qualify for the preference listed above Applications that do not qualify for the preference;
- (2) Next, by the Application's eligibility for the Per Unit Construction Funding Preference (which is outlined in Section Four A.11.d. of the RFA) with Applications that qualify for the preference listed above Applications that do not qualify for the preference;
- (3) Next, by the Application's Leveraging Level number (which is outlined in Item 3. of Exhibit C) with Applications that have a lower Leveraging Level number listed above Applications that have a higher Leveraging Level number;
- (4) Next, by the Application's eligibility for the Florida Job Creation Funding Preference (which is outlined in Item 4 of Exhibit C) with Applications that qualify for the preference listed above Applications that do not qualify for the preference;
- (5) Finally, by lottery number, with Applications that have a lower lottery number listed above Applications with a higher lottery number.

[RFA Section Five B.4.a., pp. 69-70].

9. Funding Tests and a County Award Tally are also applied. Under the Funding Tests, applications will only be selected for funding if there is enough funding available in both the geographic category and demographic category to fund the applicant's SAIL request amount.

[RFA Section Five B.4.b., p. 70]. Under the County Award Tally, each application selected for funding will count toward the County Award Tally for the county where the proposed development is located. [RFA Section Five B.4.c., p. 70]. Eligible unfunded applications that meet the Funding Tests and propose developments in counties with a lower County Award Tally are prioritized over those eligible unfunded applications that propose developments in counties with a higher County Award Tally. [RFA Section Five B.4.c., p. 70]. The RFA recognizes that this might result in the prioritization of applications that received lower rankings in counties with a lower County Award Tally over applications that received higher rankings in counties with a higher County Award Tally. [RFA Section Five B.4.c., p. 70].

10. The RFA's Funding Selection Order states that Florida Housing had a goal to fund, in the following order, eight medium and large county, new construction applications, including: (1) one new construction application in Miami-Dade County and one new construction application in Broward County; (2) two elderly, large county, new construction applications; (3) three family, large county, new construction applications; (4) one elderly, medium county, new construction application; and (5) two family, medium county, new construction applications. [RFA Section Five B.4.d.(1), pp. 70-72]. Next, Florida Housing had a goal to fund, in the following order, family or elderly small county applications, family or elderly medium county applications, and family or elderly large county applications, with the specific goal in each category being to fund the highest-ranking eligible unfunded applications, regardless of the development category, subject to the Funding Tests and the County Award Tally. [RFA Section Four B.4.d.(2)-(4), p. 72].

11. The deadline for receipt of applications was 11:00 a.m. on October 12, 2017, as modified in the second RFA modification posted on Florida Housing's website on September 15, 2017. [See RFA Section Three A.1, p. 4].

12. Florida Housing received 38 applications in response to the RFA, including Petitioners' Royal Arms application (Application No. 2018-038BS).

13. Florida Housing's Review Committee for the RFA met on November 15, 2017 to discuss the applications and to issue their funding recommendations to be presented to the Florida Housing Board of Directors ("Board").

14. At the Board's December 8, 2017 meeting, the Review Committee recommendations were presented to the Board, along with the RFA 2017-108 - All Applications Chart showing the Applications listed in application number order and identifying those Applications deemed eligible and ineligible for funding. Petitioners' Royal Arms application was included on that chart as an eligible application but was not recommended for funding.

15. On December 8, 2017, the Board approved the Review Committee recommendations.

16. At 3:40 p.m. on December 8, 2017, Florida Housing posted on its website its Notice of Intended Decision ("Intended Decision"), consisting of two documents: (1) the RFA 2017-108 - All Applications Chart; and (2) the 2017-108 RFA - Review Committee Recommendations. A copy of the Intended Decision (consisting of both documents) is attached as **Exhibit A**. Petitioners' Royal Arms application was not selected for funding. The All Applications Chart illustrates that Petitioners' Royal Arms application, proposed for Bay County, received the maximum 15 points available, received all preferences, and had a lottery number of 25.

17. An application recommended for funding, Springhill Apartments (currently known as Madison Heights Apartments) (Application No. 2018-026S), received the maximum number of 15 points and qualified for the same preferences as Petitioners' Royal Arms application but had a lottery number of 14. Another application recommended for funding, Luna Lake (Application No.

2018-042BS), similarly received the maximum number of 15 points and qualified for the same preferences as Royal Arms, but had a lottery number of 13. A third application, Avery Commons (Application No. 2018-021S), was not selected for funding, but was deemed eligible, received the maximum number of 15 points, qualified for the same preferences as Royal Arms, and had a lottery number of 5.

18. However, and as described below, Petitioners' Royal Arms application should have been recommended for funding because: (1) Luna Lake was incorrectly ranked and should have received a lower rank in Florida Housing's Funding Selection Order; (2) Springhill Apartments is ineligible for funding under the terms of the RFA; and (3) Avery Commons is ineligible for funding under the terms of the RFA, or, alternatively, was incorrectly scored and should have received a lower rank.

19. On December 13, 2017, Petitioners timely filed notice of their intent to protest Florida Housing's Intended Decision.

20. In accordance with section 120.57(3)(b), Florida Statutes, Chapters 28-110 and 67-60, Florida Administrative Code, and Section Six of the RFA, this Petition is being filed within 10 days of the date on which Petitioners' notice of intent to protest was filed.

Luna Lake Was Incorrectly Ranked

21. As described above, the RFA's goal was to first fund (1) one new construction application in Miami-Dade County and one new construction application in Broward County; (2) two elderly, large county, new construction applications; (3) three family, large county, new construction applications; (4) one elderly, medium county, new construction application; and (5) two family, medium county, new construction applications. [RFA Section Five B.4.d.(1), pp. 70-72].

22. The application submitted for the Luna Lake development² selected as the development's demographic commitment "Elderly Non-ALF." In Florida Housing's Intended Decision, however, Luna Lake was recommended for funding under the goal of "Two Family Medium County New Construction Applications." [Ex. A.] This is despite the fact that, even in the demographic commitment category on the RFA 2018-108 – Recommendations chart produced by Florida Housing, Luna Lake is listed specifically as "E, Non-ALF"—**not** "F" or Family.

23. Thus, Luna Lake was incorrectly ranked and wrongly selected for funding under the Family Medium County New Construction goal. Florida Housing's ranking is clearly erroneous, contrary to the express provisions of the RFA, arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to competition.

24. If Luna Lake is correctly ranked, another applicant—Osprey Pointe (Application No. 2018-050BS)—would have received funding under the Family Medium County New Construction goal, and Avery Commons would have also received funding. However, as discussed below, Avery Commons is ineligible and was incorrectly scored.

Springhill Apartments Is Not Eligible for Funding under the RFA

25. Section Four A.6.a. of the RFA states, in relevant part:

The Applicant must state the total number of units in the proposed Development.

Note: All Buildings must consist of at least five (5) units per building. This will be confirmed in credit underwriting.

All proposed Developments must consist of a minimum of 30 total units.

[RFA Section Four A.6.a., pp. 25-26 (emphasis added)].

26. In its application, Springhill Apartments is described as consisting of 76 units but

² Petitioner Southport is a developer of Luna Lake.

the application does not state that each building within the development consists of at least five units.

27. Springhill Apartments is located on Bum Gardner Drive in Madison County, Florida. Based upon public records available through the Madison County Property Appraiser, and upon physical observation, not all buildings in the Springhill Apartments development consist of at least five units per building, in violation of Section Four A.6.a of the RFA.

28. Springhill Apartments comprises approximately 12 buildings—11 with units. Buildings 1, 6, and 10 of Springhill Apartments each appear to have at most four units, as each of those two-story buildings only has four bathrooms. Notably too, the development category of Springhill Apartments was designated by applicant Springhill Apartments, LLC as “Acquisition and Rehabilitation”—**not** “New Construction.”

29. Thus, Florida Housing’s determination that Springhill Apartments was eligible for funding was clearly erroneous and is contrary to the express provisions of the RFA, arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to competition.

Avery Commons Was Ineligible under the Terms of the RFA

30. As noted above, if Luna Lake is correctly ranked, applicants Osprey Pointe and Avery Commons would have received funding. However, Avery Commons was ineligible and/or improperly scored for the following reasons.

31. Under Section Four A.7.a of the RFA, an applicant must demonstrate site control by providing certain documentation. One way in which an applicant may comply with this requirement is by providing an “Eligible Contract” which illustrates that the applicant does or will have control of the development site via a contract with and/or assignment from the site’s owner. [RFA Section Four A.7.a., p. 34]. If the owner of the property is not a party to the eligible contract,

“all documents evidencing intermediate contracts, agreements, assignments, options, or conveyances of any kind between or among the owner, the Applicant, or other parties, **must be provided.**” [RFA Section Four A.7.a.(1), p. 34 (emphasis added).] Furthermore, under Section Five A.1. of the RFA, only applications that meet all of the eligibility requirements—including the requirement that “Evidence of Site Control [is] provided”—will be eligible for funding and considered for funding selection. [RFA Section Five A.1., pp. 65-66].

32. In an attempt to establish its compliance with the “Eligible Contract” requirement, Avery Commons included as Attachment 8 to its application a Vacant Land Contract between “Wilton Tugwell, as attorney-in-fact for all sellers/owners” and Blue Sky Communities, LLC as buyer, and an “Assignment of Vacant Land Contract” between “WILTON TUGWELL, as attorney-in-fact for all sellers/owners” and Blue Sky Communities, LLC to the developer of Avery Commons, Blue Hilburn Ltd.

33. Upon review of the relevant Escambia County Property Appraiser records, various persons and entities own the three parcels of property that are the subject of the Avery Commons development application. **None of the owners of the properties are identified on the Vacant Land Contract or the Assignment of Vacant Land Contract, and no other documents provided by Avery Commons in its application establish the ownership of the parcels.** Nor did Avery Commons provide any documentation illustrating that “Wilton Tugwell” is an attorney-in-fact of the owners of the parcels. Consequently, Avery Commons should have been deemed ineligible because it failed to provide “all documents evidencing intermediate contracts, agreements, assignments, options, or conveyances of any kind between or among the owner, the Applicant, or other parties.” [RFA Section Four A.7.a.(1), p. 34].

34. In addition, Avery Commons is ineligible for a second reason: its application failed to properly include a valid development location point. A proposed development in a medium county was required to achieve a minimum of seven total proximity points to be eligible for funding. [RFA Section Four A.5.e., p. 20]. As a threshold for achieving proximity points, each applicant was required to designate a development location point and provide the latitude and longitude coordinates for the development location point. [RFA Section Four A.5.d., p. 19]. Providing a development location point was also a required eligibility criterion. [RFA Section Five A.1., p. 66].

35. Avery Commons' development is proposed for Escambia County, a medium county; thus, it was required to achieve at a minimum seven proximity points. Avery Commons failed to provide a longitude coordinate for its proposed development location point as required by the RFA, leaving blank the development location point's "[l]ongitude in decimal degrees, rounded to at least the sixth decimal place" in paragraph 5.d.(1) of Exhibit A to the RFA (p. 5 of 13). Because Avery Commons did not provide a valid development location point, it was ineligible under the terms of the RFA and not entitled to any proximity points.

36. Thus, Florida Housing's determination that Avery Commons was eligible for funding was clearly erroneous, contrary to the express provisions of the RFA, arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to competition.

**Alternatively, Avery Commons Was Improperly Scored and
Should Have Received a Lower Rank**

37. Alternatively, even if Avery Commons was properly deemed eligible by Florida Housing, it was improperly afforded five points for Local Government Contributions under Section Four A.10. of the RFA as Avery Commons provided an incomplete Local Government

Verification of Contribution Form.

38. Applicants for proposed developments located outside of Miami-Dade County in the rehabilitation development category receive an automatic five points if they provide evidence of a local government grant, loan, fee waiver, and/or fee deferral. [RFA Section Four A.10.b.(2), p. 47]. To be entitled to those points, the applicant “must provide the properly completed and executed Local Government Verification of Contribution Form(s) (Form Rev. 08-16) as Attachment 15 to Exhibit A.” [RFA Section Four A.10.c., p. 47]. The RFA states at least twice that “for a contribution consisting of a loan or deferred fee to be considered complete and eligible for points, **the Local Government Verification form must reflect both [(1)] the total amount of the loan or deferred fee and [(2)] the value (difference between the face amount and the net present value of the payment streams) of the loan or deferred fee.**” [RFA Section Four A.10.c., p. 48 (emphasis added); *see also id.*, p. 49 (stating the same is “required”)]. The RFA devotes no less than three pages to explaining how to calculate the second number, the value of the local government contribution. [RFA Section Four A.10.c, pp. 49-51].

39. Avery Commons failed to include the value of the local government contribution. In Attachment 15 to its application, Avery Commons provided the total amount of the loan or deferred fee committed by Escambia County (\$37,500.00) but did not provide the amount of “[t]he value of the contribution based on the difference between the face amount of the above-referenced loan and the net present value of its payment stream.” Accordingly, Florida Housing erred in awarding Avery Commons five points for a local government contribution, and thus Avery Commons should not have received the maximum 15 total points available under the RFA and should have received a lower rank than the majority of applicants, including Petitioners’ Royal Arms application, who received the maximum 15 points.

40. For the foregoing reasons, the decision of Florida Housing to deem the Avery Commons application eligible and/or entitled to the points available for a local government contribution is contrary to the RFA's explicit provisions, clearly erroneous, arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to competition.

Disputed Issues of Material Fact

41. The disputed issues of material fact of which Petitioners are aware at this time include but are not limited to:³

(a) Whether all applications, including Luna Lake's application, were properly ranked by Florida Housing;

(b) Whether the Springhill Apartments application complies with Section Four A.6.a. of the RFA;

(c) Whether each of the buildings within the Springhill Apartments development contains at least five units per building;

(d) Whether Florida Housing erred in deeming the Springhill Apartments application eligible for funding;

(e) Whether the Avery Commons application complies with Section Four A.7.a. of the RFA requiring evidence of site control;

(f) Whether the documentation provided by Avery Commons satisfies the requirement of providing an "Eligible Contract" as required by the RFA;

(g) Whether Avery Commons satisfied the RFA's requirement of establishing a development location point;

³ Petitioners reserve the right to amend or supplement this Petition, including but not limited to, the disputed issues of material fact, to the extent that Petitioners learn of additional issues of material fact in the course of discovery and preparation for final hearing in this matter.

- (h) Whether Avery Commons properly provided coordinates for its claimed development location point;
- (i) Whether Avery Commons was entitled to any proximity points;
- (j) Whether Florida Housing erred in deeming the Avery Commons application eligible for funding;
- (k) Whether Avery Commons' Local Government Verification of Contribution form was completed in accordance with the RFA;
- (l) Whether Florida Housing properly scored the application of Avery Commons;
- (m) Whether, excluding consideration of the ineligible applications of Springhill Apartments and Avery Commons, and provided that Florida Housing correctly ranks all applications, Petitioners' Royal Arms development is entitled to funding under the RFA;
- (n) Whether Florida Housing's Intended Decision is contrary to the RFA; and
- (o) Whether Florida Housing's Intended Decision is clearly erroneous, contrary to competition, arbitrary, and/or capricious.

Notice of Florida Housing's Proposed Action

42. The Notice of Intended Decision was posted on Florida Housing's website at 3:40 p.m. on December 8, 2017.

Substantial Interests Affected

43. Petitioners are substantially affected by Florida Housing's Intended Decision. Petitioners' Royal Arms application complies with all of the requirements of the RFA, and was entitled to funding under the Funding Selection Order of the RFA. If Florida Housing (1) properly ranked the Luna Lake application in its Funding Selection Order (in which case both Osprey Pointe and Avery Commons would be recommended for funding), (2) deemed the Springhill Apartments

application ineligible, and (3) deemed the Avery Commons application ineligible and/or correctly scored the Avery Commons application, then Royal Arms would have been selected for funding. As such, Petitioners' substantial interests are and will be affected by Florida Housing's Intended Decision.

Statutes and Rules that Entitle Petitioners to Relief

44. Petitioners are entitled to relief pursuant to sections 120.569 and 120.57, Florida Statutes, Chapters 28-106, 28-110, 67-48, and 67-60, Florida Administrative Code, and the established decisional law of Florida courts, the Division of Administrative Hearings, and Florida administrative agencies.

Demand for Relief

WHEREFORE, Petitioners respectfully request that Florida Housing:

- a. Provide an opportunity to resolve this Petition by mutual agreement within seven business days, as provided in section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes;
- b. Transfer this Petition to the Division of Administrative Hearings for a formal hearing conducted before an Administrative Law Judge pursuant to sections 120.569 and 120.57, Florida Statutes, if this Petition cannot be resolved within seven business days; and
- c. Ultimately issue a Final Order withdrawing the Intended Decision to award funding to Springhill Apartments and Luna Lake, correctly score and rank Avery Commons, and award funding to Petitioners' Royal Arms Development.

Respectfully submitted on December 22, 2017.



Tiffany A. Roddenberry

Florida Bar No. 92524

Lawrence E. Sellers, Jr.

Florida Bar No. 300241

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

315 S. Calhoun St., Suite 600

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

(850) 224-7000

(850) 224-8832 (facsimile)

larry.sellers@hklaw.com

tiffany.roddenberry@hklaw.com

Attorneys for Petitioners

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Formal Written Protest and Petition for Formal Administrative Hearing was filed by email with Ana McGlamory, Agency Clerk, at ana.mcglamory@floridahousing.org, and Hugh Brown, General Counsel, at hugh.brown@floridahousing.org, both of whom work at the Florida Housing Finance Corporation, 227 North Bronough Street, Suite 5000, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, on December 22, 2017.



Tiffany A. Roddenberry

EXHIBIT A

RFA 2017-108 – All Applications

Application Number	Name of Development	County	County Size	Name of Contact Person	Name of Developers	Dev Category	Demo. Commitment	SAIL Request	EU Request	Total SAIL Request (SAIL + EU)	Eligible For Funding?	Total Points	Proximity Funding Preference	Per Unit Construction Funding Preference	Leveraging Percentage	Leveraging Level	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number	
Eligible Applications																			
2018-0168S	Liberty Square Phase Two	Miami-Dade	L	Alberto Viljo, Jr.	Liberty Square Phase Two Developer, LLC	Redev	F	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	23.87%	1	Y	38
2018-0175	Venetian Walk II	Sarasota	M	Richard Higgins	Norstar Development USA, LP; Venetian Walk Developers, LLC	NC	F	2,290,000.00	464,200.00	2,754,200.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	87.16%	4	Y	33
2018-0198S	Choctaw Village	Ocala	M	John D Fage	Southport Development, Inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	A/R	F	2,500,000.00	396,300.00	2,896,300.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	169.16%	5	Y	22
2018-0215	Avery Commons	Escambia	M	Shawn Wilson	Blue Sky Communities III, LLC, TB	NC	E, Non-ALF	5,000,000.00	600,000.00	5,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	81.13%	4	Y	5
2018-0238S	Sierra Bay	Miami-Dade	L	Maria S. Mades	Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	4,400,000.00	600,000.00	5,000,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	31.50%	1	Y	37
2018-0245	Palmetto Pointe	Pinellas	L	John D Fage	Southport Development, Inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	NC	F	5,400,000.00	463,900.00	5,863,900.00	Y	10	Y	Y	Y	84.97%	4	Y	29
2018-0258S	Water's Edge Apartments	Miami-Dade	L	Maria S. Mades	Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC	NC	F	3,000,000.00	600,000.00	3,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	28.03%	1	Y	36
2018-0265	Springhill Apartments (currently known as Madison Heights Apartments)	Madison	S	James J. Kerr, Jr	AMCS Development, LLC; SCG Development Partners, LLC	A/R	F	3,064,400.00	251,600.00	3,316,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	114.88%	5	Y	14
2018-0275	Grove Manor Phase I	Polk	M	Darren Smith	Pantheon Development Group, LLC; LWHA Development, LLC	NC	F	6,000,000.00	314,600.00	6,314,600.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	71.50%	3	Y	8
2018-0288S	Hogan Creek	Duval	L	Joseph J Chambers	Jacksonville Redevelopment Partners, LLC; Jax Urban Initiatives Development, LLC	A/R	E, Non-ALF	4,778,736.00	600,000.00	5,378,736.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	26.58%	1	Y	34
2018-0298S	Lofts on Lemon	Sarasota	M	Joseph J Chambers	Gardner Capital Development Florida, LLC; SHA Affordable Development, LLC; DB Development Florida, LLC	NC	F	2,700,000.00	423,400.00	3,123,400.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	83.70%	4	Y	23
2018-0308S	Brisas del Rio Apartments	Miami-Dade	L	Alberto Viljo, Jr.	Brisas del Rio Apartments Developer, LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	4,346,770.00	600,000.00	4,946,770.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	34.50%	2	Y	1
2018-0328S	Providence Reserve Seniors	Polk	M	Scott Zimmerman	Judd Roth Real Estate Development, Inc.; BDC Providence Reserve Seniors Developer, LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	6,000,000.00	429,800.00	6,429,800.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	52.46%	2	Y	27
2018-0338S**	Citadelle Village	Miami-Dade	L	Samuel F. Diller	Little Haiti Housing Association, Inc.; Stone Soup Development, Inc.	NC	F	3,600,000.00	600,000.00	4,200,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	78.77%	4	Y	3
2018-0358S	Hibiscus Apartments	Lee	M	Scott Zimmerman	Judd Roth Real Estate Development, Inc.; BDC Hibiscus Apartments Developer, LLC	NC	F	5,125,000.00	510,800.00	5,635,800.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	75.83%	4	Y	17
2018-0368S	Lake Gibson Commons	Polk	M	Shawn Wilson	Blue Sky Communities III, LLC; TB Affordable Housing, Inc.	NC	E, Non-ALF	3,400,000.00	245,600.00	3,645,600.00	Y	15	Y	Y	Y	111.41%	5	Y	12

RFA 2017-108 – All Applications

Application Number	Name of Development	County	County Size	Name of Contact Person	Name of Developers	Dev Category	Dem. Commitment	SAIL Request	ELI Request	Total SAIL Request (SAIL + ELI)	Eligible For Funding?	Total Points	Proximity Funding Preference	Per Unit Construction Funding Preference	Leveraging Percentage	Leveraging Level	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
2018-0388S	Royal Arms Garden Apartments	Bay	M	John D Page	Southport Development, inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	A/R	F	4,600,000.00	433,200.00	5,033,200.00	Y	15	Y	Y	96.46%	5	Y	25
2018-039S	The Waves	Duval	L	Fred McKinnies	Jax Urban Initiatives Development, LLC, TVC Development, Inc.	NC	F	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	38.67%	2	Y	16
2018-040BS	Pembroke Tower Apartments	Broward	L	Scott C Seckinger	Southport Development, inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	A/R	E, Non-ALF	3,200,000.00	600,000.00	3,800,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	53.51%	3	Y	32
2018-041BS	Parrish Oaks	Manatee	M	John D Page	Southport Development, inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	NC	F	6,000,000.00	600,000.00	6,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	48.83%	2	Y	11
2018-042BS	Luna Lake	Pasco	M	John D Page	Southport Development, inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	NC	E, Non-ALF	5,800,000.00	465,000.00	6,265,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	58.73%	3	Y	13
2018-043BS	The Villages Apartments, Phase II	Miami-Dade	L	Talmaadge W Fair	New Urban Development, LLC; Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	5,000,000.00	600,000.00	5,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	59.30%	3	Y	18
2018-044BS	Woodland Grove	Miami-Dade	L	Lewis Swazy	Lewis Swazy; RS Development Corp	NC	F	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	22.79%	1	Y	31
2018-046BS*	Manatee Commons	Manatee	M	Shawn Wilson	Blue Sky Communities II, LLC; TB Affordable Housing, Inc	NC	E, Non-ALF	4,200,000.00	541,000.00	4,741,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	95.71%	5	Y	15
2018-047BS	Northside Transit Village II	Miami-Dade	L	Kenneth Naylor	APC Northside Property II Development, LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	46.62%	2	Y	19
2018-048BS	Harbour Springs Village	Miami-Dade	L	Lewis Swazy	Lewis Swazy; RS Development Corp	NC	F	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	22.79%	1	Y	7
2018-050BS	Osprey Pointe	Pasco	M	Matthew A Rieger	HTG Osprey Pointe Developer, LLC	NC	F	6,000,000.00	556,900.00	6,556,900.00	Y	15	Y	Y	57.88%	3	Y	24
2018-051BS	Northside Transit Village III	Miami-Dade	L	Kenneth Naylor	APC Northside Property III Development, LLC	NC	F	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	Y	15	Y	Y	46.32%	2	Y	30

Ineligible Applications

2018-015BS	WRDG T4 Oaks at Renaissance Preserve	Hillsborough	L	Jerome Ryans	WRDG T4 Developer, LLC	NC	F	6,197,332.00	600,000.00	6,797,332.00	N	15	Y	Y	34.50%		Y	20
2018-018S	Weldon Street MF	Lee	M	Egbert L.J. Perry	Integral Development, LLC; Housing for Urban Communities, LLC	NC	ALF	6,000,000.00	546,700.00	6,546,700.00	N	15	Y	Y	41.28%		Y	35
2018-020S	Cathedral Townhouse	Bradford	S	Louie A Lange III	Commonwealth Development Corporation	NC	F	3,933,333.00	479,500.00	4,412,833.00	N	15	Y	Y	76.34%		Y	4
2018-022BS	Brisas del Este Apartments	Duval	L	Shawn Wilson	Cathedral Townhouse Redevelopment Associates, LLC	A/R	E, Non-ALF	5,000,000.00	600,000.00	5,600,000.00	N	15	Y	Y	36.11%		Y	21
2018-031BS	Courtside Apartments, Phase II	Miami-Dade	L	Alberto Millo, Jr.	Brisas del Este Apartments Developer, LLC	NC	F	4,639,425.00	600,000.00	5,239,425.00	N	15	Y	Y	34.50%		Y	9
2018-034BS	Mary Bethune Highrise	Miami-Dade	L	Matthew A. Rieger	AMC HTG 2 Developer, LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	3,700,000.00	600,000.00	4,300,000.00	N	15	Y	Y	43.67%		Y	2
2018-037BS		Hillsborough	L	Jerome Ryans	WRDG Mary Bethune Developer, LLC	A/R	E, Non-ALF	750,000.00	600,000.00	1,350,000.00	N	15	Y	Y	5.83%		Y	6

RFA 2017-108 – All Applications

Application Number	Name of Development	County	County Size	Name of Contact Person	Name of Developers	Dev Category	Demo. Commitment	SAIL Request	EU Request	Total SAIL Request (SAIL + EU)	Eligible For Funding?	Total Points	Proximity Funding Preference	Per Unit Construction Funding Preference	Leveraging Percentage	Leveraging Level	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
2018-04585	Anderson Terrace Apartments	Orange	L	Matthew A Rieger	HTC Anderson Terrace Developer, LLC	NC	F	6,800,000.00	600,000.00	7,400,000.00	N	15	Y	Y	39.87%		Y	10
2018-04985	Rosemary Cove	Miami-Dade	L	Aaron M. Gornstein	Preservation of Affordable Housing LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	3,500,000.00	600,000.00	4,100,000.00	N	15	Y	Y	73.13%		Y	28
2018-0525	Pine Grove Apartments	Duval	L	Kristin M Miller	The Richman Group of Florida, Inc.	NC	F	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	N	15	Y	Y	35.05%		Y	26

**EU Amount was reduced during scoring.

**TDC was reduced during scoring which affected the Leveraging Percentage.

On December 8, 2017, the Board of Directors of Florida Housing Finance Corporation approved the Review Committee's motion to adopt the scoring results above.

Any unsuccessful Applicant may file a notice of protest and a formal written protest in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., Rule Chapter 28-110, F.A.C., and Rule 67-60.009, F.A.C. Failure to file a protest within the time prescribed in Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., shall constitute a waiver of proceedings under Chapter 120, Fla. Stat.

RFA 2017-108 – Recommendations

SAIL Funding Balance Available 3,888,830.00

NHTF Funding will be 100% allocated in accordance with Exhibit H

Application Number	Name of Development	County	County Size	Name of Contact Person	Name of Developers	Dev Category	Demo. Commitment	SAIL Request	ELI Request	Total SAIL Request (SAIL + ELI)	County Award Tally	Total Points	Proximity Funding Preference	Leveraging Level	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
--------------------	---------------------	--------	-------------	------------------------	--------------------	--------------	------------------	--------------	-------------	---------------------------------	--------------------	--------------	------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------------	----------------

Two Elderly Large County New Construction Applications

2018-02385	Sierra Bay	Miami-Dade	L	Mara S. Madas	Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	4,400,000.00	600,000.00	5,000,000.00	1	15	Y	1	Y	37
2018-03085	Brisas del Rio Apartments	Miami-Dade	L	Alberto Millo, Jr.	Brisas del Rio Apartments Developer, LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	4,346,770.00	600,000.00	4,946,770.00	3	15	Y	2	Y	1

Three Family Large County New Construction Applications

2018-04885	Harbour Springs	Miami-Dade	L	Lewis Swezy	Lewis Swezy, RS Development Corp	NC	F	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	1	15	Y	1	Y	7
2018-0395	The Waves	Duval	L	Fred McKinnies	Jax Urban Initiatives Development, LLC; TVC Development, Inc.	NC	F	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	1	15	Y	2	Y	16
2018-0245	Palmetto Pointe	Pinellas	L	John D Page	Southport Development, Inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	NC	F	5,400,000.00	463,900.00	5,863,900.00	1	10	Y	4	Y	29

One Elderly Medium County New Construction Application

2018-03285	Providence Reserve Seniors	Polk	M	Scott Zimmerman	Judd Roth Real Estate Development, Inc.; BDG Providence Reserve Seniors Developer, LLC	NC	E, Non-ALF	6,000,000.00	429,800.00	6,429,800.00	1	15	Y	2	Y	27
------------	----------------------------	------	---	-----------------	--	----	------------	--------------	------------	--------------	---	----	---	---	---	----

Two Family Medium County New Construction Applications

2018-04185	Parrish Oaks	Manatee	M	John D Page	Southport Development, Inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	NC	F	6,000,000.00	600,000.00	6,600,000.00	1	15	Y	2	Y	11
2018-04285	Luna Lake	Pasco	M	John D Page	Southport Development, Inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	NC	E, Non-ALF	5,800,000.00	465,000.00	6,265,000.00	1	15	Y	3	Y	13

RFA 2017-108 – Recommendations

Application Number	Name of Development	County	County Size	Name of Contact Person	Name of Developers	Dev Category	Demo. Commitment	SAL Request	EI Request	Total SAL Request (SAL + EI)	County Award Tally	Total Points	Proximity Funding Preference	Leveraging Level	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
Small County Application(s)																
2018-0265	Springhill Apartments (currently known as Madison Heights Apartments)	Madison	S	James J. Kerr, Jr	AMCS Development, LLC; SCG Development Partners, LLC	A/R	F	3,064,400.00	251,600.00	3,316,000.00	1	15	Y	5	Y	14
Medium County Application(s)																
2018-03585	Hibiscus Apartments	Lee	M	Scott Zimmerman	Judd Roth Real Estate Development, Inc.; BDG Hibiscus Apartments Developer, LLC	NC	F	5,125,000.00	510,800.00	5,635,800.00	1	15	Y	4	Y	17
2018-02985	Lofts on Lemon	Sarasota	M	Joseph J Chambers	Gardner Capital Development Florida, LLC; SHA Affordable Development, LLC; DB Development Florida, LLC	NC	F	2,700,000.00	423,400.00	3,123,400.00	1	15	Y	4	Y	23
2018-01985	Choctaw Village	Okaloosa	M	John D Page	Southport Development, Inc. a WA corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	A/R	F	2,500,000.00	396,300.00	2,896,300.00	1	15	Y	5	Y	22
2018-0175	Venetian Walk II	Sarasota	M	Richard Higgins	Norstar Development USA, LP; Venetian Walk Developers, LLC	NC	F	2,290,000.00	464,200.00	2,754,200.00	2	15	Y	4	Y	33
Large County Application(s)																
2018-04485	Woodland Grove	Miami-Dade	L	Lewis Swezy	Lewis Swezy; RS Development Corp	NC	F	7,000,000.00	600,000.00	7,600,000.00	4	15	Y	1	Y	31
2018-02585	Water's Edge Apartments	Miami-Dade	L	Mara S Vades	Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC	NC	F	3,000,000.00	600,000.00	3,600,000.00	5	15	Y	1	Y	36
2018-03385*	Citadelle Village	Miami-Dade	L	Samuel F Diller	Little Haiti Housing Association, Inc.; Stone Soup Development, Inc.	NC	F	3,600,000.00	600,000.00	4,200,000.00	6	15	Y	4	Y	3

*TDC was reduced during scoring which affected the Leveraging Percentage.

On December 8, 2017, the Board of Directors of Florida Housing Finance Corporation approved the Review Committee's motion and staff recommendation to select the above Applications for funding and invite the Applicants to enter credit underwriting.

Any unsuccessful Applicant may file a notice of protest and a formal written protest in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., Rule Chapter 28-110, F.A.C., and Rule 67-60.009, F.A.C. Failure to file a protest within the time prescribed in Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., shall constitute a waiver of proceedings under Chapter 120, Fla. Stat.