BEFORE THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION

HTG MADISON PARK, LTD

Petitioner,

vs.

FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION.

Respondent.

FHFC Case No: 2020-073BP
RFA No. 2020-202
App. No. 2021-004C

FORMAL WRITTEN PROTEST AND PETITION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING

Petitioner, HTG Madison Park, LTD., ("Petitioner" or "HTG Madison Park"), pursuant to sections 120.57(1) and (3), Florida Statutes ("F.S.") and Rules 28-110 and 67-60, Florida Administrative Code ("FAC") hereby files this Formal Written Protest and Petition for Administrative Hearing (the "Petition") regarding the scoring decisions of the Respondent, Florida Housing Finance Corporation ("Florida Housing") to award funding to responsive Applicants pursuant to *RFA 2020-202 Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Broward, Duval, Hillsborough, Orange, Palm Beach, and Pinellas Counties.* (hereinafter the "RFA")

Introduction

1 This Petition is filed pursuant to sections 120.57(1) and (3), Florida Statutes, Rules 28-110 and 67-60, Florida Administrative Code.

Parties

2. Petitioner is a Florida limited company in the business of providing affordable housing. Petitioner's address is 3225 Aviation Avenue, 6th Floor, Coconut Grove, Florida 33133. Petitioner's address, telephone number and email address are those of its undersigned counsel for purposes of this proceeding.

3. The affected agency is Florida Housing Finance Corporation. Florida Housing's address is 227 North Bronough Street, Suite 5000, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1329.

Notice

4. On August 26, 2020 Florida Housing issued the RFA.

5. On September 11, 2020 and October 12, 2020, the RFA was modified by Florida Housing and a *Notice of Modification of Request For Applications (RFA) 2020-202* was issued. [1]

6. Applications in response to the RFA were due on or before October 20, 2020.

7. Florida Housing received 35 applications in response to the RFA. Petitioner, applied in response to the RFA, requesting an allocation of $2,881,960.00 in Housing Credit Funding for its proposed one hundred and three (103) unit affordable housing development in Broward County, Florida. Petitioner's application satisfied all the required elements of the RFA and is eligible for a funding award.

8. Petitioner received notice of the preliminary RFA scoring and rankings through electronic posting on Friday, December 4, 2020 at 2:33 pm. A copy of the notices posted on the Corporations

[1] The Notices of Modification of Request for Applications (RFA) 2020-202 were posted on the Corporations website and sent via electronic mail to persons registered on the Corporation's Multifamily Programs Registry.

website are attached hereto as Exhibit "A". Petitioner was deemed eligible for funding but was not among those recommended for funding.

9. On Wednesday, December 9, 2020 at 10:47 am., Petitioner timely submitted their Notice of Intent to Protest Florida Housing's intended decision. A copy of that Notice of Intent is attached hereto as Exhibit "B".

10. This Petition is timely filed in accordance with the provisions of section 120.57(3) (b), Florida Statutes, and rules 28-110.004 and 67-60.009, Fla. Admin. Code.

Background

11. Florida Housing is a public corporation created by section 420.504, Florida Statutes, to administer the governmental function of financing or refinancing affordable housing and related facilities in Florida. Florida Housing's statutory authority and mandates are set forth in Part V of Chapter 420, Florida Statutes. See, Sections 420.501-420.55, Fla. Stat.

12. Florida Housing administers a competitive solicitation process to implement the provisions of the housing credit program under which developers apply for funding. See Chapter 67-60, Fla. Admin. Code.

RFA 2020-202

13. Through the RFA process Florida Housing anticipated awarding an estimated $18,669,520 of Housing Credits to proposed Developments in Broward, Duval, Hillsborough, Orange, Palm Beach and Pinellas Counties. (RFA at 2)

14. Appointed Review Committee members independently evaluated and scored their assigned portions of the submitted applications based on various mandatory and scored items. (RFA at 77) The maximum point total that an applicant can receive is 25 points. (RFA at 73) Failure to meet all eligibility items results in an application being deemed ineligible. (RFA at 70).

15. The RFA provides the following funding goals,

a. The Corporation has a goal to fund one Family Development that qualifies for the Geographic Areas of Opportunity/SADDA Funding Goal in Hillsborough County.

b. The Corporation has a goal to fund one Family Development that qualifies for the Geographic Areas of Opportunity/SADDA Funding Goal in Orange County.

c. The Corporation has a goal to fund one Application in each of the following counties that qualifies for the Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal: Broward, Duval, Palm Beach and Pinellas.

d. The Corporation has a goal to fund one additional Application in Broward County.

16. The RFA provides that when selecting Applications to meet the Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal, the highest scoring Applications will be determined by first sorting together all eligible Applications from highest score to lowest score, with any scores that are tied separated in the following order:

(1) First, by the Application's eligibility for the Per Unit Construction Funding Preference which is outlined in Section Four A.10.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 Development Category Funding Preference which is outlined in Section Four A.4.b.(4) 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 Classification, applying the multipliers outlined in item 3 of Exhibit C of the RFA (with Applications having the Classification of A listed above Applications having the Classification of B);

(4) Next, by the Application's eligibility for the Florida Job Creation Funding Preference which is outlined in item 4 of Exhibit C of the RFA (with Applications that qualify for the preference listed above Applications that do not qualify for the preference);

(5) And finally, by lottery number, resulting in the lowest lottery number receiving preference.

(RFA at 74)

17. The RFA further provides the following Sorting Order *after* selecting Applications to meet the Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal. All eligible Applications will be sorted from highest score to lowest score, with any scores that are tied separated as follows:

> (1) First, by the Application's eligibility for the Per Unit Construction Funding Preference which is outlined in Section Four A.10.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 Development Category Funding Preference which is outlined in Section Four A.4. b. (4) 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 Classification, applying the multipliers outlined in item 3 of Exhibit C of the RFA (with Applications having the Classification of A listed above Applications having the Classification of B);
>
> (4) Next, 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;
>
> (5) Next, by the Application's eligibility for the Grocery Store 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);
>
> (6) Next, by the Application's eligibility for the Transit Service 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);
>
> (7) Next, by the Application's eligibility for the Community Service 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);
>
> (8) Next, by the Application's eligibility for the Florida Job Creation Funding Preference which is outlined in item 4 of Exhibit C of the RFA (with Applications that qualify for the preference listed above Applications that do not qualify for the preference);

(9) And finally, by lottery number, resulting in the lowest lottery number receiving preference.

18. The RFA mandates the Funding Selection Process (hereinafter "Selection Process"), as follows,

a. Local Government Areas of Opportunity Goal

(1) The first Application selected for funding will be the highest-ranking eligible Application that meets the Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Broward County.

(2) The next Application selected for funding will be the highest-ranking eligible Application that meets the Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Duval County.

(3) The next Application selected for funding will be the highest-ranking eligible Application that meets the Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Palm Beach County.

(4) The next Application selected for funding will be the highest-ranking eligible Application that meets the Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Pinellas County

b. Geographic Area of Opportunity/SADDA Goal

(1) The next Application selected for funding will be the highest-ranking eligible Family Application located in Orange County that meets the Geographic Areas of Opportunity/SADDA funding Goal.

(2) The next Application selected for funding will be the highest-ranking eligible Family Application located in Orange County that meets the Geographic Areas of Opportunity/SADDA funding goal.

c. Selection Process for any county that was not awarded in process above

If Broward, Duval, Hillsborough, Orange, Palm Beach or Pinellas Counties did not each have one Application selected in the process described in a. or b. above, the next Application(s) selected would be the highest ranking eligible unfunded Application in those counties so that each of the counties has one Application selected.

d. One Additional Application in Broward County

The next Application selected will be the highest-ranking eligible unfunded Application for a proposed Development in Broward County.

e. One Additional Application

The last Application selected will be the highest-ranking eligible unfunded Application, regardless of county. If the selected Application cannot be fully funded, it will be entitled to receive a Binding Commitment for the unfunded balance.

No additional Applications from any county will be selected for funding and any remaining funds will be distributed as approved by the Board.

(RFA at 76-77)

19. The selection process was carried out by the members of the Review Committee at the public meeting held on November 17, 2020.

20, The following applications were selected in the following order for funding by the Review Committee:

-2021-016 C- Mount Hermon Housing, Ltd. (Broward)
-2021-022C- SP View LLC (Duval)
-2021-020C- Berkeley Landing, Ltd. LLC (Palm Beach)
-2021-010C- Blue Pierce, LLC (Pinellas)
-2021-021C- Kelsey Cove, Ltd. (Hillsborough)
-2021-013C-MHP FL II, LLC (Orange)
-2021-017C- Pinnacle 441, LLC (Broward)
-2021-025C-WRDG T4 Phase Two, LP (Hillsborough)

HTG Madison Park, LTD, Application 2021-004C, (lottery number 7) in Broward County was deemed eligible but unfunded. The scoring committee erroneously found WRDG T4 Phase Two, LP ("WRDG") (lottery number 2) and Madison Landing II, LLC ("Madison Landing"),

Application Number 2021-012C (lottery number 5) eligible for funding. Had WRDG and Madison Landing been properly deemed ineligible then HTG Madison Park would have been selected for funding as the "One Additional Application" regardless of county.

WRDG

Principal Disclosure Form for the Applicant

21. The RFA provides that Applicants must disclose Principals of both the Applicant and Developer entities. The RFA provides in pertinent part,

> c. Principals Disclosure for the Applicant and for each Developer (**5 points**)
>
> (1) Eligibility Requirements
>
> To meet the submission requirements, upload the Principals of the Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Form (Form Rev. 05-2019) ("Principals Disclosure Form") as outlined in Section Three above. Prior versions of the Principal Disclosure Form will not be accepted.
>
> **To meet eligibility requirements, the Principals Disclosure Form must identify, pursuant to Subsections 67-48.002(94), 67-48.0075(8) and 67-48.0075(9), F.A.C., the Principals of the Applicant and Developer(s) as of the Application Deadline.** A Principals Disclosure Form should not include, for any organizational structure, any type of entity that is not specifically included in the Rule definition of Principals.
>
> For Housing Credits, the investor limited partner of an Applicant limited partnership or the investor member of an Applicant limited liability company must be identified on the Principal Disclosure Form.

(RFA at p. 12) (Emphasis supplied)

22. Principal is defined as follows,

> (94) "Principal" means:
>
> (a) For a corporation, each officer, director, executive director, and shareholder of the corporation.
> (b) For a limited partnership, each general partner and each limited partner of the limited partnership.

(c) For a limited liability company, each manager and each member of the limited liability company.
(d) For a trust, each trustee of the trust and all beneficiaries of majority age (i.e., 18 years of age) as of the Application Deadline.
(e) For a Public Housing Authority, each officer, director, commissioner, and executive director of the Authority.

Rule 48.002(94), F.A.C.

23. Applicant, WRDG is a Limited Partnership. At the First Principal Disclosure Level the WRDG identified THA T4 Phase Two, LLC, a limited liability company. At the Second Principal Disclosure Level the applicant disclosed the sole Member and Manager of the entity, Tampa Housing Authority Development Corp.[2](hereinafter "THADC")

24. As required by the above stated rule, WRDG was, required to identify "each officer, director, executive director and shareholder of THADC at the Third Principal Disclosure Level. WRDG incorrectly disclosed Bemetra L Simmons as an Officer/Director. Ms. Simmons as of the Application Deadline however was not an Officer/Director of the THADC.

25. As of the Application Deadline, the Applicant failed to disclose the following individuals at the Third Principal Disclosure Level who were serving as Vice Chairperson and Director Members of the THADC; Bemetra Salter Liggins as Vice-Chairperson, Parker A. Homans as Director Member and Lorena Hardwick as Director Member. WRDG instead misidentified Bemetra L. Simmons as Officer/Director. Neither Vice-Chairperson Liggins, Director Member Mr. Homans, nor Director Hardwick were disclosed or identified on the Applicant Principal Disclosure Form. A copy of the Applicant Principal Disclosure Form is attached hereto as Exhibit "C".

[2] The Tampa Housing Authority Development Corp. is a non-profit entity of the Housing Authority of the City of Tampa.

Principal Disclosure Form for the Developer

26. The Developer entity of the Applicant is WRDG T4 Phase Two Developer, LLC.

27. At the First Principal Disclosure Level three members were identified, RUDG, LLC, Alberto Milo, Jr. and the Housing Authority of the City of Tampa, Florida.

28. As required by Rule 67-48.002(94)(e), for a Public Housing Authority the applicant is required to disclose all commissioners, officers, directors, and the executive director. As of the Application Deadline, the Applicant has failed to disclose the following individuals who were serving as commissioners of the Housing Authority of the City of Tampa, Florida; Bemetra Salter Liggins, Parker A. Homans and Lorena Hardwick, WRDG instead misidentified Bemetra L. Simmons and Susan Johnson Velez as commissioners. A copy of the Developer Principal Disclosure Form as attached hereto as Exhibit "D".

29. WRDG should be deemed ineligible for funding for failing to identify, on the respective Principal Disclosure Form for Applicants and Developers, all Principals on both the Applicant and Developer entities.

Madison Landing

Construction Funding Sources and the 15% Criteria

30. As required by the RFA, a Housing Credit Equity Proposal must be provided by each Applicant. The RFA provides in pertinent part, "Note: Exhibit D to the RFA outlines the documentation required to be submitted during credit underwriting demonstrating **that the equity amount to be paid prior to or simultaneous with the closing of construction financing is at least 15 percent of the total proposed equity to be provided. (the 15 percent criteria)"** (RFA at 34) (emphasis supplied)

31. The Equity Commitment Letter submitted by Madison Landings shows two payments of HC equity funds, in the first amount of $2,719,978 to be paid prior to or simultaneously with the closing of the construction financing and the second in the amount of $14,778,547 being paid prior to construction completion, for a total of $17,498,525.00. A copy of the Equity Commitment Letter provided by Wells Fargo Bank dated October 19, 2020 is attached hereto as Exhibit E.

32. The RFA requires that the equity amount to be paid prior to or simultaneous with the closing of construction financing is at least 15 percent of the total proposed equity to be provided. The Equity Commitment Letter identifies the Net Capital Contribution of the Housing Credits Purchased to be in the amount of $18,133,187. As a result, if the Equity Provider is only committing to funding $2,719,978 of $18,133,187 of the Net Capital Contribution of equity that is to be paid prior to or simultaneous with the closing of construction financing, then the equity being committed to is 14.99% which fails the 15 percent criteria threshold that is required by the RFA.

33. Madison Landing should be deemed ineligible as the equity proceeds paid to or simultaneous with the closing of construction financing according to the Equity Commitment Letter is $2,719,978 which is only 14.999% of the total proposed equity to be provided $18,133,187, which does not meet the 15% criterion as required by the RFA.[3]

Principal Disclosures Form for the Applicant

34. As a limited liability company, Madison Landing was required to identify the Managers and Members at the Second Principal Disclosure level. Patrick E. Law was identified as both the

[3] The undersigned acknowledges that the demonstration of meeting the 15% test does not have to occur until credit underwriting. However, the Petitioner will not have a point of entry to raise this issue during credit underwriting.

Manager and Investor Member and Madison Landing II Apartments, LLC was identified as the Non-Investor member.

35. Upon information and belief, Madison Landing II Apartments, LLC had not been created as a legally formed entity in Florida as of the Application Deadline.

36. Florida Housing as part of every Request for Application provides a Question-and-Answer Period for interested parties to submit written questions and receive written answers from Florida Housing staff on RFA issues prior to the Application Deadline.

37. All questions and the respective answers are posted on Florida Housings website so that all interested parties can avail themselves of the information provided regarding.

38. It is the intent of Florida Housing that individuals rely upon the answers given.

39. The following was included within the Questions and Answers for *RFA 2018-111, Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Miami-Dade County,*

> *Question 12:*
>
> *Do the entities listed on the Principal Disclosure Form have to be active as of the stamped "Approved" date or as of the Application Deadline?*
>
> *Answer:*
>
> ***As of the Application Deadline**. The Applicant may upload a Principals Disclosure Form stamped "Approved" during the Advance Review Process provide (a) it is still correct as of the Application Deadline, (b) it was approved for the type of funding being requested (i.e., Housing Credits or Non-Housing Credits)*

(Emphasis supplied) A copy of the *Questions and Answers for RFA 2018-111* is attached as Exhibit "F".

40. Madison Landing's Principal Disclosure for Applicant Form should be rejected, and Madison Landing should be deemed ineligible for funding for failing to have Madison Landing II Apartments, LLC created as a legally formed entity in Florida by the Application Deadline as per

Florida Housing's instructions given in RFA 2018-111 thus negating Florida Housing's ability to perform due diligence checks on the entity.[4]

Substantial Interests Affected

41. If WRDG and Madison Landing had been properly deemed ineligible, then HTG Madison Park would have been selected for funding as the "One Additional Application" regardless of county.

42. Petitioner is substantially affected by the evaluation and scoring of the responses to the RFA. The results of the scoring have affected Petitioners ability to obtain funding through the RFA. Consequently, Petitioners have standing to initiate and participate in this and related proceedings.

43. Petitioner is entitled to a Formal Administrative Hearing pursuant to Sections 120.57(1) and 120.57(3), Florida statutes, to resolve the issues set forth in this Petition.

Disputed Issues of Material Fact and Law

44. Disputed issues of material fact and law exist and entitle Petitioners to a Formal Administrative Hearing pursuant to Section 120.57(1), Florida Statutes. The disputed issues of material fact and law include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. Whether Florida Housing's actions in determining WRDG eligible for funding were arbitrary and capricious?

b. Whether Florida Housing's actions in determining WRDG eligible elected for funding were contrary to competition?

---

[4] See *Quail Roost Transit Village I, Ltd v. Florida Housing Finance Corporation and 675 Ali Baba, LLC, DOAH Case No. 20-3094BID (*Applicants failure to properly identify manager, conceding, "manager was not accurately disclosed on Principals Disclosure Form … and that to his knowledge no entity called "Ali Baba Manager, LLC, existed" was deemed a material error as "Florida Housing cannot perform due diligence checks on the entity if it is not correctly identified")

c. Whether Florida Housing's actions in determining WRDG eligible for funding were clearly erroneous?

d. Whether WRDG identified all required Principals on its Principal Disclosure for Applicant Form.

e. Whether WRDG identified all required Principals on its Principal Disclosure for Developer Form.

f. Whether Florida Housing's actions in determining Madison Landing eligible for funding were arbitrary and capricious?

g. Whether Florida Housing's actions in determining Madison Landing as eligible for funding were contrary to competition?

h. Whether Florida Housing's action in determining Madison Landing as eligible were contrary to competition?

i. Whether Madison Landing II Apartments, LLC was "active" as a legally formed entity in Florida as of the Application Deadline?

j. Such, other issues as may be revealed during the protest process.

Statutes and Rules Entitling Relief

45. Petitioner is entitled to relief pursuant to Section 120.569 and 120.57, Florida Statutes, Chapters 28-106, 28-110, and 67-60, Florida Administrative Code.

Concise Statement of Ultimate Fact and Law, Including the Specific Facts Warranting Reversal of the Agency's Intended Award

46. Petitioner participated in the RFA process to compete for an award of Housing Credit funds based upon the delineated scoring and ranking criteria in the RFA.

47. Unless the scoring and eligibility determination is corrected, and the preliminary allocation revised, Petitioner will be excluded from funding contrary to the provisions of the RFA and Florida Housing's governing statutes and rules.

48. A correct application of the eligibility, scoring and ranking criteria will result in funding for the Petitioner.

Right to Amend the Petition

49. Petitioner reserves the right to amend this Petition if additional disputed issues of material fact are identified during the discovery process in this case.

WHEREFORE, pursuant to section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, and rule 28-110.004. Florida Administrative Code, Petitioner's request the following relief:

a) An opportunity to resolve this protest by mutual agreement within seven days of the filing of this Petition as provided by Section 120.57(3)(d)(1), Florida Statutes.

b) If this protest cannot be resolved within seven days, that the matter be referred to the Division of Administrative Hearings for a formal hearing to be conducted before an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") pursuant to Section 120.57(1) and (3), Florida Statutes.

a) The ALJ enter a Recommended Order determining that the applications of WRDG T4 Phase Two LP and Madison Landing II, LLC should have been deemed ineligible for funding and award funding to HTG Madison Park, LTD.

c) That the Corporation adopt the Recommended Order of the ALJ.

FILED AND SERVED this 21st day of December 2020

Maureen McCarthy Daughton
FBN 655805
Maureen McCarthy Daughton, LLC
1400 Village Square Blvd.
Ste 3-231
Tallahassee, Florida 32312
Mdaughton@mmd-lawfirm.com
(850)-345-8251

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that the original of this Formal Written Protest and Petition for Administrative Hearing was filed by electronic mail with the Corporation Clerk and Hugh Brown, General Counsel, Florida Housing Finance Corporation, 227 North Bronough Street, Suite 5000, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, on this 21st day of December.

Maureen McCarthy Daughton

RFA 2020-202 Board Approved Preliminary Awards

Total HC Available for RFA	18,669,520.00
Total HC Allocated	18,077,900.00
Total HC Remaining	591,620.00

App Number	Name of Development	County	Name of Authorized Principal Representative	Developers	Demo	Total Units	HC Funding Amount	Eligible For Funding ?	Development is in Hillsborough County or Orange County and serves the Family Demographic Commitment, and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity Funding/SADDA Goal	Qualifies for the Local Government Area of Opportunity	Total Points	Per Unit Construction Funding Preference	Development Category Funding Preference	Leveraging Classification	Proximity Funding Preference	Grocery Store Funding Preference	Transit Service Funding Preference	Community Service Preference	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Broward County																				
2021-016C	Mount Hermon Apartments	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Mount Hermon	E, Non-ALF	103	2,881,900	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Duval County																				
2021-022C	Parkview Commons	Duval	J. David Page	Southport Development,	F	122	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	32
Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Palm Beach County																				
2021-020C	Berkeley Landing	Palm Beach	Jonathan L. Wolf	Berkeley Landing	F	112	2,375,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6
Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Pinellas County																				
2021-010C	Blue Dolphin Tower	Pinellas	Shawn Wilson	Blue Sky Developer, LLC	F	81	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15
Family Application located in Hillsborough County that meets the Geographic Areas of Opportunity / SADDA funding goal																				
2021-021C	Kelsey Cove	Hillsborough	James R. Hoover	TVC Development,	F	108	2,000,000	Y	Y	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	14
Family Application located in Orange County that meets the Geographic Areas of Opportunity / SADDA funding goal																				
2021-013C	The Enclave at Lake Shadow	Orange	Christopher L. Shear	MHP FL II Developer, LLC;	F	96	1,828,000	Y	Y	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
One Additional Application in Broward County																				
2021-017C	Pinnacle 441	Broward	David O. Deutch	Pinnacle Communities, LLC	F	110	2,882,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4
One Additional Application																				
2021-025C	WRDG T4 Phase Two	Hillsborough	Leroy Moore	WRDG T4 Phase Two Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	120	2,375,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2

On December 4, 2020, 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.

Exhibit A

RFA 2020-202 Board Approved Scoring Results

App Number	Name of Development	County	Name of Authorized Principal Representative	Developers	Demo	Total Units	HC Funding Amount	Eligible For Funding?	Development is in Hillsborough County or Orange County and serves the Family Demographic Commitment, and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity Funding/SADDA Goal	Qualifies for the Local Government Area of Opportunity	Total Points	Per Unit Construction Funding Preference	Development Category Funding Preference	Leveraging Classification	Proximity Funding Preference	Grocery Store Funding Preference	Transit Service Funding Preference	Community Service Preference	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
Eligible Applications																				
2021-001C	Tallman Pines - Phase I	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Tallman Villas Developer, LLC; Building Better Communities, Inc.	F	80	2,145,200	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	28
2021-002C	University Station - Phase II	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	University Station II Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	108	2,881,940	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	23
2021-003C	Parkview	Duval	Matthew A Rieger	HTG Parkview Developer, LLC	F	110	1,855,000	Y	N	N	20	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	3
2021-004C	Madison Park	Broward	Matthew A Rieger	HTG Madison Park Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	103	2,881,960	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7
2021-005C	University Station - Phase I	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	University Station I Developer, LLC	F	108	2,881,880	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	12
2021-006C	City Place	Broward	Francisco A Rojo	Landmark Development Corp.	F	110	2,796,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11
2021-007C	Ocean Crest	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Ocean Crest Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	80	2,266,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	26
2021-008C	Residences at Marina Mile	Broward	Robert G. Hoskins	NuRock Development Partners, Inc.	F	100	2,482,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	33
2021-009C	Paramount Park	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Paramount Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	103	2,881,980	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10
2021-010C	Blue Dolphin Tower	Pinellas	Shawn Wilson	Blue Sky Developer, LLC	F	81	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15
2021-012C	Madison Landing II	Orange	Patrick E. Law	ARC 2020, LLC; New South Residential, LLC	E, Non-ALF	86	1,950,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5
2021-013C	The Enclave at Lake Shadow	Orange	Christopher L. Shear	MHP FL II Developer, LLC; Magellan Housing LLC	F	96	1,828,000	Y	Y	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
2021-014C	Heritage Oaks	Pinellas	Brian Evjen	Norstar Development USA, LP; PCHA Development, LLC; Newstar Development, LLC	E, Non-ALF	80	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	25
2021-015C	Blanche Ely Villas	Broward	Ralph Adderly	Ambar3, LLC; HAPB Supporting Housing Opportunities, Inc.	E, Non-ALF	102	2,608,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	19
2021-016C	Mount Hermon Apartments	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Mount Hermon Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	103	2,881,900	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
2021-017C	Pinnacle 441	Broward	David O. Deutch	Pinnacle Communities, LLC	F	110	2,882,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4
2021-018C	Tallman Pines - Phase II	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Tallman HR Developer, LLC; Building Better Communities, Inc.	E, Non-ALF	75	2,256,500	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	22
2021-019C	Island Cove Apartments	Palm Beach	Darren J Smith	SHAG Island Cove, LLC; Delray Housing Group, Inc.	F	54	1,140,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	24
2021-020C	Berkeley Landing	Palm Beach	Jonathan L. Wolf	Berkeley Landing Developer, LLC; Pinnacle Communities, LLC	F	112	2,375,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6
2021-021C	Kelsey Cove	Hillsborough	James R. Hoover	TVC Development, Inc.	F	108	2,000,000	Y	Y	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	14

RFA 2020-202 Board Approved Scoring Results

App Number	Name of Development	County	Name of Authorized Principal Representative	Developers	Demo	Total Units	HC Funding Amount	Eligible For Funding?	Development is in Hillsborough County or Orange County and serves the Family Demographic Commitment, and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity Funding/SADDA Goal	Qualifies for the Local Government Area of Opportunity	Total Points	Per Unit Construction Funding Preference	Development Category Funding Preference	Leveraging Classification	Proximity Funding Preference	Grocery Store Funding Preference	Transit Service Funding Preference	Community Service Preference	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
2021-022C	Parkview Commons	Duval	J. David Page	Southport Development, Inc., a WA Corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	F	122	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	32
2021-023C	Pinnacle at La Cabaña	Broward	David O. Deutch	Pinnacle Communities, LLC	E, Non-ALF	114	2,882,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	17
2021-024C	Island View	Palm Beach	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Island View Developer, LLC	F	104	2,020,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	34
2021-025C	WRDG T4 Phase Two	Hillsborough	Leroy Moore	WRDG T4 Phase Two Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	120	2,375,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2
2021-026C	Cypress Preserve	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Preserve Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	80	1,923,550	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	27
2021-027C	Burlington Post II	Pinellas	Oscar A Sol	Burlington Post 2 Dev, LLC	E, Non-ALF	68	1,672,100	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	21
2021-028C	Marina Grand	Broward	Oscar A Sol	Grand Mile GM Dev, LLC; SFCLT Grande Mile Developer, LLC	F	94	2,690,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	30
2021-029C	Heritage Place	Hillsborough	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Heritage Developer, LLC	F	88	2,224,880	Y	Y	N	20	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	35
2021-030C	Calusa Pointe	Palm Beach	J David Page	Southport Development, Inc., a WA Corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	E, Non-ALF	140	2,375,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	13
2021-031C	Sunshine Lofts on 78th	Pinellas	Brian Evjen	Norstar Development USA, LP; PCHA Development, LLC; Newstar Development, LLC	E, Non-ALF	78	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	29
2021-032C	Avalon	Pinellas	Mara S. Mades	Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC	F	96	1,868,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	20
2021-033C	Douglas Gardens VI	Broward	Christopher L Shear	MHP Douglas Developer II, LLC; Douglas Gardens VI Developer, LLC; Magellan Housing LLC	E, Non-ALF	130	2,882,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	16
2021-034C	Andrew Landing	Duval	James R. Hoover	TVC Development, Inc.	E, Non-ALF	96	1,800,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9
2021-035C*	Springfield Plaza	Duval	Clifton Phillips	Roundstone Development, LLC	F	96	1,868,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	31

Ineligible Applications

2021-011C*	Coleman Park Renaissance	Palm Beach	Terri Murray	NRI Development Corp.; Neighborhood Renaissance, Inc.; Stone Soup Development, Inc.	F	42	921,567	N	N	N	15	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	18

*The Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside Amounts were calculated during scoring.

On December 4, 2020, 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.

Maureen McCarthy Daughton, LLC

MMD LAW

Maureen McCarthy Daughton, LLC
1400 Village Square Blvd., Ste 3-231
Tallahassee, Florida 32312

T: (850) 345-8251
Mdaughton@mmd-lawfirm.com
www.mmd-lawfirm.com

Via Email
December 9, 2020

Ms. Ana McGlamory (Ana.McGlamory@Floridahousing.org)
Corporation Clerk
Florida Housing Finance Corporation
227 North Bronough, Suite 5000
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

RE: **Notice of Intent to Protest, Request for Applications (RFA) 2020-202 Proposed Funding Selections**

Dear Corporation Clerk:

On behalf of Applicant, HTG Madison Park, LTD, Application No. 2021-004C, we hereby give notice of our intent to protest the Award Notice and Scoring and Ranking of RFA 2020-202 posted by Florida Housing Finance Corporation on December 4, 2020 at 2:33pm concerning *Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing developments located in Broward, Duval, Hillsborough, Orange, Palm Beach and Pinellas Counties* (See Attached).

A formal written petition will be submitted within ten (10) days of this Notice as required by law.

Respectfully Submitted,
Maureen M. Daughton

Cc Hugh Brown, General Counsel

- Exhibit B -

RFA 2020-202 Board Approved Preliminary Awards

Total HC Available for RFA	18,669,520.00
Total HC Allocated	18,077,900.00
Total HC Remaining	591,620.00

App Number	Name of Development	County	Name of Authorized Principal Representative	Developers	Demo	Total Units	HC Funding Amount	Eligible For Funding ?	Development is in Hillsborough County or Orange County and serves the Family Demographic Commitment, and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity Funding/SADDA Goal	Qualifies for the Local Government Area of Opportunity	Total Points	Per Unit Construction Funding Preference	Developme nt Category Funding Preference	Leveraging Classification	Proximity Funding Preference	Grocery Store Funding Preference	Transit Service Funding Preference	Commu nity Service Prefere nce	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Broward County																				
2021-016C	Mount Hermon Apartments	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Mount Hermon	E, Non-ALF	103	2,881,900	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Duval County																				
2021-022C	Parkview Commons	Duval	J. David Page	Southport Development,	F	122	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	32
Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Palm Beach County																				
2021-020C	Berkeley Landing	Palm Beach	Jonathan L. Wolf	Berkeley Landing	F	112	2,375,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6
Local Government Areas of Opportunity Funding Goal in Pinellas County																				
2021-010C	Blue Dolphin Tower	Pinellas	Shawn Wilson	Blue Sky Developer, LLC	F	81	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15
Family Application located in Hillsborough County that meets the Geographic Areas of Opportunity / SADDA funding goal																				
2021-021C	Kelsey Cove	Hillsborough	James R. Hoover	TVC Development,	F	108	2,000,000	Y	Y	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	14
Family Application located in Orange County that meets the Geographic Areas of Opportunity / SADDA funding goal																				
2021-013C	The Enclave at Lake Shadow	Orange	Christopher L. Shear	MHP FL II Developer, LLC;	F	96	1,828,000	Y	Y	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
One Additional Application in Broward County																				
2021-017C	Pinnacle 441	Broward	David O. Deutch	Pinnacle Communities, LLC	F	110	2,882,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4
One Additional Application																				
2021-025C	WRDG T4 Phase Two	Hillsborough	Leroy Moore	WRDG T4 Phase Two Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	120	2,375,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2

On December 4, 2020, 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.

RFA 2020-202 Board Approved Scoring Results

App Number	Name of Development	County	Name of Authorized Principal Representative	Developers	Demo	Total Units	HC Funding Amount	Eligible For Funding?	Development is in Hillsborough County or Orange County and serves the Family Demographic Commitment, and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity Funding/SADDA Goal	Qualifies for the Local Government Area of Opportunity	Total Points	Per Unit Construction Funding Preference	Development Category Funding Preference	Leveraging Classification	Proximity Funding Preference	Grocery Store Funding Preference	Transit Service Funding Preference	Community Service Preference	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
Eligible Applications																				
2021-001C	Tallman Pines - Phase I	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Tallman Villas Developer, LLC; Building Better Communities, Inc.	F	80	2,145,200	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	28
2021-002C	University Station - Phase II	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	University Station II Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	108	2,881,940	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	23
2021-003C	Parkview	Duval	Matthew A Rieger	HTG Parkview Developer, LLC	F	110	1,855,000	Y	N	N	20	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	3
2021-004C	Madison Park	Broward	Matthew A Rieger	HTG Madison Park Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	103	2,881,960	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7
2021-005C	University Station - Phase I	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	University Station I Developer, LLC	F	108	2,881,880	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	12
2021-006C	City Place	Broward	Francisco A Rojo	Landmark Development Corp.	F	110	2,796,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11
2021-007C	Ocean Crest	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Ocean Crest Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	80	2,266,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	26
2021-008C	Residences at Marina Mile	Broward	Robert G. Hoskins	NuRock Development Partners, Inc.	F	100	2,482,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	33
2021-009C	Paramount Park	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Paramount Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	103	2,881,980	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10
2021-010C	Blue Dolphin Tower	Pinellas	Shawn Wilson	Blue Sky Developer, LLC	F	81	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15
2021-012C	Madison Landing II	Orange	Patrick E. Law	ARC 2020, LLC; New South Residential, LLC	E, Non-ALF	86	1,950,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5
2021-013C	The Enclave at Lake Shadow	Orange	Christopher L. Shear	MHP FL II Developer, LLC; Magellan Housing LLC	F	96	1,828,000	Y	Y	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
2021-014C	Heritage Oaks	Pinellas	Brian Evjen	Norstar Development USA, LP; PCHA Development, LLC; Newstar Development, LLC	E, Non-ALF	80	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	25
2021-015C	Blanche Ely Villas	Broward	Ralph Adderly	Ambar3, LLC; HAPB Supporting Housing Opportunities, Inc.	E, Non-ALF	102	2,608,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	19
2021-016C	Mount Hermon Apartments	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Mount Hermon Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	103	2,881,900	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
2021-017C	Pinnacle 441	Broward	David O. Deutch	Pinnacle Communities, LLC	F	110	2,882,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4
2021-018C	Tallman Pines - Phase II	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Tallman HR Developer, LLC; Building Better Communities, Inc.	E, Non-ALF	75	2,256,500	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	22
2021-019C	Island Cove Apartments	Palm Beach	Darren J Smith	SHAG Island Cove, LLC; Delray Housing Group, Inc.	F	54	1,140,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	24
2021-020C	Berkeley Landing	Palm Beach	Jonathan L. Wolf	Berkeley Landing Developer, LLC; Pinnacle Communities, LLC	F	112	2,375,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6
2021-021C	Kelsey Cove	Hillsborough	James R. Hoover	TVC Development, Inc.	F	108	2,000,000	Y	Y	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	14

RFA 2020-202 Board Approved Scoring Results

App Number	Name of Development	County	Name of Authorized Principal Representative	Developers	Demo	Total Units	HC Funding Amount	Eligible For Funding?	Development is in Hillsborough County or Orange County and serves the Family Demographic Commitment, and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity Funding/SADDA Goal	Qualifies for the Local Government Area of Opportunity	Total Points	Per Unit Construction Funding Preference	Development Category Funding Preference	Leveraging Classification	Proximity Funding Preference	Grocery Store Funding Preference	Transit Service Funding Preference	Community Service Preference	Florida Job Creation Preference	Lottery Number
2021-022C	Parkview Commons	Duval	J. David Page	Southport Development, Inc., a WA Corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	F	122	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	32
2021-023C	Pinnacle at La Cabaña	Broward	David O. Deutch	Pinnacle Communities, LLC	E, Non-ALF	114	2,882,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	17
2021-024C	Island View	Palm Beach	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Island View Developer, LLC	F	104	2,020,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	34
2021-025C	WRDG T4 Phase Two	Hillsborough	Leroy Moore	WRDG T4 Phase Two Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	120	2,375,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2
2021-026C	Cypress Preserve	Broward	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Preserve Developer, LLC	E, Non-ALF	80	1,923,550	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	27
2021-027C	Burlington Post II	Pinellas	Oscar A Sol	Burlington Post 2 Dev, LLC	E, Non-ALF	68	1,672,100	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	21
2021-028C	Marina Grand	Broward	Oscar A Sol	Grand Mile GM Dev, LLC; SFCLT Grande Mile Developer, LLC	F	94	2,690,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	30
2021-029C	Heritage Place	Hillsborough	Matthew A. Rieger	HTG Heritage Developer, LLC	F	88	2,224,880	Y	Y	N	20	Y	Y	B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	35
2021-030C	Calusa Pointe	Palm Beach	J David Page	Southport Development, Inc., a WA Corporation doing business in FL as Southport Development Services, Inc.	E, Non-ALF	140	2,375,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	13
2021-031C	Sunshine Lofts on 78th	Pinellas	Brian Evjen	Norstar Development USA, LP; PCHA Development, LLC; Newstar Development, LLC	E, Non-ALF	78	1,868,000	Y	N	Y	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	29
2021-032C	Avalon	Pinellas	Mara S. Mades	Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC	F	96	1,868,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	20
2021-033C	Douglas Gardens VI	Broward	Christopher L Shear	MHP Douglas Developer II, LLC; Douglas Gardens VI Developer, LLC; Magellan Housing LLC	E, Non-ALF	130	2,882,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	16
2021-034C	Andrew Landing	Duval	James R. Hoover	TVC Development, Inc.	E, Non-ALF	96	1,800,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9
2021-035C*	Springfield Plaza	Duval	Clifton Phillips	Roundstone Development, LLC	F	96	1,868,000	Y	N	N	25	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	31

Ineligible Applications

2021-011C*	Coleman Park Renaissance	Palm Beach	Terri Murray	NRI Development Corp.; Neighborhood Renaissance, Inc.; Stone Soup Development, Inc.	F	42	921,567	N	N	N	15	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	18

*The Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside Amounts were calculated during scoring.

On December 4, 2020, 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.

Principal Disclosures for the Applicant

APPROVED for HOUSING CREDITS
FHFC Advance Review
Received 10.5.20; Approved 10.5.20

Select the organizational structure for the Applicant entity:

The Applicant is a: Limited Partnership

Provide the name of the Applicant Limited Partnership:

WRDG T4 Phase Two, LP

First Principal Disclosure Level:

Click here for Assistance with Completing the Entries for the First Level Principal Disclosure for the Applicant

First Level Entity #	Select Type of Principal of Applicant	Enter Name of First Level Principal	Select organizational structure of First Level Principal identified
1.	General Partner	THA T4 Phase Two, LLC	Limited Liability Company
2.	Non-Investor LP	RUDG West River T4 Phase Two, LLC	Limited Liability Company
3.	Investor LP	Housing Authority of the City of Tampa, Florida	Public Housing Authority

Second Principal Disclosure Level:

WRDG T4 Phase Two, LP

Click here for Assistance with Completing the Entries for the Second Level Principal Disclosure for the Applicant

Select the corresponding First Level Principal Entity # from above for which the Second Level Principal is being identified	Second Level Entity #	Select the type of Principal being associated with the corresponding First Level Principal Entity	Enter Name of Second Level Principal	Select organizational structure of Second Level Principal identified
1. (THA T4 Phase Two, LLC)	1.A.	Sole Member	Tampa Housing Authority Development Corp.	Non-Profit Corporation
1. (THA T4 Phase Two, LLC)	1.B.	Manager	Tampa Housing Authority Development Corp.	Non-Profit Corporation
2. (RUDG West River T4 Phase Two,	2.A.	Manager	JMP Investor, LLC	Limited Liability Company
2. (RUDG West River T4 Phase Two,	2.B.	Member	JMP Investor, LLC	Limited Liability Company
2. (RUDG West River T4 Phase Two,	2.C.	Member	Milo Family Real Estate Investments, LLC	Limited Liability Company

Third Principal Disclosure Level:

WRDG T4 Phase Two, LP

Click here for Assistance with Completing the Entries for the Third Level Principal Disclosure for the Applicant

Select the corresponding Second Level Principal Entity # from above for which the Third Level Principal is being identified	Third Level Entity #	Select the type of Principal being associated with the corresponding Second Level Principal Entity	Enter Name of Third Level Principal who must be either a Natural Person or a Trust	The organizational structure of Third Level Principal identified Must be either a Natural Person or a Trust
1.A. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.A.(1)	Executive Director	Ryans, Jerome D.	Natural Person
1.A. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.A.(2)	Officer/Director	Moore, Leroy	Natural Person
1.A. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.A.(3)	Officer/Director	Begazo McCourty, Susi	Natural Person
1.A. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.A.(4)	Officer/Director	Johnson Velez, Susan	Natural Person
1.A. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.A.(5)	Officer/Director	Cloar, James A.	Natural Person
1.A. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.A.(6)	Officer/Director	Johnson Griffin, Billi	Natural Person
1.A. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.A.(7)	Officer/Director	Dachepalli, Ben	Natural Person
1.A. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.A.(8)	Officer/Director	Simmons, Bemetra L.	Natural Person
1.B. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.B.(1)	Executive Director	Ryans, Jerome D.	Natural Person
1.B. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.B.(2)	Officer/Director	Moore, Leroy	Natural Person
1.B. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.B.(3)	Officer/Director	Begazo McCourty, Susi	Natural Person
1.B. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.B.(4)	Officer/Director	Johnson Velez, Susan	Natural Person
1.B. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.B.(5)	Officer/Director	Cloar, James A.	Natural Person
1.B. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.B.(6)	Officer/Director	Johnson Griffin, Billi	Natural Person
1.B. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.B.(7)	Officer/Director	Dachepalli, Ben	Natural Person
1.B. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.B.(8)	Officer/Director	Simmons, Bemetra L.	Natural Person
2.A. (JMP Investor, LLC)	2.A.(1)	Sole Member	Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Dated 04/19/00	Trust
2.A. (JMP Investor, LLC)	2.A.(2)	Manager	Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Dated 04/19/00	Trust
2.B. (JMP Investor, LLC)	2.B.(1)	Sole Member	Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Dated 04/19/00	Trust
2.B. (JMP Investor, LLC)	2.B.(2)	Manager	Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Dated 04/19/00	Trust
2.C. (Milo Family Real Estate Investme	2.C.(1)	Manager	Milo, Alberto, Jr.	Natural Person
2.C. (Milo Family Real Estate Investme	2.C.(2)	Member	Milo, Alberto, Jr.	Natural Person

[redacted] the Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Form (Form Rev. 05-2019)

- Exhibit C -

Principal Disclosures for the Applicant

APPROVED for HOUSING CREDITS
FHFC Advance Review
Received 10.5.20; Approved 10.5.20

2.C. (Milo Family Real Estate Investmer	2.C.(3)	Manager	Milo, Maria C.	Natural Person
2.C. (Milo Family Real Estate Investmer	2.C.(4)	Member	Milo, Maria C.	Natural Person
1.A. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.A.(9)	Officer/Director	Ryans, Jerome D.	Natural Person
1.B. (Tampa Housing Authority Develo	1.B.(9)	Officer/Director	Ryans, Jerome D.	Natural Person

Fourth Principal Disclosure Level: WRDG T4 Phase Two, LP

Click here for Assistance with Completing the Entries for the Fourth Level Principal Disclosure for the Applicant

Select the corresponding Third Level Principal Entity # from above for which the Fourth Level Principal is being identified	Select the type of Principal being associated with the corresponding Third Level Principal Entity	Enter Name of Fourth Level Principal who must be a Natural Person	The organizational structure of Fourth Level Principal identified Must Be a Natural Person
2.A.(1) (Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Datec	Trustee	Perez, Jorge M.	Natural Person
2.A.(1) (Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Datec	Beneficiary	Perez, Jorge M.	Natural Person
2.A.(2) (Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Datec	Trustee	Perez, Jorge M.	Natural Person
2.A.(2) (Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Datec	Beneficiary	Perez, Jorge M.	Natural Person
2.B.(1) (Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Dated	Trustee	Perez, Jorge M.	Natural Person
2.B.(1) (Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Dated	Beneficiary	Perez, Jorge M.	Natural Person
2.B.(2) (Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Dated	Trustee	Perez, Jorge M.	Natural Person
2.B.(2) (Jorge M. Perez Declaration of Trust Dated	Beneficiary	Perez, Jorge M.	Natural Person

Principal Disclosures for the Developer

APPROVED for HOUSING CREDITS
FHFC Advance Review
Received 10.5.20; Approved 10.5.20

How many Developers are part of this Application structure?

1

Select the organizational structure for the Developer entity:

The Developer is a: Limited Liability Company

Provide the name of the Developer Limited Liability Company:

WRDG T4 Phase Two Developer, LLC

First Principal Disclosure Level:

WRDG T4 Phase Two Developer, LLC

Click here for Assistance with Completing the Entries for the First Level Principal Disclosure for a Developer

First Level Entity #	Select Type of Principal of Developer	Enter Name of First Level Principal	Select organizational structure of First Level Principal identified
1.	Manager	RUDG, LLC	Limited Liability Company
2.	Member	RUDG, LLC	Limited Liability Company
3.	Member	Milo, Alberto, Jr.	Natural Person
4.	Member	Housing Authority of the City of Tampa, Florida	Public Housing Authority

Second Principal Disclosure Level:

WRDG T4 Phase Two Developer, LLC

Click here for Assistance with Completing the Entries for the Second Level Principal Disclosure for a Developer

Select the corresponding First Level Principal Entity # from above for which the Second Level Principal is being identified	Second Level Entity #	Select the type of Principal being associated with the corresponding First Level Principal Entity	Enter Name of Second Level Principal	Select organizational structure of Second Level Principal identified
1. (RUDG, LLC)	1.A.	Manager	PRH Affordable Investments, LLC	Limited Liability Company
1. (RUDG, LLC)	1.B.	Member	PRH Affordable Investments, LLC	Limited Liability Company
1. (RUDG, LLC)	1.C.	Member	The Urban Development Group, LLC	Limited Liability Company
2. (RUDG, LLC)	2.A.	Manager	PRH Affordable Investments, LLC	Limited Liability Company
2. (RUDG, LLC)	2.B.	Member	PRH Affordable Investments, LLC	Limited Liability Company
2. (RUDG, LLC)	2.C.	Member	The Urban Development Group, LLC	Limited Liability Company
4. (Housing Authority of the City of	4.A.	Executive Director	Ryans, Jerome D.	Natural Person
4. (Housing Authority of the City of	4.B.	Officer/Director	Moore, Leroy	Natural Person
4. (Housing Authority of the City of	4.C.	Officer/Director	Begazo McCourty, Susi	Natural Person
4. (Housing Authority of the City of	4.D.	Commissioner	Johnson Velez, Susan	Natural Person
4. (Housing Authority of the City of	4.E.	Commissioner	Cloar, James A.	Natural Person
4. (Housing Authority of the City of	4.F.	Commissioner	Johnson, Griffin, Billi	Natural Person
4. (Housing Authority of the City of	4.G.	Commissioner	Dachepalli, Ben	Natural Person
4. (Housing Authority of the City of	4.H.	Commissioner	Simmons, Bemetra L.	Natural Person
4. (Housing Authority of the City of	4.I.	Officer/Director	Ryans, Jerome D.	Natural Person

- Exhibit D -

Wells Fargo Community Lending and Investment
301 South College Street
Charlotte, NC 28288-5640

WELLS FARGO

WELLS FARGO BANK
EQUITY LETTER

October 19, 2020

Mr. Patrick E. Law
Madison Landing II, LLC
c/o American Residential Development, LLC
558 W. New England Avenue
Suite 250
Winter Park, Florida 32789

Re: Madison Landing II – 86 units
Orlando, Orange County, Florida

Dear Mr. Law:

We are pleased to advise you that we have preliminarily approved an equity investment to be used for construction and permanent financing in Madison Landing II, LLC, a Florida limited liability company, which will own and operate an 86-unit senior affordable housing community to be known as Madison Landing II, located in Orlando, Orange County, Florida. This preliminary commitment is made based upon the financial information provided to us in support of your request, and under the following terms and conditions:

Investment Entity/Beneficiary:	Madison Landing II, LLC, a Florida limited liability company (the "Company"), with Madison Landing II Apartments, LLC as Administrative Member and Wells Fargo Bank ("Wells Fargo") as Investor Member with a 99.99% ownership interest in the Company.
Annual Housing Credit Allocation:	$1,950,000*
Housing Credits Purchased:	$19,498,050 ($19,500,000 x 99.99%)*
Syndication Rate:	$0.93*
Net Capital Contribution:	$18,133,187* * All numbers are rounded.
Equity Proceeds Paid Prior to Construction Completion:	***$17,498,525**** * All numbers are rounded to the nearest dollar.

- Exhibit E -

Pay-In Schedule:

Funds available for Capital Contribution #1: $2,719,978 * to be paid prior to or simultaneously with the closing of the construction financing.
* All numbers are rounded to the nearest dollar.

Funds available for Capital Contribution #2: $14,778,547* prior to construction completion.
* All numbers are rounded to the nearest dollar.

Equity Proceeds Paid After Stabilization:

$634,662*
* All numbers are rounded to the nearest dollar.

Obligations of the Administrative Member and Guarantor(s):

Operating Deficit Guaranty: The Administrative Member agrees to provide operating deficit loans to the Company for the life of the Company.

Development Completion Guaranty: The Administrative Member will guarantee completion of construction of the Project substantially in accordance with plans and specifications approved by Wells Fargo, including, without limitation, a guaranty: (i) to pay any amounts needed in excess of the construction loan and other available proceeds to complete the improvements; (ii) of all amounts necessary to achieve permanent loan closing; and (iii) to pay any operating deficits prior to the conclusion of Project construction.

Credit Adjusters: The Company will provide that, if in any year actual credits are less than projected credits, then the Investor Member shall be owed an amount necessary to preserve its anticipated return based on the projected credit.

The obligations of the Administrative Member shall be guaranteed by Patrick E. Law

Incentive Mgmt. Fee:

90%.

Cash Flow Split:

Cash Flow to the Company shall be distributed as follows:

a. To Wells Fargo in payment of any amounts due as a result of any unpaid Credit Adjuster Amount.
b. To Wells Fargo in payment of Asset Management Fees or any unpaid Asset Management Fee.
c. To the payment of any Deferred Developer Fee.
d. To the Administrative Member to repay any Company loans.
e. To the Administrative Member for Incentive Management Fees.
f. The balance, 90% to the Administrative Member and 10% to Wells Fargo

Residual Split:

Any gain upon sale or refinancing shall be distributed as follows:

a. To Wells Fargo in payment of any amounts due because the Actual Credit is less than the Projected Credit, or there has been a recapture of Credit.
b. To the payment of any unpaid Asset Management Fee.
c. To the Investor Member in an amount equal to the capital contribution.
d. The balance of available cash for distribution, 90% to the Administrative Member and 10% to the Investor Member.

Replacement Reserves:

$300/unit/year increasing 3% annually.

Asset Management Fee:

$8,500 per year increasing 3% annually.

Other Terms and Conditions:

1) Successful award and allocation of low income housing tax credits from the Florida Housing Finance Corporation.

2) Prior to closing, the Administrative Member must have a firm commitment for fixed-rate permanent first mortgage financing with terms, conditions and Lender acceptable to the Investor Member.

3) Prior to closing, the Administrative Member must have firm commitments for all fixed-rate subordinate financing with terms, conditions and Lender acceptable to the Investor Member including subordinate debt subject to cash flow.

4) Receipt, review, and approval of the appraisal with incorporated market study, environmental and geological reports, plans and specifications, contractor and such other conditions which are customary and reasonable for an equity investment of this nature and amount.

5) Pricing is based upon current and anticipated federal and state laws, including federal and state corporate income tax rates and other tax laws, rules and regulations (all collectively, the "Laws"), current and anticipated yield requirements (the "Yield Requirements"), and current and anticipated cost of funds (the "Cost of Funds"). Any proposed or actual modifications to such Laws, Yield Requirements, Cost of Funds, and any changes regarding our or the LIHTC industry's expectations regarding potential tax or other legislative reforms, could affect pricing and the terms herein.

6) This letter reflects an estimate of what Wells Fargo would invest based on its view of current market pricing for the underlying transaction as presented. It is based upon current tax laws, current return objectives and current market conditions. Changes to any of the foregoing could affect pricing if and when a term sheet is issued. In addition, all equity investments are subject to verification of project information, completion of underwriting, due diligence, and documentation, and Wells Fargo credit and business unit approvals.

This preliminary commitment will expire on June 30, 2021 if not extended by Wells Fargo. Wells Fargo wishes to thank you for the opportunity to become investment partners.

Sincerely,

Matthew Parkhill

Matthew Parkhill
Senior Vice President

Agreed and Accepted this Day:
By: Madison Landing II, LLC

By: _____ **Date:** 10/19/20

Name: Patrick E. Law

Title: Manager of Madison Landing II Apartments, LLC

Questions and Answers for RFA 2018-111

Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Miami-Dade County

Question 1:

Are the 08-16 version of the Ability to Proceed forms acceptable if used in a previous RFA for the same proposed Development?

Answer:

No. The Applicant must utilize the 08-18 version of the Ability to Proceed forms.

Question 2:

Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Department provided a dated letter of availability, however the information contained in the letter of availability has a 30-day expiration date. Will letters of availability from Miami-Dade that are dated within 12 months of application deadline still suffice, or will the letter of availability have to be dated with the 30-day expiration date taken into consideration? Basically, will a letter dated earlier than September 25th, even though it meets the RFA requirement of dated within 12 months, be deemed insufficient to evidence water and sewer availability due to the language of the letter providing for a 30-day expiration?

Answer:

If a letter is provided to demonstrate the availability of infrastructure, but the letter has expired prior to the Application Deadline, the requirement to demonstrate the availability of infrastructure will not be considered met.

Question 3:

The RFA inquires "Does the proposed Development consist of Scattered Sites?" The definition of Scattered Sites as defined in Rule 67-48 states that Scattered Sites "means a Development site that, when taken as a whole, is comprised of real property that is not contiguous." The definition further states that "Real property is contiguous if the only intervening real property interest is an easement, provided the easement is not a roadway or street." We are inquiring as to whether the question in the RFAs is with regard to the existing site to be developed or to the site as it will be after development. We are contemplating submitting an application for a site that is presently "contiguous" as defined in 67-48.002(106). However, the requirements of the local government are such that, after the application deadline, the development of the property will require either (i) the dedication of Rights-of-Way, or (ii) the provision of easements, either of which would be followed by the construction of roadways which would create "Scattered Sites." Please advise whether to answer the Scattered Sites question as the property exists at the time of the application deadline or at the time the Development will be complete.

Answer:

If the proposed Development meets the definition of Scattered Sites, all Scattered Sites requirements that were not required to be met in the Application will be met, including that all features and amenities committed to and proposed by the Applicant that are not unit-specific shall be located on each of the Scattered Sites, or no more than 1/16 mile from the Scattered Site with the most units, or a combination of both. If the Applicant indicates that the proposed Development does not consist of Scattered Sites, but it is determined during credit underwriting that the proposed Development does meet the definition of

Scattered Sites, all of the Scattered Sites requirements must have been met as of Application Deadline and, if all Scattered Sites requirements were not in place as of the Application Deadline, the Applicant's funding award will be rescinded.

Per Subsection 67-48.002(34), the Development Location Point for a Development which consists of Scattered Sites must be a single point on the site with the most units that is located within 100 feet of a residential building existing or to be constructed as part of the proposed Development.

Question 4:

I have a Medical Facility that has an ARNP who sees patients in the clinic on a walk-in/appointment basis. There is a Medical Director that is a licensed physician that supervises the clinic/ARNP. Does this clinic meet the definition of a Medical Facility?

Answer:

The first part of the definition of Medical Facility defines Medical Facility as "A medically licensed facility that (i) employs or has under contractual obligation at least one physician licensed under Chapter 458 or 459, F.S. available to treat patients by walk-in or by appointment…"If the Medical Director is employed or under contractual obligation at the facility, and is a physician licensed under Chapter 458 or 459, F.S. available to treat patients by walk-in or by appointment, and if the definition of Medical Facility is otherwise met, the Medical Facility will qualify for purposes of the RFA.

Question 5:

If using the Average Income Test, the Applicant must set-aside 15% of the total units for ELI households. Does 50% of the 15% reserved for ELI need to by Link units, or does 50% of the 10% of the ELI units need to be Link units if using the Average Income Test?

Answer:

If the Applicant elects the Average Income Test, the Applicant must set-aside 15% of the total units as ELI units at 30% AMI and 50% of those ELI units must be set-aside as Link units.

Question 6:

If an Applicant selects the Average Income Test and later determines the selection is not feasible, may the selection be changed during credit underwriting?

Answer:

As stated in the Acknowledgement and Certification form signed by the Authorized Principal Representative, "The Applicant acknowledges and certifies that it will abide by all commitments, requirements, and due dates outlined in the RFA, inclusive of all exhibits." Additionally, pursuant to Rule 67-48.023(2), F.A.C., all applicants must comply with any Housing Credit set aside committed to in the Application.

Question 7:

In Exhibit A, the Application contact person information has been re-worded slightly. What should an Applicant include under Organization of the Authorized Principal Representative in 3.a.(1)? Should the organization be in connection to the Applicant entity or the Organization the person works for?

Answer:

The Authorized Principal Representative must be a Principal of the Applicant and disclosed on the Principals Disclosure Form. In Exhibit A, the Applicant should insert the name of the organization for which the Principal is associated.

Question 8:

Can you clarify what the funding adjustment would be on a wood-frame mid-rise? The language in the RFA paragraph 3.b.(2) on page 87 of the RFA seems to suggest that the requirements of (b) and (c) below *both* must be met to get the 0.80 multiplier. But paragraph (b) contradicts this statement and suggests that a mid-rise, regardless of construction type will get the 0.80 multiplier.

Answer:

If a Mid-Rise Development meets all of the requirements outlined at 3.b.(2)(b) in Exhibit C, the multiplier will be 0.80. If the same proposed Development meets the requirements of both 3.b.(2)(b) and 3.b.(2)(c), the multiplier is still 0.80. If a Development qualifies for more than one multiplier, the one multiplier that provides the best result will be applied to the Development. In the example provided, the 0.80 multiplier will be applied.

Question 9:

If I am submitting an Application for "Phase II" of a project and Phase I of the project did not receive housing credits, would the Application be disqualified as it is not the FIRST Phase of a Multi-Phase project (10.a.(3))?

Answer:

For purposes of Section Four A.10.a.(3) of the RFA, the first phase of a multiphase project is considered the first phase that is awarded funding.

Question 10:

Regarding Section 6.d.(2)(a) Total Income Set-Aside Commitment, does (a)(i) through (iii) apply to for profit and Non-Profit Applicants that select the Average Income Test?

Answer:

Yes.

Question 11:

Regarding Section 10.c.(2)(a), the "Note" at the end of the page states that Local Government financial commitments can be considered a source of financing without meeting the requirements of (i) through (iv) above. What section (or page) of the RFA is (i) through (iv)?

Answer:

The eligible Local Government financial commitments can be considered a source of financing without meeting the requirements outlined in the bullet points in 10.c.(2)(a), directly above the "Note". A modification to the RFA will be issued.

Question 12:

Do the entities listed on the Principal Disclosure Form have to be active as of the stamped "Approved" date or as of the Application Deadline?

Answer:

As of the Application Deadline. The Applicant may upload a Principals Disclosure Form stamped "Approved" during the Advance Review Process provide (a) it is still correct as of Application Deadline, (b) it was approved for the type of funding being requested (i.e., Housing Credits or Non-Housing Credits).

Question 13:

The RFA states "Up to three Public Bus Stops may be selected. Each Public Bus Stop must meet the definition of Public Bu Stop, as defined in Exhibit B, using at least one unique bus route. Up to two of the selected Public Bus Stops may be Sister Stops that serve the same route, as defined in Exhibit B".

Sister Stop is defined as "two (2) bus stops that (i) individually, each meet the definition of Public Bus Stop, (ii) are separated by a street or intersection from each other, (iii) are within 0.2 miles of each other, (iv) serve the same bus route(s), (v) and the buses travel in different directions.

Definition #1 above states that 3 Public Bus Stops may be selected but that they must each have at least one unique route. Definition #2 above states that in order to be a Sister Stop, they need to serve the same bus routes. The definitions of Public Bus Stop and Sister Stop contradict one another. How can all these Public Bus routes be unique if two Sister Stops are allowed to have the same bus route?

Answer:

If each of the three bus stops in the above example would individually meet the definition of Public Bus Stop, and the two bus stops that serve Route 81 meet the definition of Sister Stops, the combination of all three Public Bus Stops may be used to achieve a maximum of 6 Transit Points. Sister Stops are a supplemental method in which to achieve three Public Bus Stops

Question 14:

Please note that each of the Florida Housing Ability to Proceed Verification forms (Form Rev. 08-18), includes the following language under "Development Location: "The Location of all Scattered Sites, if applicable, must also be included."

Please assume an application with the following facts:

1. There are two Scattered Sites ("Site A" and "Site B").
2. Site A is in "Municipality X" and Site B is in "Municipality Y."

For certain Ability to Proceed Verification forms, the governmental authority having jurisdiction over the same specific form is different (e.g., the Zoning form), as a consequence of having two Scattered Sites in different municipalities. Must all Scattered Sites be listed on each individual form, or is it permissible to have two separate forms (e.g., two separate Zoning forms) with: **1.** one form indicating Site A only, and executed by an appropriate party from Municipality X, and **2.** a separate form indicating Site B only, and executed by an appropriate party from Municipality Y?

Answer:

It is permissible to provide multiple copies of Ability to Proceed forms to demonstrate infrastructure and zoning for Developments consisting of Scattered Sites.

Question 15:

Please note that some of the Florida Housing Ability to Proceed Verification forms (Form Rev. 08-18), include the following language under "Number of Units in the Development:" "This number must be equal to or greater than the number of units stated by the Applicant in Exhibit A of the RFA."

For applications with Scattered Sites (especially Scattered Sites within different municipalities) the official that is required to sign a particular form may only be able to opine as to one Scattered Site at a time. For example, a Zoning form may be needed to opine as to the number of units on Site A, in Municipality X, with a *separate* Zoning form needed to opine as to the number of units on Site B, in Municipality Y. Considering the foregoing, will it be permissible for the *sum* of the number of units stated in multiple forms of the same type (e.g., on two separate Zoning forms) to be equal to or greater than the number of units stated by the Applicant in Exhibit A of the RFA.

Answer:

When the same type of Ability to Proceed form is executed by different jurisdictions in a Scattered Sites Development and each jurisdiction can only opine as to the number of units on the portion of the site that is within the jurisdiction, Florida Housing will confirm the total number of units on the form(s) is equal to or greater than the total number of units committed to by the Applicant in the Application.

Question 16:

Please note that the Local Government Verification of Contribution – Fee Waiver Form (Form Rev. 08-16), includes the following language under "**Development Location**:" "If the Development consists of Scattered Sites, the Development Location stated above must reflect the Scattered Site where the Development Location Point is Located."

Is it permissible for this form to also list *other* Scattered Sites, *in addition to* the Scattered Site where the Development Location Point is Located, in order to verify fee waivers in respect of the *other* scattered sites as well?

Answer:

Yes.

Question 17:

Our local jurisdiction is stating that they must add additional information on FHFC's sewer verification form. Please let us know if this is acceptable.

Answer:

If the alterations made to the form change the meaning of the form, the form will not be accepted.

Question 18:

If a PHA utilizes an instrumentality in its Applications, how should the PHA provide verification to FHFC, in its submission, that the entity is an instrumentality of the PHA and is therefore a PHA Applicant/Principal and entitled to the TDC boost allotted to PHA's?

Answer:

The Applicant should state, at Section Four A.10.f. of the RFA, whether any Principals of the Applicant entity are a Public Housing Authority (PHA) or an instrumentality of the PHA. The Applicant should note on the Principals Disclosure Form that the entity is an instrumentality of the PHA.

A modification to the RFA and Exhibit A will be issued to include an instrumentality of a PHA as eligible for the TDC boost. The modified Exhibit A will include a text box so that the Applicant may identify the PHA.

Question 19:

The RFA states: The Applicant should state whether any Principals of the Applicant entity are a Public Housing Authority. To qualify for the "Add-On Bonus" described Section Five, A.1 of the RFA and in Item 1 of Exhibit C, the Public Housing Authority must be reflected on the Principals of the Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Form (Form Rev. 08-16). For purposes of the "Add-On Bonus", the Public Housing Authority must not be disclosed as only the Investor Limited Partner of the Applicant or Investor Member of the Applicant.

Would this mean that the PHA / or instrumentality needs to be both the Owner/Applicant and the Developer, or is this just a reference to the form and the PHA entity just needs to be listed in the ownership? I believe the latter to be the instance, but I have someone asking for clarification.

Answer:

The PHA/instrumentality must be listed as a Principal of the Applicant, but not as ONLY the Investor Limited Partner or Investor Member of the Applicant. For example, in order to qualify for the "Add-On Bonus", if the PHA/instrumentality is serving as the Investor Member of the Applicant, it must also serve as another non-investor type Principal.

Question 20:

If a proposed Development was built prior to 1991, do all units have to comply with the accessibility requirements of the Fair Housing Act?

Answer:

No. All units, regardless of the age of the Development, must meet the Accessibility Requirements outlined in Section Four A.8.c. of the RFA.

Additionally, all Developments must meet the accessibility standards of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which require a minimum of 5 percent of the total dwelling units, but not fewer than one unit, be accessible for individuals with mobility impairments, and an additional 2 percent of the total units, but not fewer than one unit, be accessible for persons with hearing or vision impairments.

With regard to public and common use areas, Florida Housing requires the design, construction, or alteration of FHFC-financed Developments be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities and in compliance with federal and state accessibility requirements. When more than one law and accessibility standard applies, the Applicant shall comply with the standard which affords the greater level of accessibility for the residents and visitors.

Question 21:

What is an "accessible route"?

Answer:

An accessible route is a continuous unobstructed path connecting accessible elements and spaces in a building or within a site that can be negotiated by a person with a severe disability using a wheelchair, and that is also safe for and usable by people with other disabilities. Interior accessible routes may include corridors, floors, ramps, elevators and lifts. Exterior accessible routes may include parking access aisles, curb ramps, walks, ramps and lifts. A route than complies with the requirements of the Fair Housing Act Guidelines is considered an "accessible route".

Question 22:

I have two Public Bus Stops near the proposed Development. Between the two of them, they serve three routes that each meet the hourly requirement. I see that you now allow three Public Bus Stops to be

combined to get a up to 6 Transit Points. Because three routes are served, can I combine the two Public Bus Stops to get up to 6 Transit Points?

Answer:

No. The first part of the definition for Public Bus Stop states that it is "A fixed location at which passengers *may access one or two routes* of public transportation via buses." In the example provided, one of the stops serves more than one route. According to the definition provided even though it serves two routes, it counts as one bus stop. There is a chart outlined in Item 2 of Exhibit C that is titled "Distances if using one or two Public Bus Stops". The chart that would be used for calculating points in this scenario has a maximum of two points.

The Q&A process for RFA 2018-111 is concluded and Florida Housing does not expect to issue any further Q&As regarding RFA 2018-111.

Submitted by:

Marisa Button
Director of Multifamily Allocations
Florida Housing Finance Corporation
227 N. Bronough Street, Suite 5000
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850-488-4197 or Marisa.Button@floridahousing.org