

Questions and Answers for RFA 2019-112

HOUSING CREDIT FINANCING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS LOCATED IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

Question 1:

In my reading of the developer experience requirements, I see no distinction between experience in 9% and 4% credit projects or new construction and rehabs. Is my interpretation correct?

Answer:

Yes.

Question 2:

The Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department has implemented a new system (“e-Builder”) to help manage the development requests from developers and will engage their customers electronically. Can the form used through this system be submitted in response to the RFA for the Water and Sewer Ability to Proceed requirements?

Answer:

Yes. The RFA was modified to accept either the FHFC form or “documentation” from the service provider. This documentation includes the form completed through the Miami-Dade “e-Builder” system.

Question 3:

In regards to Part 6-Units/Buildings, if a For-Profit Applicant is selecting the Average Income set-aside and is proposing less than 75 total units, how many Set-Aside Units would be required? Part 6.a states the minimum required is 30 total units, but the last paragraph in this section states “... if the Applicant commits to set-aside less than 80 percent of the total units at or below an average of 60 percent AMI, the Development must have a minimum of 75 Set-Aside Units.” This sentence is repeated in 6.d.(2)(a)(i).

Answer:

If a proposed Development has less than 75 total units, the Applicant must commit to set-aside at least 80 percent of the total units. If the Applicant selects the Average Income Test, these Set-Aside Units may be set aside at or below 80 percent AMI, but the average AMI of all of the Set-Aside Units cannot exceed 60 percent AMI.

Question 4:

For a zero percent interest, deferred loan forgiven after a 15 year term, should it be treated as a grant? (on the loan form). Is the NVP the face value of the loan?

Answer:

A loan with a forgiveness provision and no accrued interest charges can be treated as a loan or a grant and either the “Loan” or the “Grant” verification forms can be used. If the loan form is used for a loan with a forgiveness provision (and no accrued interest charges), the space for entering the net present value of the loan is not applicable and will not be considered.

Question 5:

The rule notes that after the Applicant has been invited to enter credit underwriting and subject to written request of an Applicant to Corporation staff and approval of the Corporation, the site for the Development may be increased or decreased provided the Development Location Point is on the site and, if applicable, the total proximity points awarded during scoring are not reduced.

Would FHFC apply this to the following example: At Application, a Development consisted of three non-contiguous sites and applied as a Scattered Site Development. After the Applicant had been invited to enter credit underwriting, the Development site was decreased to two non-contiguous sites. There was no change to the Development Location Point for the site with the most units, the total number of units, or the Applicant's ability to provide those units on the two (vs. three) sites.

Answer:

Yes.

Question 6:

The RFA notes in several sections that, if the proposed Development consists of Scattered Sites, some information must be provided for each or all of the Scattered Sites. While it is clear that FHFC requires the address, longitude and latitude coordinates for each individual Scattered Site, it is not clear whether or not FHFC requires other information/documentation requested in the RFA to be provided for each individual Scattered Site or the Scattered Sites Development as a whole.

With regard to Site Control and Ability to Proceed, would FHFC accept one site control document (for site control) and one verification form and/or eligible documentation (for ability to proceed) for the Scattered Sites Development as a whole if the site control and ability to proceed documentation references all the Scattered Sites as being included?

Answer:

Yes.

Question 7:

In reviewing the requirements of the RFA, it appeared that a proposed development/development entity would not be eligible to receive funding if they had any past due financial obligations to Florida Housing Finance Corporation. There was then a link to the past due report. This report was long and included not only past due amounts, but a section on foreclosures, and insurance deficiencies. Is it only the past due portion of this report that applies or is any listing on this report a disqualifier? The report was date August 2019, is it possible for an applicant to come into compliance at any time before or after the selection? Or must they come into compliance before the RFA deadline?

Answer:

Pursuant to Section Five A.1. of the RFA, an Application will be deemed ineligible for funding if, as of close of business the day before the Committee meets to make a recommendation to the Board, there remains any financial obligations for which an Applicant or Developer or Principal, Affiliate or Financial Beneficiary of the Applicant or Developer is in arrears to the Corporation or any agent or assignee of the Corporation as reflected on the most recently published Past Due Report. Only the Past Due portion of the Past Due Report will be reviewed.

The Q&A process for RFA 2019-112 is concluded and Florida Housing does not expect to issue any further Q&As regarding RFA 2019-112.

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