FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION

WORKSHOP MEETING

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2019

1:49 p.m. - 3:16 p.m.

Orlando Airport Hyatt Regency
9300 Jeff Fuqua Boulevard
Briefing Room
Orlando, Florida 32827

WORKSHOP MEMBERS:

Marisa Button
Jean Salmonsen
Kevin Tatreau
Trey Price
Thereupon:

the following proceedings began at 1:49 p.m.:

MS. BUTTON: Okay. I think we're ready
to begin. My name is Marisa Button. I am
the director of Multi-Family Programs.

Everyone that's joining us today in the
room, thank you for joining us in person and
those of you out on the phone lines, thank
you so much for your patience. We had some
technical difficulties getting started with
the phone system, so a Listserv went out
letting folks know that we would be not
having phone capabilities and we just sent
out another one saying that we would be.

But for those who dropped off and are
not able to join us and those who are here
today but want to double-check what we've
talked about in the future, we are having the
workshop transcribed as well for your
convenience in doing that.
So we're going to get started today. As I said, this is the workshop for possible changes to the 2020/2021 funding cycle. My name is Marisa Button, I'm the director of Multi-Family Programs. We have a small but mighty panel for the workshop today and I'll let everybody introduce themselves starting with Jean.

MS. SALMONSEN: Jean Salmons, I'm one of the assistants directors in the Multi-Family Programs Department.

MR. TATREAU: Kevin Tatreau, director of Development Finance.

MR. PRICE: Good afternoon. Trey Price, executive director of Florida Housing.

MS. BUTTON: Thanks, everyone. So I'm going to try to talk slow because this is being transcribed, so please raise your hand if I'm talking too fast because I'm going talk too fast.

The purpose of this workshop is to get a jump start in talking about the funding cycle.
for the 2020/2021 year. So as a background
to this, when we were doing our large
workshopping last year for the current
funding cycle that we're in, you'll recall
that we said we wanted to have definitive
positions on where we were going to be with
proximity requirements going forward and
certain funding goals by February to allow a
reasonable level of predictability for you
all as you go into site selection in the
coming year and we find out what
appropriations will be dedicated to our
programs.

So that's the purpose of getting started
now, and it was nice to be able to have this
in coordination with the Orlando board
meeting so we could get a nice in-person
presence and though there's -- you know,
again, it's like school, nobody wants to sit
towards the front and I know it's dark, we're
not well lit, so anyways, so lots of this.

When we open the lines for questions,
there are mics on either end of the aisles
and so because this is being transcribed,
please come on to the mic to provide any
comments or feedback and again, we'll -- like
we do with all of our workshops --
periodically open the phone lines for
discussion as well.
So I also wanted to lay out a bit of --
not ground rules, but housekeeping items.
I'm going to talk about some things and
Jean's going to as well in that regard.

We wanted to provide this workshop as
the format, like I said, to get in on things
early. There are, you know, applications
pending for scoring right now, so nothing
that we say will be construed as anything
indicative of scoring for the currently open
RFAs, and so we're going to be ever mindful
of that and we ask that you are, too, in
terms of what type of questions you ask or
feedback that you provide, and we know
everybody will comply with that, but it is
worth noting. And so that's why we have also
a reminder, which we've been doing a lot in
our -- all of our workshops and our
discussion of the non-interference clause
because we are in that bubble of
non-interference.

So that's just that nice reminder about
that. But we should have a really robust
conversation about really good stuff. So I'm
going to turn it over to the Jean to talk
about the reminder of the Listserv and how to
get most of our information.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you. And yes, the
Listserv is really the best way to stay
informed. In fact, those of you who are
already signed up for the Listserv, you
probably got a copy of a direct link to our
agenda for today's workshop.

You know, whenever we have send out
messages about anything to do with an RFA, we
send that through the Listserv and that's
really the best way to stay informed.
For those of you in the room, of course, there are copies of the agenda in the back near the sign-in sheets on the back table of this room.

For those of you on the phone, if you got that Listserv, you might already have the agenda pulled up in front of you. And if you don't have that, I'd like to first talk about how to sign up for the Listserv and also how to access some of the information on our website. We really have a lot out there and I'll kind of hit those high notes.

So first off, signing up for our Listserv, if you haven't done so already, please, please, please do. If you go to our web page, home page, https://protect-us.mimecast.com/s/_A-OCYExBJu5w64h41ppW, at the bottom of that page, there's a gray box that says subscribe to Enews. That's our Listserv. You can click that, you can see all different types of Listservs that we have.
The multi-family programs is definitely the best one that you’ll want to sign up for.

You may want to sign up for others as well.

That's great. Definitely sign up for multi-family programs. Whenever we send in an announcement about an RFA issuing a new timeline, that'll be actually going out next week and we'll send out a Listserv for that timeline when it gets posted and how to get to that.

So as far as navigating our website, floridahousing.org, there's a shortcut on that home page that'll take you to information about all of our RFAs. So when you go to our home page, you'll see a big picture, takes up most of the screen, but if you go below that big picture, there's a dark green box that says developers and within that dark green box, there's a link that says request for applications, RFAs, and when you click that, you're taken directly to a competitive application page and this is
lot of information about our competitive process.

Some of the links there, the timeline is there. Currently, there's a 2019/2020 tentative funding amounts and timeline dated 10/25/19. Like I said, a new one will come out next week, we'll pull that old one off and put a new one on there and we'll send a Listserv when that's done.

Also on this competitive page, there are years at the top and when you click on each year, you'll see all the RFAs that are issued within that year. If you click on 2020, you'll see some RFAs already starting to get populated there. Each RFA is actually the link to an RFA page dedicated to that RFA, and that's a great way to stay informed.

Also, let's see, yes, information for this workshop, there's -- on that competitive page, there's a 2020/2021 RFA cycle information and when you click that, you'll see information about today's workshop. If you haven't pulled up the agenda and you're on the phone, that's how you access it. And
you'll also see things like public comments. As we get public comments, we don't have any yet, but as we get them, we'll post them there, you can click there, see what's coming and you'll also see instructions on how to send in public comments.

And as we start developing the RFAs, we might get comments that are specific to an RFA, we'll put those on that RFA's web page, but the general ones will go on public comments on that 2020/2021 RFA cycle information. And as we start -- if we have another workshop, that information will also go there. So that's a great place to keep checking.

MS. BUTTON: Yeah. So we intend to have -- thank you, Jean. We intend to have another workshop. The big point is nothing in this agenda is final right now, so that's like the -- that's the other point to head home. I know people have looked at this, what are they doing? They're crazy, why
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would they do this? Go back to 2011? No.

Or, you know, why get rid of schools as

proximity or other things on there.

This is all for discussion purposes to
get your feedback. We'll have another
workshop that kind of hones in on where we're
landing for the next cycle and, of course,
feedback there and then we'll get things
squared away once we are able to proceed with
our RFAs and know where our funding resources
are going to be. So that's my big thing.
Like this is for feedback and discussion.

And we're also going into tomorrow, we
asking our board to -- for permission to go
into rule development and I'll just take note
of that because as this moves along with
development as an FYI, we'll be moving along
as well.

We intended to originally talk about
just proximity specifically, but as you've
all been able to look at the agenda, there's
some other broader things for the next
funding cycle that we thought were worth bringing up at this point.

So enough of all that. We'll get into the meat of the agenda in Subsection B. We're going to do a brief review of the current process for proximity scoring in RFAs without narrative scoring, so we're not talking about our permits for the housing RFAs that we do later in the year. This is thinking in terms of general occupancy RFAs that we are issuing.

And I'm going to turn it over to Jean to hit the high notes on some of that stuff to just get you all on the same page we're currently at.

MS. SALMONESEN: Okay. And yes, this is -- this is the general proximity scoring process I'm about to go over. Of course, you know, as we go through this, make sure you go to each RFA and see exactly what the proximity requirements are within that RFA, but I'll just be describing the basic
And when we talk about proximity, we really think of it as two different pieces. There's the closest to points, which are described in items B1 and 2 on page 1 of the agenda, and then the away from proximity, which is the mandatory distance requirement in Number 3.

And the close-to points in 1 and 2, those are the two different pieces that make up the close-to. Transit, which applicants can provide for one type of transit service and you can earn up to six proximity points and they're listed here, private transportation, up to three, public bus stops, public transfer stops, public rapid transit stop and rail stops, and in most RFAs, transit is required for large counties.

For the other piece of those close-to proximity points is the community services, and you can choose up to three types of community service earning up to four points.
for each service, and we've been using grocery store, medical facility, pharmacy and if serving the family demographic commitment, public schools. And for each of those services, you get points for them.

The charts for how to allocate those points are usually in Exhibit C of each RFA, and there's a certain number of points that need to be reached in order to be eligible for funding in most of those RFAs. And that's based on county size. So smaller counties, there's less points that are needed to be eligible whereas larger counties need more points to be eligible for funding.

And then if you get two more points than those minimum number of points, you actually qualify for a funding preference in the scoring -- in the selection process.

So and then in Part 3, we have a mandatory distance requirement. Applications that are not eligible for the automatic qualification, each RFA has different ways to
 automatically qualify for the mandatory distance requirement.

So applications that are not eligible for the automatic qualification will qualify if the distance between the development location point and the latitude and longitude coordinates for any scattered sites, if applicable, so the coordinates for the other properties identified on the Florida Housing Development Proximity List that serve the same demographic group as the proposed development.

So we're looking for properties as they come in through the application proposed development to be far away from recently funded developments that are on that proximity list and that serve the same demographic. If they serve the same demographic group, they're competing with those developments on the proximity list and that's what we're trying to avoid.

The proximity list is a list of the
recently funded developments, so it's typically three years of RFAs. Sorry. Three years of RFAs, and each RFA that uses the development proximity list has a link to that list.

It is separated by different demographic groups, so we have on there the family demographic, elderly ALS and elderly non-ALS, those are actually two different demographics on the proximity list, and then workforce, which is separate from family. I get that question sometimes, and that's a separate demographic.

So four demographics are represented on the development proximity list and the development proximity list lists recently funded developments that are not occupied rehab, so they're usually new construction or new developments and therefore, certain RFAs that aren't those specialized demographics. So again, I mentioned the four demographics, so you won't see PSN, persons with special
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We also have mapping software, a link to kind of help guide you through our proximity list. So if you go to our mapping applications, those links are typically on each RFA page that uses the proximity list and they're also scattered throughout our website, so you'll see that quite a bit, but they all take you to the same place.

You can open a data layer for the proximity list and see those properties on a map of Florida. You can also open up another data layer called buffers and that'll give you circles around each property that show you how kind of far away you have to be if you are a proposed development serving the same demographic group.

I think that's covers it. Is there anything else we should add about the current system?

MS. BUTTON: No, I think that, you know, we don't intend to change the system, flowing
into the next item about changes to the upcoming funding cycle with regard to the mandatory distance requirement, and we talked last year about maybe allowing for some additional automatic qualifications for developers who have their own developments on the list, and we stepped away from that and I don't think we're moving back to it. I think we're going to essentially stay the same.

You know, the list -- when things are pending in litigation, we try to essentially have that relatively updated as well, and when things become clearer out of litigation, what happens, we update the list at that point.

Is there anything else that you want to mention about the update of the list?

MS. SALMONSEN: No. The next one will probably come out this summer and I'll be pulling off the old deals. I guess right now, I think it reflects 2017, 2018 and 2019, so we'll pull off the last year of deals and update it this summer for the new deals.

MS. BUTTON: Great. So mandatory
distance, the away-from, probably going to
stay the same. We will of course take
feedback, but that's just to let you all know
where we're at with it right now.

So moving on to page 2 of the agenda,
changes that we're currently considering, and
we'll talk about the -- we'll talk about the
community -- Number 1 and Number 2, the
community service potential changes and
transit and then we'll open up the floor for
any discussion or comments. We'll open up
the phone lines after we open up the floor.

So something that we've been batting
around is removing the public school as an
eligible community service and you know,
that's -- there's a few reasons we're talking
about that. One of which is the idea that if
we were looking at it in terms of an intended
benefit for the proposed residents, the idea
that at this point, where we're at these days
in terms of who's attending school where,
school choice, all the other things involved
with that, using proximity to the school as a measure of what is beneficial for a potential resident may not be the most meaningful thing to look at, and that's sort of self explanatory.

And if you're looking at how close you are to the school and, you know, the closer that it is, the bus doesn't come and there's no transit for the student to get to the school, or the school -- the student has the choice to go to a different type of school, maybe not there, you know, that's all the things we've been thinking about that and alternatively, of course, the idea that, you know, this is -- proximity services are also -- also have a measurement of telling us -- the idea is at least -- that they have a measurement of telling us what the development's near, right?

So the idea is well, of course, not every student that lives in a proposed development may go to that school that's
designated, but surely if there's a school there, then there are other beneficial things for the community there and I think that's something that is worth discussing as well, too, is that really the case? Where are our schools located?

We know that, you know, as you're making your business decisions, you've relied on this as a measurement for, you know, for a number of years as it has been, but, you know, so taking this away and adding something different, maybe something that we look at. Maybe we keep schools and add some additional metrics.

But that just gives you a flavor of what we're thinking about as we're thinking about using this as a metric for community services for proximity purposes and sort of changing it up some.

So I think anywhere where some of us live, we know that sometimes there's a school that is not -- not near a bunch of other
beneficial things for the community, could be, you know, where land is working out for that point in time, so it doesn't -- it may not the best thing that proves the intended purpose. It may still be the closest thing we can get to the something that's reasonable for us.

So that's just to let you know, you know, what we're thinking about and why we're looking at that and to allow you to digest that and again provide feedback to us whether you think that's the right direction, the wrong direction or if you're indifferent to it.

Then the second item under A is that what we're also acknowledging is that all developments can provide information for grocery stores, medical facilities and pharmacies. So that's adding pharmacies in into that elderly demographic as a potential community service, which is I think also is self -- the benefit is self-explanatory for
And you know, the meat of what we also want to get feedback from you all on is the review of community services used in the 2011 universal cycle.

So we have those listed in the way that they were implemented back in 2011 and many of you here were a part of that process, competed in that process, experienced that first hand, I didn't, so you could -- Jean did, Kevin did, we were talking about it earlier today with regard to some other things, but what we wanted to get was feedback if we were to go to one of these, but be able to implement it in such a way that it just provides additional items to achieve the score, not having the result as it did arguably in 2011 where you could essentially -- everyone could find what the perfect highest scoring site would be, therefore, potentially inflating land values in order to get that property around those.
best scoring sites.

So it is again, if we were going to implement additional services, it would be with the idea that it's sort of still a choose your own proximity adventure of what makes sense for your proposed development and being close to -- close to these services.

And so for -- and again the tiers, we don't have to particularly do these in the way that they're set forth in terms of the value of the points. The addition that we don't have now that was in Tier 1 is the senior center, which presented its own challenges at the time as well. So the question is is that something we're willing to go back to and look at?

And then below, of course, public park, community center and public library, and again, all of these things presented their own challenges that we can go back to and look at and see how we may implement them in a different way.
But what we're also interested in getting feedback in is that this is almost ten years ago and so what's come up in the past ten years that may be a meaningful metric in your perspectives as you're looking at sites and you're serving attendant residents that would be make sense, you know, in your -- from your professional experiences and industries. So we'll be looking for that kind of feedback as well.

And then Jean just -- feel free to note -- I guess it's here, we don't really need to say much else about it. In Number 2, we're going to revise the transit scoring charts for the public bus stops.

This is pretty self-explanatory. It's not an overall change to how we're looking at transit, and we don't anticipate that overall that we're going to make any changes to how we're implementing transit scoring for the RFAs going forward. Of course, we'll take feedback on that as well.
I know that we received some feedback requesting -- as Jean mentioned -- in large counties, we were -- for the most part, we require a minimum transit score, of course, unless you're competing for a goal where you get an automatic score.

But, you know, we've been -- it's been requested of us that we look at allowing that to not be the case for all large counties and being able to sort of choose your own amount of proximity points overall by looking at community services and not having to have that transit in all areas of large counties, and I don't think we're ready to go there right now. We know that transits a need and we know it's still a need even if you're competing in a geographic area of opportunity.

So I think we're -- going forward, we're not looking at changing any of those requirements as they've been implemented in

the general occupancy RFAs. But I did want
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to note that and acknowledge that we have received requests about that.

We'll talk about the potential for the TOD after we open up comments and questions about the proximity services as we've discussed them. And I think now is as a good time as any to get some feedback on some of those things that we put out there in thinking about.

Maybe it makes sense to open up the line first and then as you're thinking about it out in the audience, if you want to approach the mic as the calls that come in conclude, then we'll actually hit the room after that.

So Operator, could you open up the line for any comments or questions at this time, please?

THE OPERATOR: Everyone, your question/answer session will now begin. If wish to ask a question, please press pound on your headphone. (Unintelligible) all questions will be answered in the order received. (Unintelligible) I have no incoming questions currently in queue.
MS. BUTTON: And we have someone approaching the mic here in the room, so please, if you're approaching and making comment, introduce yourself and who you're with and be mindful that we are being transcribed, so speak slowly.

MR. WILSON: Testing. Testing. Testing. Testing. I'm ready for my guitar solo now. Shawn Wilson, Blue Sky Communities. I'm also the chairman of CAHP, but we didn't meet to talk about this, so I'm just speaking for Blue Sky. I'm sure we will discuss in our regular CAHP membership meeting after the workshop.

Blue Sky does not -- does not agree with removing schools. I mean, to me, it's -- it was never meant to say the kids are going to go to that school, otherwise the proximity test would have been how close are you to the school that your site is zoned for according to that school system. That's never what it is.
Just as the crow flies, we know, again, as you alluded to, the idea behind proximity is not to say that the residents are going to use that particular service. It's as a proxy to be able to evaluate how convenient the site is to services that low income families and elders need.

So they need schools that are nearby and being near a school is an important indicator of how convenient the site is to all those services. So I would really disagree with the idea that you should pull it out.

I know that you guys did face some challenges about what is a school, but that -- you're always going to get that and I would remind everybody that 15 years ago, you also faced challenges about what is a grocery store? And so now, that's all sorted out. So I mean, you know, and if you implement the other services, you may also face a challenge about what is a public library?

Blue Sky definitely favors, as I said
many times, any kind of scoring system that
will eliminate ties, so I think it's great to
put in more proximity. I wouldn't say that
it's just more ways to get to a minimum
number, I think you should go back to a much
more complicated scoring system where you can
get points for proximity, more points for
developer experience. Because right now, you
just have a few points and everything's very
binary. I know this is a definition of
insanity because I say it every year,
everything's binary, you're either this or
you're that, you're either that or you're
this and then you get slotted and then it's a
lottery.

You can say it's not a lottery, but it
is. Even though it's SAIL, you have your
quintiles, that's fine. But if you've got
five hats in same the quintile, it's a
lottery.

So anything that you can do to get rid
of ties I think is a great idea. I mean,
there's so many other things you can do for
proximity that are more complicated, harder
to define, but they're important if you
wanted to go there.
The traffic count on the road that
you're close to. How close are you to the
central business district in your city? Are
you near any major employment centers?
Again, those are things that are hard to
define. I know, I get it. But you know,
those are all -- those are important factors.
Let's see, medical facility. You know,
any old doctor's office counts as a medical
facility and that's fine. I just want -- I
just want to remind everybody that doctors'
offices can open and close and they basically
all qualify, but I don't think you should
change the definition of medical facility.
I don't -- I was just going to keep
going until somebody comes up behind me.
MS. BUTTON: Where's the hook? This is
helpful. Serious. That's very helpful,
Shawn, thank you. Any other comments at this time? Good, there's someone else.

MS. ESKRA: Hi, Hana Eskra, Marais Development. So I just want to talk a little about senior centers and defining senior centers because I remember when they were on the list a while ago and I had a county where the address that was on your list on the senior center was not actually the address where the senior center was.

There also may be some counties and I'm thinking St. Augustine where they literally have one senior center in the county. So if we do proximity to seniors -- to a senior center and there's only one of them, you know, how do we -- how do we do that?

So I just think we need to be cognitive. I don't know where that senior center came from or how it got vetted, but we've got to -- do you remember, Jean? I don't remember.

MS. SALMONSEN: It was a third-party
list by the Department of Elder Affairs that

12 put the list together.

13 MS. ESKRA: Yeah.

14 MS. SALMONSEN: So it wasn't something

15 that Florida Housing had control over.

16 MS. ESKRA: Right. And I don't know

17 that they updated it. I think what happened

18 is the senior center had moved and it never

19 got updated, so you know, it just created a

20 problem in this county I was in, so just a

21 comment about that.

22 MS. BUTTON: And I think that's helpful

23 feedback because if we -- we know each one of

24 these had their own problems. Like a couple

25 of libraries had its own thing, too, grocery

1 stores, and as Shawn said, we've been able to

2 get around some of these that get a

3 understanding of what we're looking for, and

4 so that's helpful feedback for us of what

5 didn't work before and also how can we wrap

6 our arms around it now to avoid manipulation

7 of whatever it is that we put out there.
I'm not saying that that's -- you know, that's a harsh word, but you want to make something work and we want to make sure we're getting what we're actually asking for. So especially thinking of looking at things like the public park and library system, that would be very helpful for feedback about the experiences with those in the past and how we may be able to tailor that if we go in that direction going forward and what's the threshold in terms of area that we're looking for or, you know, capacity for any of those services. If there's something that we can pinpoint on those, it would be very helpful. And you know, it is the challenge what you're saying, Shawn, about, you know, getting -- getting away from -- away from lottery and having a more nuanced scoring system. We always have to balance with does that lend us to the highest and best use of the resources because there is then an
inherent change in the value of those properties and we would be putting more in. 

So that really -- when you're thinking about what is Florida Housing thinking about? That's part of what we're thinking about here.

Is there anything -- do you want to mention anything else about that, Kevin? Is there anything? You just put a mint in. Sorry.

MR. TATREAU: That's all right. No, it's like we, you know, that one year we did have a robust proximity and land cost pretty much doubled that year, so it wasn't a good resource, but it's something we could think of to enhance this process.

MS. BUTTON: Right. Because the other thing we hear is if we've kept everything the same for so long, then looking at new sites in a different way and opening things up, if we can't get to that more nuanced scoring, at the very least adding more potential options...
for services to the, you know, menu of

options allows hopefully for some more

flexibility in site selection, too. So

that's something that we're looking at.

MR. TATREAU: And I know consistency is

important so you can have a business plan,

and it's a good possibility that a lot of

developers have already picked sites for the

next year and so comments now if they're

radical or different or something, it might

be something for the following year. So it's

got to be planned well in ahead so it doesn't

interrupt your first business plan.

MS. BUTTON: And which we are trying to

be cognizant of. So -- yes.

MR. HARTMAN: Hi, Michael Hartman,

Turnstone Development, and I hate to admit

it, but I've been doing this for 26 years

now, so I've got a little long-term

perspective on what we've done over the

years.

And first off, I agree with you

100 percent. If you add more items to get

the same score, I think your land cost is
going to do down because we're going to have so many more sites to choose from. So I think we'll have more resources to build more units and I think that's a good thing because that's what we ultimately want to do.

In terms of scoring and trying to differentiate between maps and everybody thinks lottery is such a bad term, I just like, you know, to give an alternative perspective to that.

For years, we had scoring and everybody scored, so we said okay, these are all the things we want it people to do, they're doing them. We made them mandatory. So the only difference was we made them mandatory as opposed to scoring. So we really didn't change anything.

But I guess the question is unless something serves a social policy, what really differentiates one of the deals that's been submitted from another? You know, when you look at the list of deals that are submitted,
all those deals are in areas that need affordable housing, all the deals are meeting all the social criteria that we're asking them to meet, they're all meeting the quality criteria that we're asking them to meet, so is there something that really differentiates one from another?

And as you were talking about, whatever the differentiator is, that's where people are going to go. And I don't think it's good for us to end up with six deals in a three-block area in downtown Miami-Dade like we did years ago.

Or even, you know, more extreme thing and this isn't Florida, but in Texas, they have basically one criteria where people win and so in a 200-square mile area, the top four applications were all in the same census track.

Now, does that make any sense? Is that how we want to disperse it? So when people talk about a lottery being a bad thing, you
know, the alternatives I don't know are any better, but you know, that's for other people to address, so I'm just putting that out there as examples of what I've seen over the years, so thank you.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you, Michael.

MR. TAYLOR: Hey, Ken Taylor, Atlantic Pacific. I don't want to perpetuate the endless debate between standards and no standards, and there are definitely unintended consequences.

2011 worked extremely well, probably too well, if you look at Miami. They targeted -- the system targeted a great neighborhood through the use of proximity points. Unintended consequences, land cost fight, too many deals in the same area, but it worked. So I think one thing you could look at is a system like that combined with a type of system that you have in SAIL where you have quintiles.

You know, whenever we start racing and
there's only one guy leading the pack,
like you usually have at least a few years
in, that's guy doing something crazy, right?
So if you had proximity quintiles, as an
d example, you could find better neighborhoods,
find great places for people to live without
it being just a bleeding-edge competition.
Thanks.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you. And I think

that that's the interesting thing in looking
at how we can implement this -- you know, a
fresh look at proximity, looking back for
reference to 2011, but knowing now we have
the RFA system as well, right?

So a huge part of what we're talking
about and particularly in the large six RFA
and medium counties that we have in the local
government area of opportunity, some of those
funding preferences and then there's an
automatic there and how does balance with,
you know, what we balance with the geographic
area of opportunity and the methodology
behind that versus what we then also end up funding when there's remaining funding as well.

So it's an interesting -- thank you for that interesting thought as a different way to look at it. And another comment here.

MR. DEMARCO: Hi, Joe DeMarco, Catalyst Community Development. I'm on other side of the spectrum where we're four months into this business, so we're kind of new, fresh eyes, so if my question sounds ridiculous, I apologize.

But historically, has Florida Housing Finance looked back over the last 15, 20 years of doing this, these programs and assessed what metrics or what factors had the most impacts on the lives of residents and used that to create the weight for the scoring system? MS. BUTTON: You know, I think that it's -- we monitor our developments. I can't say in my experience what -- that there's any
long-term study has been done like that, but I think what we find is that we're getting developments in areas where affordable housing is needed, and these metrics have worked. It's a question of balancing the use of the resources as we target where the proximity is. Is there anything -- is that --

MR. DEMARCO: Yes. Just make a comment on that. So I guess when you say a more nuanced approach to an application process, that almost leads to area of being necessary to, you know, further support why yours is different from all the other applications and so how do you qualify that with certain factors like outside of what's proximity and all that.

So maybe just the suggestion is some type of like additional section that further supports why this particular site project, you know, should get funding because it does meet these certain things and historically
it's shown to improve residents' lives.

MS. BUTTON: Got it. Thank you.

MR. LOPEZ: Hi, Danny Lopez, Landmark Development. Speaking to what some other people had said, you don't have a lot of differentiating factors right now. I'm not going to speak to whether we should add more or keep it the way it is, but I do think that it's important that the ones we currently have actually work and meet their intended purpose.

So medical facility I think is one that is not meeting its intended purpose. And I think the reason for that is an applicant can select any medical facility where, you know, the medical facility might tailor to a specific demographic, let's say elderly patients, and whereby if someone was appealing that applicant, there really is no method to come through successful due to the fact that a doctor is not going to sign a note saying that they're not going to treat a
specific class of patient because in an emergency case, you know, their duty is to do so, so --

MS. BUTTON: Appreciate your perspective. Not going to comment on our interpretation of the definition because we are in a pending application period, but the feedback is important to us to consider.

MR. LOPEZ: Thank you.

MS. BUTTON: Uh-huh. Okay. Well, so keep all that in mind, those of you who are members of CAHP can go to CAHP and talk about this, hopefully come up with great ideas, you can give us some additional feedback. Those of you who are not, as you're thinking about things, we want that feedback as well.

For members of Florida Housing Coalition, there are folks here from there as well, as you look and compete, we want all of that feedback for how we're looking at where we land on proximity going forward.

The next item that we have on the agenda
is specific to those develop in Miami-Dade

and this is -- what we have referenced here

is creating a goal to fund one development

and this is specifically the nine percent

housing credit RFA that's dedicated to

Miami-Dade. In that RFA, within a Miami-Dade

County Urban Center zoning district in that

RFA.

So where did this come from? Those of

you who have been attending workshops for the

past couple of years know that we considered

and sort of toyed with the idea of making a

TOD goal in the Miami-Dade RFA a couple -- or

a year and a half ago or so and we just sort

of scratched the surface and realized we

didn't have enough time to fully vet it, look

how we would do the approach, whether it be

similar to how we've looked at transit

oriented developments in the past.

And so we put it on the burner and that

also came from the feedback publicly of --

you know, can we change or do something and

look a little differently about what the

funding goals have been in that RFA because
they had been stagnant for a number of years.

So a couple of years ago, we opened up and said okay, we're going to be able to fund an elderly development and we've got our geographic area of opportunity on that RFA as well, and so what we decided to try to look at was what's another way we can, you know, easily in terms of scoring and assessing what the area is, implement a different look in an additional funding goal in Miami-Dade County.

So we don't think this is perfect, but we wanted you to know this is sort of where we thought would be a good place to start from it.

And in the urban center zoning districts, there is sort of the correlation to those being transit-oriented developments if potentially they are in those districts. And we are -- and Miami-Dade County knows we're going to be talking about this and our goal is also not to do something that's contrary to where they see the future of
their transit and their goals going as well,
so we wanted to put that out there as well,
that that's a line of communication we're
going to be continuing as we talk about this.

So as the -- I don't need to read the
outline of the RFA to you, but you know, of
those of you who are competing in Miami-Dade,
this is important to you, of course.

What we thought about is that we know
that all of these are not created the same,
the way that these districts are zoned and
some are more transit-oriented than others.

You know, they look different. The zoning's
different, the land availability is different
and another thing that's different about them
is the concentration of currently funded
Florida Housing Develop -- Finance --
developments in those areas as well.

So if some of you remember as we talked
about these in a broad workshop about a year
ago when our housing director Nancy Muller
was still with us, something that she
mentioned was what we want to be cognizant of
is that we're not having a concentration of
affordable housing in an extreme way in some
of these of transit stops, and so that's
something that's on our mind.

Bill Aldinger couldn't be with us today,

he's our current policy director and you
know, we've been discussing that from a
policy perspective and Diana Fields, who's in
our office as well, some of you have
interacted with Diana and so they've been
looking at this and also, we're trying to get
feedback publicly about what would make sense
for this.

So one idea is would we have a Tier 1
and Tier 2 where there's a -- the urban
centers that do not let's say have less
than -- less than ten Florida Housing
financed developments around them of a
greater priority and then a Tier 2 would be
where there are more than ten.

Again, this is not set in stone at all,
this is just things to generate discussion

and thought, is that that would be

potentially something important for us to

look at.

But what we also know is, like I said,

if there's a reason there's not Florida

Housing financed developments there, that

could be for a number of reasons, proximity

maybe being one of them to services, land

availability being something to look at, so

do we need to differentiate? Do we not --

what are we not seeing or, you know, what do

we not know from not being on the ground

there and familiar with those sites?

The approach that we have here is

something that we've discussed in that

Subsection D is looking at scoring criteria

that would ensure that we -- that at least

have the development set-aside units would be

located in that area and so to ask that even

knowing that if -- it's hard when it's hard

and fast, right? Like boundaries and zoning,
but if you can tell us you're in a place
where at least half of what you're looking
for is in that area, that may work.

So that's a nod to that understanding
that sometimes these hard and fast sort of
bound boundaries or census tracts become
difficult when you think there can still be a
benefit to a development being located there,
and that they must be able to achieve a
minimum transit score of least five points.

So if you're in the urban center, but
you're not really close enough to transit

where it makes a difference, then that's also
not really transit-oriented, right? So
that's something that as we looked at this,
we thought that would be a reasonable
criteria to look at.

And then that the -- that there's a
significant -- the next bullet point goes on
to page 3, but there's a significant request
amount of the maximum housing credit request
amount so they were getting a significant
So those are some of the things that we were thinking about with this sort of transit-oriented development slash urban center goal. And again, this is something that, you know, we want feedback from you all who are there, here's what we're balancing, we know that there's -- there's also no proximity to the actual access to the transit.

There are some developers who already have, you know, who are on it, who have property lined up, they have land leases and can they still compete with others who are just coming into the process? So we want to look at it broadly so that we're not -- we're balancing those things.

We've received really great feedback from various developers saying that this is really what you should be looking at, we're concentrated on, you know, work centers that close by or different unique ways to look at
it, and all of those are great ideas, but

invariably they won't work for all and so we

need to be able to have an approach that

is -- that everyone's able to participate.

Not that everyone's able to score, but

you know, we can't tailor it to approaches

that already work for a particular developer

one way or another, and that's -- we get lots

of good feedback, and this is our version of

trying to distill that into something that's

manageable across the board.

So I will stop talking about that, but

wanted to let you know that what's we're

thinking about. For that RFA, if we did

implement that goal, we would I think still

keep an elderly development goal and keep a

family geographic area of opportunity goal

and this would be something new, the third

development, because we do anticipate again

funding three developments out of this RFA,

one with a binding commitment if necessary in

the coming funding cycle.
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So with that, I will turn it over to operator to -- if we have any comments or questions about that process that I've just discussed, please.

THE OPERATOR: As a reminder, if you wish to ask a question, please press pound on your telephone. There are no incoming questions currently in the queue.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you. Any -- all right. We have -- coming to the mic.

MR. KISS: Hey, Jeff Kiss, Banyan Development. Are you anticipating doing any TODs in medium or other large counties?

MS. BUTTON: Not at this point. Thank you for asking that question because I meant to touch on that. Previously, we had -- the last time we did TODs -- and part of the reason we're not looking at that right now is because in the -- especially in the large county nine percent RFA, we're coming into the last cycle of having four developments funded with the local government area of...
opportunity funding preference and so we
have, you know, the automatic transit scoring
for that and because part of that is
understanding that a local government is
supporting a proposed application because
that meets whatever their needs are in that
regard.

And then we'll be having the -- and I
say that it's not the final round on that,
but we've come through having two other
counties designated as the geographic area of
opportunity funding goals. And so for
predictability's sake in that RFA
particularly, we've said okay, so you know
that the next round is going to be those
final two counties for that RFA.

So right now we're not, but that's not
to say looking forward that we may not look
at that again, but we think because those
goals have been pretty predictable so far in
this round, we're not looking at it.

We'll of course take feedback about if
we do in the future, what that may look like,
especially for different areas of the State.
MR. KISS: Okay. Thanks. I mean, respectfully, I just say if you do want to look at it, it may be a good differentiating factor. If you're looking to avoid, you know, ties as Shawn said in the future, you can, you know, if you're adding other services, maybe also look at a train station where you get cars off the road and you're green and who knows what that'll develop into later, a rail station or something, if it's in use, transit's there, that's more desirable I think than a bus.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you.

MR. KISS: Sure.

MS. BUTTON: And so that's a good point. I mean, in terms of the definition of what we're using for transit, I said we're not looking at changing anything, but if there are ideas about how we define transit in terms of the service itself, we're of course willing to look at that.

I was, you know, responding to that
question in terms of whether we would have a
designated goal, but if there's something
that broadens the transit scoring that would
be meaningful, that's certainly something
that we would like to meet back on as well.
Any other comments in the room?

MS. ESKRA: Hi, Hana Eskra, Marais Development. So I do a lot of work in
Miami-Dade and I have spent the past year
looking for a site for one of the folks I
work with in South Dade. So what I'm going
to say about these urban centers is they are
literally the only areas that are zoned for
multi-family, so we have to be in those
areas, right?

One of these centers are 112 acres that
look like vacant land are owned by one
developer, not a Florida developer, not
giving them up. There is very, very limited
land in those urban centers right now. And
you know, a couple of us have had site
control of some land down there, so that's
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20 great, that puts me -- I've got a site with one of my partners down there under control that will put me in an advantage.

21 Some other folks down there own some sites, but just understand that it's very limited land and we can't develop outside of those sites. They're either industrial, they are single family or they are absolutely developed. We can't go in there. So it's just something to think about if you're going to use that as a priority.

MS BUTTON: Thank you. Okay. Not seeing any other comments on the TOD. Should we -- yeah, all right. We do have a comment.

MR. TAYLOR: Ken Taylor, Atlantic Pacific. I think the TOD is a thoughtful and very useful goal in Miami. You did mention my pet peeve, which is the geographic area of opportunity sites. As a life-long Miami guy, it's not what I consider an area of opportunity, the sites we end up in. So I think that's a concept that makes a lot of
sense, but you may want to look at your data set and figure out ways to expand it a little bit.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you for that feedback. And we're always willing to receive feedback about that. If you're not familiar, I think most of the folks in this room significantly are familiar with the methodology we use for the geographic area of opportunity, the census track designations, that's on our website. There is a link to it in the competitive page and those will be updated. We do intend to go back to that in the next funding cycle. Our current -- our policy folks have, you know, currently as we've been talking about that, that is the idea.

I think it also speaks to what we're -- we are trying to measure, so it's always the balance of, you know, those of you who are developing have a feel for where opportunity is going to truly occur and what will be up
and coming versus what can be demonstrated through data and methodology, census tracks, numbers, which is something that, you know, we fall back on in terms of how we're implementing a process and I think it's been very beneficial.

But what we also understand is in -- you know, we have heard that feedback about Miami-Dade and so it's not that we're -- we're just looking -- if we're not going to use that, what are we going to use and what makes sense? And we do think we've had success with it, but we also know that we don't know everything.

And so what I would encourage is that if you have ideas that about the way opportunity in that context can be measured, that we'd always be willing to look at that and our policy department most certainly would be willing to look at that and engage with that.

That funding goal is, the methodology -- I think it was 2016, y'all would know better
than me probably, but it's been a few years
and so anyway I say that to say we hear you
and we appreciate that and that's something
that we'll continue to look at. But in terms
of predictability, we see still working
within that construct.

And we did mention -- and I'm sorry,
Shawn, I'll get to you -- I believe it was
mentioned last year during one of the
workshops as well, that our policy staff was
looking at how and if we could measure
gentrification as a measurement and how we
look at funding and it became sort of we
started looking at it, it was hard to -- it
was hard to nail anything down, and so we
decided to take a turn and look at more of
this urban center TOD as a way to measure.

But know that, you know, if you have
ideas, we're willing to explore that, look at
that and engage with you about it. So I did
want to speak to that because that had been
mentioned previously, I believe. Shawn.
MR. WILSON: Shawn Wilson, Blue Sky Communities. This -- I'm going to go backwards. On gentrification, I think I did provide a suggestion on how to measure it, maybe we'll talk about that more in CAHP. So on GAO, I think what I hear you saying is -- and this is not a today-specific comment, but since GAO's the topic of discussion, I didn't see it anywhere later in the agenda -- but I think what I hear what you saying is you -- Florida Housing wants to continue a goal to do some developments in areas that are higher-end areas and right now you call it GAO and you define it one way.

MS. BUTTON: Uh-huh.

MR. TAYLOR: Fine.

MR. BUTTON: Yes for those on the phone.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you very much.

So there are maps out right now that show where the GAOs are that were put into place at some point during 2019. Please do not change those for 2020. Because what will...
happen is you'll change the maps in April or May or June and then everybody -- then some sites that we had teed up that were in GAOs are not -- and those factors don't -- those are not quantum leap factors that you're measuring.

You know, you're not measuring -- an area doesn't all of a sudden go from a bad area to a good area, it's by tiny degrees. So please, just leave the 2019s in place for the 2020 cycle is my comment there. Thank you.

MS. BUTTON: Oh, just in comment, hearing you there and we will -- I mean, if we were to take that comment, what we may do is -- without talking to anybody here, the purpose of this is discussion again -- is look at do we preserve the 2019s, add in 2020 if there's new areas that come in and do a phase-out a year prior. That's something that we could consider. I'm going to hear what you're saying on that. Yes, Michael.
MR. HARTMAN: Michael Hartman, Turnstone Development. Kind of going back to something that you started with today on mandatory distance, are we looking at the current deals and how many people are on their waiting list? Because in some cases, like, for instance, our deal in Fort Lauderdale, okay? We're a family deal, so a family deal gets done within a half mile of us, fine, then nothing's going to get done around there for the next two or three years after that, okay?

But just looking at my property, you could build six more deals just off of my waiting list. So in some areas, it may be that you don't need, you know, to stop development for a couple of years because there's such a demand, and I don't know if you want to look at that and say okay, you know, if I say you could put 600 more units right next to my property and they would all be full the day of the CO.

MS. BUTTON: Well, we don't do that currently, right? But I do hear what you're saying about that.
MR. TAYLOR: Just something to think about when you're looking at that from another perspective.

MR. TATREAU: Michael?

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah.

MR. TATREAU: You say yours is a PHA property?

MR. TAYLOR: No.

MR. TATREAU: It's just your personal development?

MR TAYLOR: Correct.

MR. TATREAU: Has a waiting list.

MR. TAYLOR: Right.

MS. BUTTON: And I think, you know, we do phase out so, you know, once you're awarded, you don't -- there isn't any construction yet, so as the phase -- I hear your feedback and it's all about that timing and how we keep --

MR. TAYLOR: Right. And I'm saying there's, you know, in some areas, there's such a demand that like I say, you could put
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23 five or six deals there simultaneously and

24 they would all lease up before they even got

25 CO'd. So just something to think about.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: All right.

MS. BUTTON: Any other comments on

proximity generally or the ideas about the

funding cycle? We'll open -- I will open up

the phone lines. Operator, again, at this
time, if there's any lingering comments or

folks that have been able to dial in that

weren't on the first time around. So if you
could open the lines for any comments,

please?

THE OPERATOR: The lines are open now

for incoming questions. However, just as a

reminder, if you wish to ask a question,

please press pound on your telephone.

MS. BUTTON: Okay. We're going to take

that as no comments or questions pending on

the phone line and hopefully people

are actually able to call back in. There are
So the next item is E, additional --

this beyond proximity, possible topics for

big picture, we're talking in Spring, you

know, Spring 2020.

We have some -- we've been talking about

some proposed changes to A/B leveraging and

so what I'm going to do at this time is turn

it over to Jean to just do the highlights of

the current system that all of you are --

those who are participating anyways are

currently familiar with. So Jean, you want

to go over some of that, please?

MS. SALMONSEN: Yes. So currently, when

we have A/B leveraging in our RFAs, we list

all the applications in ascending order by

the total corporation funding per set aside

unit and then we count how many applications

are on that list, we multiply that number by

80 percent and roundup so we get a whole

number, and that's our A/B cutoff.

And then the line will be drawn below
the application whose place on the list is equal to the A/B cutoff. So whatever that corporation funding per set aside number is, we draw the line and then if we see that the next one down has an identical amount, we drop the line so we capture all those with that same amount and then draw the actual line, so everything above that line is an A and everything below that line is a B.

MS. BUTTON: So what I meant to say before even jumping into that as well is that this is obviously for those general occupancy nine percent credit RFAs where we do A/B, right? SAIL, we're using quintiles. We don't anticipate changing that particularly and we don't anticipate changing that we will have A/B leveraging the nine percent and that it will generally occur with that 80/20 percentage. So that we don't anticipate changing in sort of how we implement it.

I'm going to turn it over to Kevin to talk a little more about what the proposed
MR. TATREAU: All right. Thanks. So the last couple of years, we've seen a trend where there's a number of applications coming in with basically a common scheme of leveraging whereby they're able to actually get a leveraging number that is at or just below the eight percent cutoff line. So they would be in it, but when we say everything that ties is A/B line moved downward, now you're drastically moving the A/B line way down the list, so it's no longer an 80/20, it's like a 95/5 or something. I'm joking, but that'll give you the idea here. So the idea here is we're trying to get an 80/20 split here now. So we thought maybe if we brought in -- when we sort these things, we sort them first by the corporation leveraging number that we've calculated, and then we incorporate then a second sorting of a type of the lottery so that the lottery...
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11 comes in to and then ranks those corporation
12 funding amounts by the lottery as well, but
13 there is a definitive 80/20 cutoff. But
14 there's also the chance that two unrelated
15 parties actually do tie, I've seen it. So
16 it's not like we want to harm two random
17 samples tying.
18 So the idea here is we offered like we
19 have -- we would allow the 80/20 line to go
20 down one application and then cut off there
21 for the chance of that second one that ties
22 could be related or could be a random, I
23 don't know, but that gives a chance for a
24 truly random application to tie, to get cut
25 in at that cutoff line, and then we would

1 actually have that as the 80/20.
2 Now, we're open to other ideas. This is
3 just something that just came up as an idea
4 and you know, this is also a chance to talk
5 about other leveraging things we can talk
6 about as well. You know, we're getting more
7 data in how things pan out. I know we've

Page 69
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been providing Broward County with a multiplier for a little while and that's basically because operating expenses, namely real estate taxes are much higher in Broward than other counties.

But it's also appearing that Palm Beach is in a similar boat where they have higher expenses than other counties, not quite as drastic, but it's a higher number. So, you know, right now, I'm just thinking of providing a multiplier for Palm Beach of 90 percent versus the 85 we give to Broward.

So just an idea and I'm open for other discussions of this stuff. I'm just trying to figure out ways. Certain places are naturally disadvantaged that I can try and level out, so I'm open for all those discussions.

I usually get them like right at the very end as we're doing this, it's like too late to implement, so the earlier you think about getting back to me, the more we can vet
this with the stakeholders and so we're all on board early in the process and it won't be a surprise at the last minute. So that's the whole idea is to get the thing started now.

MS. BUTTON: Thanks, Kevin. And because this is a pretty discrete section of the agenda, we'll open up the phone lines and any feedback from the audience here as well. If you have any thoughts about that as you're digesting what we just talked about for the proposed system going forward.

So Operator, could you open up the lines for any comments or questions?

THE OPERATOR: If you wish to ask a question, please press pound on your telephone. I have no incoming questions currently in the queue.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you. And it doesn't look like there's any feedback from the audience on this one either, and so we are I think committed to moving forward with this proposed system. So if you have feedback,
please get it us to as you can.

So moving on to the last page of the agenda, these are all short items, but they're a big deal and so probably you also you may notice we tried not to be too -- too verbose in the agenda because we did want to have the opportunity for discussion and feedback, but we also know these are big things we're talking about. So our email and our phone lines are open after the workshop as you continue to digest some of this stuff and are able to provide your feedback.

The item Number 2 at the top of page 4 is a reference to the Priority I, Priority II classification. If you're not familiar with this, this is what has been implemented in the Miami-Dade nine percent RFA that was -- that is currently being scored and so there's a, you know, there's a cone of silence around that RFA. But the terms of the RFA exist and you can go and look at that if you do not compete in that RFA, what the Priority I, Priority II classification is.

And essentially, what it is is the
designation of a maximum of three
applications for each principle. And the
language of the RFA is set forth in the RFA,
I'm just doing a broad overview here.

We're looking at how that's implemented
and we anticipate that we not only want to
continue implementing that in Miami-Dade, but
to also increase that to the small/medium
county RFA.

And what we also will be doing is
looking at how we define what that means to
designate as a Priority I application and how
we as the corporation determine what is a
Priority I application and how it relates to
the entities submitting, entities and
individuals submitting the application.

So that sounds kind of vague, but that
is enough for you to know, one, that we are
looking at continuing the process. If you're
not familiar with it, please go look at the
Miami-Dade nine percent RFA that was issued
and is currently out there on our website and
we'll take feedback about that.

Ultimately, you know, the facts speak for themselves in terms of the number of applications submitted for the small/medium RFA and it goes also without saying that we are responsible for reviewing and scoring all of those applications as a corporation.

And the theory behind the Priority I, Priority II applications, one of those as we talked about in the original workshop was that if you were submitting -- if your entity is submitting applications, you should be able to tell us what your three best developments are.

And it's interesting because it's come up here, you know, as we talk about proximity and as we talk about leveraging and all of those things that go into what you're submitting to Florida Housing, you generally write the broad view as an entity.

The purposes -- part of the big purpose of that is just tell us what your three best
are, what are the three best to get funded
that you know, you're not going to have, you
know, ideally issues with later on, might we
say that and that of course, things come off
after developments are credited into credit
underwriting, but that's part of what we're
looking at here and so that's why we think
it's important to continue it and it's
important to scrutinize it and we believe we
can get to what we're trying to accomplish in
implementing that.
And so we'll take feedback about it, but
of course, as we have an pending RFA with
that right now, we're not going -- that's
about all we're going to say about it
generally.
Any other comments about Priority I,
Priority II? So we're saying the maximum of
three and that's also because that's what we
put in the Miami-Dade application and we
understand that we did receive feedback about
having consideration for developments that
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may be associated with an PHA and of course,

we'll still consider those comments,

developments that are associated potentially

with non-profit applicants.

Of course, we'll take feedback about,

you know, those types of things that we may

want to consider in getting to the right

number of the designation of priority

applications, so I just thought that was

worth mentioning as well.

And we will open up on that one again.

That's pretty discrete as well. We'll open

up the phone lines for any comments about

that and then the room as well.

So Operator, if you could open the lines

for any discussion about the Priority I,

Priority II classification. Thank you.

THE OPERATOR: If you have questions,

please press pound on your telephone. There

are no incoming questions or comments on the

phone.

MR. PRICE: Do we know that they can
actually get in? Because we haven't had anybody yet, so I'm just pointing that out.

MS. BUTTON: Excellent point, Trey.

It's on. There's -- well, and we're just going to continue.

MR. PRICE: Does somebody want to star 1 and just like say hello or whatever?

MS. BUTTON: As we -- we'll come back to the phone lines after we take a comment we have in the room here.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: There are people on the phone.

MS. BUTTON: There are. Thank you.

MR. PRICE: Thanks.

MR. ROSENSTEIN: Hi there. Mitch Rosenstein, Green Mills. I can't speak for the majority of the development community, although I think the majority would agree with me when I say that we're supportive of a Priority I, Priority II system that works and I think Kevin's idea about changing the leveraging system is a good one and works,
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too. So thank you for addressing both of those.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Shawn Wilson, Blue Sky Communities. Blue Sky and none of our principles did participate in the Miami-Dade cycle this year, although we did look at it and it looks like that Priority I/II system worked in most cases, but that it may be tested and so as long as the integrity of the system is there, then Blue Sky definitely supports it for medium next year as well.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you for the feedback. Okay. TDC next on the agenda, so Number 3, I'm going to turn over to the Kevin to talk about TDC limits.

MR. TATREAU: All right. So we adjust these things every year for -- we do one common based on the process for the entire RFA cycle and just like leveraging, it's a good thing to start early in this process and get some feedback. And I just want you to
know some feedback that I've been getting
recently and share that and then tell you
what we're thinking.

One is, you know, right now, there is a
TDC boost for Broward/Miami-Dade developments
and it appears that there's a possibility
that maybe Palm Beach be included in that, so
you know, we have some numbers. They're
not -- Palm Beach isn't quite as high as
Miami-Dade County, but it's getting up there,
so I would look forward to anybody helping me
out with that possibly if there's discussion
as well.

And then we've also gotten comments
on -- well, this I guess actually more on
leveraging, if I could back up on this one.
That garden and four story mid-rise are
similar or they should have the same

multiplier as leveraging, and I've gotten
four, five or six of us saying they should
have the same leveraging number, and I've
gotten five, six -- that high-rise is the
same, that they should all have the same leveraging number.

So if I take all that in, I should have one leveraging number for garden through high-rise. So it's conflicting here, so if I get some more feedback, more people on actually what is going out on there out there, but generally speaking, the taller you go, the less advantaged you are, you're disadvantaged, so I'm trying to help out the taller ones being -- leveling off, we want them to have a shorter height.

So that's how we've got it split out now. If I should be addressing it differently, please give me some more feedback, give me some examples, what I should be looking at, I'd appreciate that.

And then also, you know, we are in discussion with how we address post-award escalations or TDC per unit limitations and in general, the new construction applications get a three percent post application
increase. Staff is willing to look at increasing that to be four and a half percent going forward. We would probably be open to presenting to the board for past RFAs to make that percent be four and a half percent to help out, and so that's where we are with that.

We've got some more feedback of other things that are out there. We've not quite settled on anything else besides that at the moment and of course, if somebody has some ideas of how trends and current negotiations with GCs as their costs go up, what the trend is since last year, that'll help guide us in setting new numbers as a baseline.

And if there's anything else that you think needs to be fixed or tweaked, please let me know, appreciate it. More time you give me to analyze your comments in the telecommunity, it's better to implement those, be fully informed with everybody.

MS. BUTTON: Thanks, Kevin. We'll do the last two items and then we'll do a final round of comments or questions on the phone.
MR. TATREAU: Actually, I had a --

MS. BUTTON: Sure.

MR. TATREAU: Sorry. I had a handwritten -- so the TDC per unit limitations basically is a way for us to control costs and with that, of course, with new construction, the land component is removed, so that's controlled by an appraisal.

On ac/rehab, the land is still removed, but yet the building allocation is still also controlled by the appraisal. There's an allocation between land and building, but the combination is an appraisal limitation.

So it's a possibility if you want me to look into it, I can remove the acquisition -- all acquisition costs from a TDC per unit limitation process for ac/rehabs and just have basically have new costs going in to the development as your TDC per unit limit.

Now, it'll be a much smaller number, won't have the acquisition numbers in there.
23 It'll be a whole new concept, but there's a possibility it'll be a fair way to go with everybody. I'm open to the idea. Please give me some feedback on that one.

MS. BUTTON: Thanks, Kevin. And the last two items are more process oriented in terms of application submission. So what we are going to be doing, what you'll notice going forward for the RFAs that we post is that we're going to be bookmarking them for your convenience so they're just easier to maneuver. So the sections of the RFA will be bookmarked in the PDF.

And so for ease of convenience, we found it helpful internally and we think you all -- it will hopefully be helpful to you as well, and then when we post it on the website like that.

Now, what also would be very helpful and we're looking at implementing is when you submit your application and your all-attachments document, that you all
bookmark as well, so when we're processing applications, the submissions are easily identifiable and really it is. Because we're doing it, we know it's not that hard to do. So we also think that there could be, you know, we may look at some type of incentive for applications that come in that are bookmarked in the PDF that way. I don't think I need to say much more about it. I know new changes are like not pleasant, but it really is very helpful and I think mutually helpful in terms of accessing our information. And the online submission portal has been working great in terms of now doing the application submissions that way with the one hard copy and we'd love to get to the point where we don't have any hard copy submissions, so that's still -- we understand we need to talk about that more and what that might really look like and so no news on that really, but we will be looking to have some
type of bookmarking of the applications in
the all-attachments document that comes in.

And then we are going to have a new RFA
numbering system also for your ease of
convenience and mutually helpful for us, too.

So I'm going to let Jean talk about that.

MS. SALMONSEN: I don't know if y'all
have been able to keep all those numbers
straight. I know I personally have had

trouble, but maybe y'all have a good system,
but this is to help everybody be on the same
page when we have these numbers.

So you'll see them here, the 100s are
the, you know, specialized RFAs that are
typically issued in the beginning of the
year, that's why they have the 100s. And
they are currently listed here numbers 101
through 107 and we can always add on more if
new ones come up.

The 200s, it starts with 201 medium
county geo, that's the way I just listed it
because one year, we're didn't have small
county in there, but of course, this is our
typical medium/small geo RFA with the 200s.
And then those are more like the general
occupancy that are typically issued in the
fall.
And then I have here a couple of 300s
and those -- in fact, we started with our
2020 302, that's been our first RFA. So if
you saw that, that's why they're not really
issued in a particular year, they're not
expected maybe every year and so this is our
new system.

So when we talk about like the 205,
that'll always be that SAIL family elderly,
so we'll 2020 205, a 2021 205 and you'll see
those consistent numbers every year
hopefully.
MS. BUTTON: So idea is that, you know,
in those sections, it's going to be the same
number RFA every year. So in 2021, the large
county geo is still going to be 2021 202 and
that you just get used to what it is.
So hopefully, that's meaningful. And like Jean said, when we have the one-off funding sources that come in, particularly we don't want to have -- we love new funding sources, we don't love disasters, but it made sense to have that separate 300 level for sort of the one-offs that we're able to administer and that's why you see the RLP and CBDGDR in that designation. So that's, you know, that's -- we thought that would be helpful to you all and think it's going to be helpful to us as well.

So with that, that includes the substance of the workshop today. What we anticipate going forward again is that we'll schedule a workshop in early 2020 where you'll see the RFAs that are coming up for the next year and what we're thinking about for the goals, where we've landed on some of these other items we've talked about and if anything new comes into the mix.

So I think we're looking at potentially
something in association with the March board meeting for that and that meeting is in Tallahassee. We'll have a phone system that works because we always have workshops in Tallahassee, so that was a joke.

But anyway, we intend to do that and so we'll be looking at feedback and we'll hopefully meet our commitment where we said by February, we'd be telling you where we stand on some of these things because we'll get out an agenda well in advance of any workshop in March.

So we'll do one for sort of the good of the order, open up the phone lines for any comments or discussion at this point and we'll take any comments from the room as well. Operator, can you open the line, please?

THE OPERATOR: So the lines are now open. If you wish to ask a question, please press pound and (unintelligible).

CALLER ON PHONE: I was actually the
caller on the line earlier just to let you

know that we can call in from the line. No

questions. Thanks.

MR. TATREAU: Thank you.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you.

MR. PRICE: It worked.

MS. BUTTON: Operator, is there anyone

else in the queue?

THE OPERATOR: No, there are no incoming

questions.

MS. BUTTON: Okay. Thank you. Shawn?

MR. WILSON: Shawn Wilson, Blue Sky

Communities. I only have six more comments.

This is a comment that was made last year

that I think is worth repeating. In your

large six, you give two to Broward. It's

been that way for at least three or four

years. I think you need to start giving --

one year, maybe give two to Orange, Orange

County. Just before you leave, I had to get

that out there. Or two to Hillsborough. I

mean, there's huge needs, especially in
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Orange County of all the six. So I think you should consider giving two to another county other than Broward.

Back to proximity, medium county, definitely support that. You may also want to consider just increasing. If you're going to stick with the general, the same general proximity concept where you could get nine and then you qualify, you may want to increase that number. I think there's plenty of sites that score far greater than nine.

Publicly owned land and public/private partnerships, I think you saw in the DR round there are a lot of opportunities, there's a lot of cities and counties that have publicly owned land that they want to get deals done. They can't get them done because they're just sort of thrown in with everybody else. I think you need to find a way to continue to encourage publicly owned land and public/private partnerships.

The number of units as a tie-breaker.

You may want to look at the number units as a tie-breaker. I'm not going to describe it or
think of the goods or bads, I'm just throwing it out there.

LGAO, you had 20 -- well, I'm not going to talk about the current cycle.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you.

MR. WILSON: There's a lot LGAOs out there and so I think that is definitely proven to be -- to be an impetus for getting local governments involved and you should definitely keep it up.

MS. BUTTON: Thank you, Shawn. Any other concluding comments? All right. Well, thank you, everyone, for spending your time with us this afternoon and keep the comments and suggestions coming, we appreciate it. And this will conclude the workshop, thank you.

(Thereupon, the workshop was concluded at 3:16 p.m.)
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