Questions and Answers for RFAs 2026-201, 2026-202, and 2026-203

The following is a set of Questions and Answers for the following RFAs:

- RFA 2026-201 Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Small and Medium Counties
- RFA 2026-202 Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Broward, Duval, Hillsborough, Lee, Orange, Palm Beach, Pinellas, and Polk Counties
- RFA 2026-203 Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Miami-Dade County

Questions that are applicable to RFAs 2026-201, 2026-202, and 2026-203

1. For a Site Control extension beyond November 30, 2026, could you please confirm whether any additional documentation or evidence of the exercise of such an extension option is required at the time of application submission, or if the existence of the option within the existing agreement is sufficient?

   Answer:

   Per Section Four, A.7.a. of the RFA, site control documentation must be provided demonstrating that the Applicant is a party to an eligible contract or lease for the subject property, or is the owner of the subject property. Such documentation must include all relevant intermediate contracts, agreements, assignments, options, conveyances, intermediate leases, and subleases. If the proposed Development consists of Scattered Sites, site control must be demonstrated for all of the Scattered Sites.

   Note: The Corporation has no authority to, and will not, evaluate the validity or enforceability of any site control documentation.

2. On the Dev Pref Tab of Exhibit A: Option iii Liquidity - If you already score more than 20 points on (i) and (ii), is it OK to leave the liquidity question blank?

   Answer:

   To be eligible for this preference, the Application must achieve a minimum of 20 Developer Experience Points that must include a minimum of 5 points in criteria (i) and a minimum of 5 points in criteria (ii). There are no requirements for points in criteria (iii).

3. For the Developer Experience Funding Preference, are applicants permitted to use the same affordable rental housing developments to demonstrate both successful completion of affordable rental housing developments and ownership in affordable rental housing developments for purposes of claiming these funding preference points? Or are separate developments required for each category?

   For example, could an applicant list Community A under the successful completion category to demonstrate that the development was completed and successfully placed in service, and also list

Community A under the ownership category to demonstrate that the applicant continues to own the affordable rental housing development? Or would the applicant be required to provide separate developments for each category.

Answer:

Yes, if one development meets the criteria (i) and (ii), it may be used in both sections.

4. Would you please confirm the deadlines for application submission? RFA 2026-203 reflects the deadline as August 13 on Page 1, however, Page 2, Section A.1. has August 16.

   Answer:

   Florida Housing has issued a modification with the following Application deadlines:

   The Application Deadline for RFA 2026-201 is **3:00 p.m**., Eastern Time, on August 14, 2026

   The Application Deadline for RFA 2026-202 is **3:00 p.m**., Eastern Time, on August 13, 2026

   The Application Deadline for RFA 2026-203 is **3:00 p.m**., Eastern Time, on August 13, 2026

5. I noticed that the Continuous Advance Review Process was revised this month (07/2026). I want to ensure that our previously approved principals disclosure forms signed in 2025 are still acceptable for submittal?

   Answer:

   Yes. No changes were made to the Principals Disclosure Form (Form Rev. 05-2019). The process document posted to the RFA webpages "Continuous Advance Review Process Rev. 07-2026" has been revised.

6. Where can I find the definition of Affordable Rental Housing Developments?

   Answer:

   Section Four, A.3.g, includes a new item called "Terms Used in this Section". In this section of the RFA, Affordable Rental Housing Development means that at least 50% of the total residential units in the development must be income and rent restricted at 120% AMI or below, which must be memorialized by a recorded Land Use Restriction Agreement, Extended Use Agreement, or other equivalent document.

7. I'm reviewing the posted Exhibit A and have run into a couple of issues on the Funding tab for two different Applications.

   With my first Application, the Exhibit A is correctly identifying the site as being in a DDA, but it is not recognizing that the site is also located in a QCT.

With a second Application, the Exhibit A is identifying the site as being in a non-metro DDA, even though the county is no longer designated as a DDA for 2026 (it was in the prior year 2025). In addition, the Exhibit A is not recognizing that the site is located in a QCT.

Answer:

The 2026 Qualified Census Tracts (QCT) and Difficult Development Areas (DDA) are available on the webpage https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/qct.html . The original Exhibit A posted for RFAs 2026-201, 2026-202, and 2026-203 did not properly align with the data available from HUD. A revised Exhibit A has been posted for RFAs 2026-201, 2026-202, and 2026-203. Applicants that complete the original Exhibit A posted on the RFA Webpage may not receive accurate messaging regarding the Development's QCT or non-metro DDA status. Applicants that wish to receive the most accurate messaging regarding the Development's QCT or non-metro DDA status must use the July 27, 2026 versions of Exhibit A.

8. I am working on an application for a development in Key West and am unable to request any equity, as for some reason, Monroe County is showing the max request as $0.

   Answer:

   A revised Exhibit A has been posted for RFA 2026-201 to allow a request amount for Monroe County. Applicants that wish to submit an Application proposing a Development in Monroe County must use the July 27, 2026 version of Exhibit A.

9. Under Exhibit A, Section 4.A.3.b.(3)(b), Developer Experience Funding Preference, there are three ways to reach the 20-point threshold: (i) Demonstration of successful completion of Affordable Rental Housing Developments, (ii) Demonstration of ownership in Affordable Rental Housing Developments, and (iii) Demonstration of Developer Financial Liquidity/Capacity.

   If we can achieve the full 20 points through Options (i) and (ii) alone and do not intend to pursue Option (iii), should we leave the liquidity dropdown ("Does the liquidity of the Principal(s) meet the criteria outlined in Section 4.A.3.b.(3)(b) of the RFA?") as <select one>, or should we affirmatively select "No"?

   Answer:

   A "No" response and a default "<select one>" response to this question are treated equally.

10. Should the initial response to the question "Which natural person Principal identified above was also a Principal of this Development?", remain <select one>, or should it default to Natural Person 1?

    Answer:

    All Applications with information provided in the required Developer Experience listed on the "General Information" tab will have a Natural Person 1 listed in the Developer Preference section of Exhibit A. Therefore, the response to this question defaults to the Natural Person 1.

As stated in Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(b)(ii) of the RFA, to demonstrate that the second natural person Principal provided in the "Developer Pref" tab is the experienced Principal associated with a listed development, Applicants must change the selection under each Development from Natural Person 1 to Natural Person 2 within Exhibit A. If both Natural Person Principals meet the experience with the listed development, Applicants may select Natural Person 1, Natural Person 2 or Both Natural Persons.

11. Regarding Section Four, A.3.c.(3)(b) of the RFA [corresponding Exhibit A question: Provide the Development name(s) of the other Priority 1 Related Applications submitted in this RFA]:

    a. Is this question meant to be completed only by an Applicant whose Affordable Rental Housing Development listed to meet the Required Developer Experience in (3)(a) of Exhibit A is either (i) not located in Florida; or (ii) was not Completed since January 1, 2016?

    b. Regardless of the above, what is the consequence for failing to identify, or incorrectly identifying, the Related Applications in this Section? Would a lack of identification or misrepresentation in this section be considered an ineligibility item?

    Answer:

    In response to 11.a., the language in Section Four A.3.c.(3)(b) of the RFA states:

    If the Affordable Rental Housing Development listed to meet the Required Developer Experience in (3)(a) of Exhibit A is either (i) not located in Florida; or (ii) was not Completed since January 1, 2016, provide the names of up to two other Priority 1 Related Applications submitted in this RFA.

    In response to 11.b., due to the competitive nature of the RFAs, Florida Housing has a policy that prohibits staff from answering questions such as 11.b. confirming whether something will be acceptable or not during scoring.

12. Regarding Section Four, A.3. of the RFA:

    a. Is the term Affordable Rental Housing Development defined in Section Four, A.3.g.(1) meant to be: "at least 50% of the total residential units in the development must be income and rent restricted at 120% AMI or below, which must be memorialized by a recorded Land Use Restriction Agreement, Extended Use Agreement, or other equivalent document"? From Workshop and CAHP comments, our understanding was that in order to meet the Developer Experience Funding Preference [Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(b)], the Developer needed to have experience in developing LIHTC (because it requires specialized knowledge to close within reasonable timeframes, etc.), while the Required Developer Experience [Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(a)] would allow a Developer to qualify with a development restricted at 120% AMI even without LIHTC experience. Is that the intended distinction?

Answer:

The Developer Experience Requirement and Funding Preference can be met with experience with Affordable Rental Housing Developments. There is no requirement that it be experience with a specific funding source.

b. Was it intended that the requirement indicated in the second paragraph of Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(a), in which the individual meeting the Required Developer Experience must also remain with the Development for three years following the issuance of a final certificate of occupancy, was meant to apply to the natural person Principal of the Developer entity? We ask because the Principals in a Developer entity don't need to do much after TCO, except conversion and 8609.

   Instead, shouldn't the experienced Developer be required to be part of a development from funding and to stay on until the certificate of occupancy or 8609? Moreover, shouldn't this requirement be imposed as it relates to the prior developments the Principal of the Developer is claiming to have experience from, and shouldn't that also be required for the Developer Experience Funding Preference [Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(b)]? This would avoid someone that claims to have experience but was a principal of the prior Developer entity on a point of time where no development activity happened.

   Shouldn't this requirement in the second paragraph of Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(a), be stipulated in Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(b)(ii) in which the individual meeting the Developer Experience Funding Preference as it relates to the ownership (prior Applicant entity) must have remained in that prior development for three years following the issuance of a final certificate of occupancy? That's the period of time in which an owner is liable towards investors for operating deficits, etc.

   Answer:

   The language has been consistent for a number of years. This language is not expected to be modified in this cycle.

c. To qualify for the Developer Experience Funding Preference [Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(b)], wouldn't the Applicant need to also demonstrate that at least one of its prior Affordable Rental Housing Developments consists of a total number of units no less than 50% of the total number of units in the proposed Development?

   Answer:

   As stated in Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(a) to meet the Developer Experience Requirement, Applications provide information in Exhibit A to meet the required Developer experience demonstrating that a natural person Principal of at least one experienced Developer entity, which must be disclosed as a Principal of the Developer on the Principals of the Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Form, Rev. 05-2019, ("Principals Disclosure Form"), must have, since January 1, 2006 Completed at least one Affordable Rental Housing Development that consists of a total number of units no less than 50% of the total number of units in the proposed Development.

d. To qualify for the Developer Experience Funding Preference via demonstration of Developer financial liquidity [Section Four, A.3.b.(3)(b)(iii)], wouldn't it be advisable for FHFC to create a form that's executed by a C.P.A. rather than requiring evidence within 21 days after the issuance of the Invitation to Enter Credit Underwriting?

   Answer:

   This is not required in the RFA and this language is not expected to be modified in this cycle.

13. Regarding the Permit Ready eligibility requirements:

   a. Wouldn't it be advisable for FHFC to add the number of units permitted to the Local Government Verification that Development Qualifies as Permit Ready Development form?

      Answer:

      This is not required in the RFA and this language is not expected to be modified in this cycle.

   b. Wouldn't it be advisable to require that the number of units stated on such Permit Ready form must be equal to or greater than the number of units stated by the Applicant in Exhibit A of its Application, and such should be a requirement described in Section Four, A.7.c. to qualify as Permit Ready?

      Answer:

      This is not required in the RFA and this language is not expected to be modified in this cycle.

   c. Wouldn't it be advisable to require that the unit mix required in the entitlements obtained meet the demographic unit mix and maximum unit requirements for demographic selected by the Applicant in Exhibit A of its Application, and such should be a requirement described in Section Four, A.7.c. to qualify as Permit Ready?

   Answer:

      This is not required in the RFA and this language is not expected to be modified in this cycle.

14. The 2025 RFAs prohibit Principals that were funded as Permit Ready Applications who miss the closing deadlines from submitting Priority 1 Applications in the next RFA Cycle, which would be the 2026 cycle. Here are our questions about that:

    a. Because deadline to close on Permit Ready Applications is September 7, 2026 (this is after the August 11 deadline to apply for 2026-201) and this is before the Review Committee meets on September 8, will the Review Committee verify whether these Permit Ready Applicants met their closing deadline by the day they meet and therefore apply the Priority 1 penalties if necessary?

    Answer:

    Yes.

    b. If a 2025 Permit Ready award does not close by September 7, will the Priority 1 Applications that the Applicant and its Principals or Developer(s) submitted in the 2026 RFAs be deemed ineligible? We note that the Eligibility Items in Section Five, A.1 do not appear to include an item addressing a missed Permit Ready closing deadline from a prior cycle, but the language from the 2025 RFA speaks about Priority 1 ineligibility for missing closing deadline.

    Answer:

    If the maximum number of Priority 1 Applications is exceeded, all Applications affiliated with the Principals of the affected Applications will be deemed Priority 2.

<u>Questions regarding Local Government Area of Opportunity that are applicable to RFAs 2026-201 and 2026-202</u>

15. Are eligible Counties able to support only one 9% project application per cycle with a local government contribution of $460,000? If so, does this not allow an incorporated city in the same County to support an additional project made by a different developer? Is there a penalty if this occurs? If both apply to FHFC will the two applications be disqualified and not considered?

    Answer:

    As further described in Section Four, A.11.a. of the RFA (page 85 of RFA 2026-201), a county may provide Local Government Areas of Opportunity (LGAO) Funding for a Development in addition to a city within the county providing LGAO Funding for a different Development. For instance, Leon County may provide LGAO funding for Development A and Tallahassee may provide LGAO funding for Development B. Both Developments may qualify for LGAO goals if the other requirements are also met.

16. Are there any limitations that would prevent a county from requiring a local government to provide a letter stating their complete support for the proposed project, aside from zoning, within their incorporated boundaries if the applicant is applying for a $460,000 local contribution from the county? Any limitations on the County from requesting and requiring some level of financial support or valued fee relief from an incorporated city in addition to the $460,000 to be provided by the County?

    Answer:

    Each Local Government may have unique criteria for selecting their LGAO recipients.

Please Note: The Q&A process for RFAs 2026-201, 2026-202 and 2026-203 is concluded and Florida Housing does not expect to issue any further Q&As regarding these RFAs.

Submitted by:

Melissa Levy
Managing Director of Multifamily Programs
Florida Housing Finance Corporation
227 N. Bronough Street, Suite 5000
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850-488-4197 or Melissa.Levy@floridahousing.org

The Q and A responses are based on the information presented in the question and the terms of the RFA. The responses to the Q and A are provided as a courtesy and shall not be construed as scoring of an application. If there is any conflict between the response to a Q and A and the RFA itself, the terms of the RFA control. These Q and A responses apply solely to RFAs 2026-201, 2026-202, and 2026-203.