

Dear Ms. Salmonsens,

Upon reviewing the comments that had been submitted earlier on RFA 2024-215/Military Installations, I respectfully request that the two issues below should be taken into consideration in formulating the final RFA.

A. Tailoring the development location requirement to the geographic nuances of each military installation, although time-consuming for the Corporation, would be the most fair to the developers and consumer-friendly to the ultimate users. While imposing a generic 5-mile limitation may be too restrictive for some bases, allowing a generic 15-mile would be akin to performing surgeries with a butcher knife. Certain bases, such as Eglin AFB or Hurlburt Field, have only one single main artery (State Highway 98), resulting in a bottleneck during traffic hours even for a short distance. Extending the location of the housing development to 15 miles from *ALL* installations would not accomplish, but defeat, the purpose of being "near" a military installation.

B. The current status of supply & demand of housing near each military installation should also be considered in scoring the RFAs. Tyndall AFB, for example, has been awarded over \$5 Billion in funding after Hurricane Michael occurred in 2018, to fortify it into the "base of the future". A fair amount of such funding has been for housing, to develop dwellings based on the most updated, highest quality building codes in effect at the time. Most other bases have not received anywhere near such funding thus have less available housing, both in terms of quantity AND quality, hence may have a much greater housing needs than Tyndall AFB.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Kim

Kim Do, JD, CPA

Cell/Viber/WhatsApp: +1 858 837 1683

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/kimdo888/>