Florida Housing Finance Corporation
2013 Universal Application Cycle
Fourth Rule Development Workshop Agenda
Tallahassee City Hall, Commission Chambers,
300 South Adams Street, Tallahassee, FL 32301
August 14, 2012

1. TOD Goal

The intent of the goal when it was introduced last year was to capture public-private partnerships within TOD areas. There were 10 awards given to TOD applicants in the 2011 UAC with at least another just outside of a TOD. Florida Housing is giving thought to changing or augmenting this goal with one focused on public-private partnerships, regardless of any relationship to a TOD. FHFC is looking to hear some feedback on this possible change along with appropriate qualifying conditions to define a public-private partnership.

With the concern of concentrating a large number of units quickly in certain areas, FHFC is attempting to incorporate various methods to have a better geographic distribution of its awards. The new ranking process only allows one TOD per county within the TOD goal and the ranking further indicates that any TOD that has an applicant that receives a preliminary allocation will not have a second applicant awarded in that TOD. FHFC would like to hear from stakeholders how to avoid awarding new applications within TODs that had applications that received awards in the 2011 UAC.

2. Proximity

There are a number of changes in the current draft and we would like to have stakeholder opinions about the effectiveness or alternatives.

a. Point boosts offered to Preservation applications related to RA levels and concrete construction along with a point boost for Preservation and Redevelopment applications with a DOT on their site(s)
b. Tier 1 and Tier 2 services must be in place for 1 year prior to application deadline
c. Changes to Services definitions for public school, medical facility, and library
d. Increase to distances for schools and should we also consider a decrease for senior centers
e. Proximity levels (appropriate groupings, nearly automatic top rating in each county for both Preservation and Non-Preservation, no minimum for developments in Monroe County)
f. Removal of developments with the same financial beneficiaries from being exempt within the process for qualifying for the automatic 10 proximity points

3. Ranking

The current draft has all applications being sorted together with one set of tie-breakers. The changes incorporated into the determination of the proximity levels are intended to have a wide range of excellent applications competing equally. As the ranking priorities go down the single application sort, the top scoring applications will fill various funding pools, specific to each application's qualifications. Each selected applicant will take funds from either a Preservation or

Non-Preservation funding pool as well as either the small, medium, or large county funding pool, and count against a particular county's single SAUL.

One item that has not yet been incorporated is a maximum amount of funding per county. FHFC used to have a 50% limitation for any one county, but that is not believed to be an appropriate limit based on the need for geographic distribution. Giving consideration to the wide range of affordable housing needs around the state and the wide range of costs based on location (i.e., DDAs) or development type, what do stakeholders believe appropriate funding limitations should be?

How should FHFC incorporate a priority for non-profit applications that are 100% non-profit?

4. Rule Chapter 67-48, F.A.C.

There a few new concepts introduced into the rule, namely within 67-48.004(9), 67-48.005, and 67-48.0072(1).

5. Developer and General Contractor Fees

Florida Housing has incorporated some changes to the 2013 UAC process that are intended to control costs and to ensure that the request amount of a housing credit allocation is enough for the transaction, but not more than the transaction needs. In that vein, FHFC is seeking ways to further control costs and one suggestion is to review the limitations on developer fees and GC fees. FHFC is considering retaining the 16%/18%/21% limitations currently outlined in Rule Chapter 67-48, F.A.C., but also putting an additional limitation on the amount earned based on bedrooms per set-aside unit. What would be appropriate limitations for 0/1/2/3/4 bedroom units? The idea is to take into consideration the financial risks inherent in these transactions and to encourage quality developments, but at some point, simply incurring higher costs should not directly equate to higher profits.

6. Other Discussion Items