

FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION
Board Meeting
December 11, 2015
Action Items



FISCAL

Action

I. FISCAL

A. 2016 Operating Budget

1. Background

- a) The Florida Housing Finance Operating Budget is created with a conservative approach to both revenue and expenses.
- b) The 2016 budget, which includes both Operating and the Hardest Hit Fund, was created using the following approach, as applicable:
 - a projection of fee revenue based on the current loan portfolio. Fifteen new multi-family bond transactions were projected for 2016;
 - a projection of revenue from the administration of other federal programs;
 - a projection of investment earnings based on input from investment managers;
 - a zero-based budget model for operating expenses, exclusive of salaries and benefits; the 2016 projected work plan for operational units determines the initial expense budget request from each work unit;
 - employee benefits information based on final quotes for insurance.
- c) Upon implementation of the 2016 Operating Budget, Florida Housing will closely monitor revenues and expenses. Non-discretionary line item budgets, such as program administration, monitoring and workshops, will be fully allocated to work units; however, we will vigorously monitor all expenditures to assure revenues will support expenditures. Discretionary line items, such as staff development travel and certain outreach travel, will be controlled at the executive level. With these measures in place to control expenditures, Florida Housing expects to maintain a positive trend of revenues exceeding expenses.

2. Present Situation

- a) The recommended Operating Budget for 2016 has been compiled, reviewed, and revised and is provided.
- b) A schedule detailing the changes made to the October draft is provided.
- c) An Account Guide describing the budget categories is included with the Operating Budget.

3. Recommendation

- a) Staff recommends approval of the 2016 Operating Budget.

LEGAL

Action

II. LEGAL

A. **Madison Hollow, LLC v. Florida Housing Finance Corporation, FHFC Case No. 2015-023BP; (Intervenor: Brixton Landing, Ltd.)**

1. **Background**

- a) This case regards RFA 2015-115: Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments in Broward, Duval, Hillsborough, Orange, Palm Beach, and Pinellas Counties (the “RFA”). Petitioner Madison Hollow, LLC and Intervenor Brixton Landing, Ltd. applied for funding through the RFA for projects in Orange County. Madison Hollow and Brixton Landing both had perfect application scores, and Brixton Landing was selected for funding on the basis of having a lower lottery number.
- b) Sheeler Club Apartments, Sheeler Club Apartments-Phase II, Banyan Station, and Lauderdale Place submitted applications for projects in Orange County, and also had perfect application scores. One of the “tie breakers” applied by Florida Housing is the Leveraging Classification, essentially a ranking of eligible applications based upon the cost per unit. Madison Hollow and Brixton Landing were both classified in the “A” group, and Sheeler Club Apartments, Sheeler Club Apartments-Phase II, Banyan Station, and Lauderdale Place were classified in the “B” group. In this case, applicants in the “B” group were essentially ineligible for funding.
- c) Petitioner was notified of the Board’s intended decision on or about May 8, 2015. Petitioner timely filed a notice of intent to protest and formal written protest as required by section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, challenging the Corporation’s scoring and ranking of Applicants for funding under the RFA. Brixton Landing properly and timely filed for intervention to participate in the case. Because material facts were in dispute, the case was referred to the Division of Administrative Hearings.
- d) The central issue here is whether Florida Housing’s decisions to award or deny funding under the RFA, as proposed on May 8, 2015, are contrary to the agency’s governing statutes, the agency’s rules or policies, or the solicitation specifications. More specifically, the issue is whether Florida Housing’s scoring of the Applications in the “B” group was within the bounds described above.
- e) Madison Hollow’s position was that Sheeler Club Apartments and Sheeler Club Apartments-Phase II should have been found ineligible primarily because of a failure to demonstrate the “ability to proceed.” Madison Hollow also contended that Banyan Station and Lauderdale Place should have been found ineligible primarily for failure to fully disclose the principals of the applicant and developer. If any two of these four applications had been found ineligible, Brixton Landing would have ended up being classified in the “B” group and Madison Hollow would have been awarded funding. Madison Hollow was thus in the unusual position of challenging four applicants who were not selected for funding and are not parties to this case, while Brixton Landing was in the equally unusual position of defending these four applicants.

LEGAL

Action

2. **Present Situation**

- a) A hearing was conducted on August 3-4, 2015, before Administrative Law Judge Suzanne Van Wyk. All parties filed Proposed Recommended Orders. After reviewing the Proposed Recommended Orders, the Administrative Law Judge issued a Recommended Order on October 29, 2015. The Recommended Order affirmed Florida Housing's scoring and ranking decisions on all issues. A copy of the Recommended Order is attached as [Exhibit A](#).
- b) Madison Hollow filed 18 Exceptions to the Recommended Order on November 9, 2015. Both Brixton Landing and Florida Housing filed Responses to the Exceptions.

3. **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the Findings of Fact of the Recommended Order, the Conclusions of Law of the Recommended Order, and the Recommendation of the Recommended Order, and issue a Final Order in accord with such decisions.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

III. MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

A. Request for Applications (RFA) 2015-112 for SAIL Financing of Affordable Multifamily Housing Developments to be used in Conjunction with Tax-Exempt Bond Financing and Non-Competitive Housing Credits

1. Background/Present Situation

- a) On October 9, 2015, Florida Housing staff issued RFA 2015-112 offering the following State Apartment Incentive Loan (SAIL) Program funding: (i) an estimated \$16.2 million of Elderly funding for proposed Developments with the Elderly Demographic Commitment (ALF and Non-ALF), and (ii) an estimated \$32.8 million of Family funding for proposed Developments with the Family Demographic Commitment. The deadline for receipt of Applications was 11:00 a.m., Eastern Time, Tuesday, November 10, 2015.
- b) Florida Housing received 23 Applications in response to this RFA (12 with the Family Demographic and 11 with the Elderly Demographic). The Review Committee members, designated by the Executive Director, were Kevin Tatreau, Director of Development Finance (Chair), Elizabeth O’Neill, Multifamily Programs Manager, Eva Fambro-Price, Multifamily Programs Manager, Heather Boyd, Multifamily Programs Manager, and Elizabeth Thorp, Multifamily Programs Manager. Each member of the Review Committee independently evaluated and scored their assigned portions of the submitted Applications, consulting with non-committee staff and legal counsel as necessary and appropriate.
- c) At its December 1, 2015 Review Committee meeting, the individual committee members presented their scores, and the Committee carried out the funding selection process in accordance with Section Four B of the RFA.
- d) The RFA 2015-112 All Applications chart (provided as Exhibit A) lists the eligible and ineligible Applications. The eligible Applications (i.e., Applications that met all criteria to be eligible to be considered for funding) and the ineligible Applications are listed in assigned Application Number order.
- e) The Review Committee considered the following two (2) motions:
 - (1) A motion to adopt the scoring results, as set out on [Exhibit A](#); and
 - (2) A motion to tentatively select the Applications for funding, as set out on [Exhibit B](#), and invite the Applicants to enter credit underwriting.
- f) Both of the motions were passed unanimously.
- g) As outlined in subsection 67-48.0072(1), F.A.C., at the completion of all litigation and approval by the Board of all Recommended Orders with regard to this RFA, the Corporation shall offer all Applicants within the funding range an invitation to enter credit underwriting.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

2. **Recommendation**

- a) Approve the Committee's recommendations that the Board adopt the scoring results of the 23 Applications (set out on Exhibit A), and authorize the tentative selection of the 9 Applications (set out on Exhibit B) for funding and invitation to enter credit underwriting).
- b) An unallocated balance of \$5,467,871.60 remains. As provided in Section Four B of the RFA, any remaining funding will be distributed as approved by the Board.
- c) If no notice of protest or formal written protest is filed in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., et. al., staff will proceed to issue an invitation to enter credit underwriting to the Applications set out on Exhibit B.
- d) If a notice of protest or formal written protest is filed in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., et. al., then at the completion of all litigation, staff will present all Recommended Orders for Board approval prior to issuing invitations to enter credit underwriting to those Applicants in the funding range.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

B. Request for Applications (RFA) 2015-105 - Financing To Build Smaller Permanent Supportive Housing Properties For Persons With Developmental Disabilities

1. Background

- a) Florida Housing Finance Corporation (Florida Housing) was appropriated \$10 million in grant funds by the 2015 Legislature for housing for Persons with Developmental Disabilities as defined in Section 393.063, F.S. On August 14, 2015, Florida Housing issued a Request for Applications (RFA) to allocate \$7 million of the \$10 million appropriation for properties consisting of no more than four (4) Units.
- b) The deadline for receipt of Applications was 11:00 a.m., Eastern Time, Friday, October 9, 2015.

2. Present Situation

- a) Florida Housing received 12 Applications in response to this RFA. The Review Committee members, designated by the Executive Director, were Kevin Tatreau, Director of Developmental Finance (Chair), Kevin McCarthy, Policy Administrator, Susan Parks, Special Programs Manager, John Toman, Policy Manager, and Elaine Roberts, Senior Supportive Housing Analyst. Each member of the Review Committee independently evaluated and scored their assigned portions of the submitted Applications, consulting with non-committee staff and legal counsel as necessary and appropriate.
- b) At its December 1, 2015 Review Committee meeting, the individual committee members presented their scores and the Committee carried out the funding selection process in accordance with Section Five of the RFA.
- c) The RFA 2015-105 All Applications chart (provided as Exhibit C) lists the eligible Applications (i.e., Applications that met all criteria to be eligible to be considered for funding) in assigned Application number order. There were no ineligible Applications.
- d) The Review Committee considered the following motions:
 - (1) A motion to adopt the scoring results, as set out on [Exhibit C](#);
 - (2) A motion to tentatively select the Applications set out on [Exhibit D](#) for funding and invite the Applicants to enter credit underwriting.
- e) The motions passed unanimously.
- f) As outlined in Section Six, E. of the RFA, at the completion of all litigation and approval by the Board of all Recommended Orders with regard to this RFA, Florida Housing shall offer all Applicants within the funding range a Corporation letter of preliminary award.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

3. **Recommendation**

- a) Approve the Committee's recommendations that the Board adopt the scoring results of the twelve (12) Applications (set out on Exhibit C), and authorize the tentative selection of the twelve (12) Applications (set out on Exhibit D) for funding.
- b) An unallocated balance of \$2,446,000 remains. Staff recommends that the remaining funding be added to the \$3 million in grant funding to be made available in RFA 2016-105 which is currently scheduled to be issued in March, 2016.
- c) If no notice of protest or formal written protest is filed in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., et. al., staff will proceed to issue Corporation letters of preliminary award to the Applicants set out on Exhibit D.
- d) If a notice of protest or formal written protest is filed in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., et. al., then at the completion of all litigation, staff will present all Recommended Orders for Board approval prior to issuing the Corporation letters of preliminary award to those Applicants in the funding range.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

C. **Request for Applications (RFA) 2015-110 for Financing of Affordable Multifamily Housing Developments with HOME Funding to be used in Conjunction with Florida Housing-Issued MMRB and Non-Competitive HC**

1. **Background**

- a) On September 4, 2015, Florida Housing staff issued RFA 2015-110, offering \$25 million in HOME funding. The HOME funding offered in this RFA must be used in conjunction with MMRB and Non-Competitive Housing Credits.
- b) The deadline for receipt of Applications was 11:00 a.m., Eastern Time, Tuesday, October 20, 2015.

2. **Present Situation**

- a) Florida Housing received 6 Applications in response to this RFA. The Review Committee members, designated by the Executive Director, were David Woodward, Federal Loan Program Manager (Chair), Elizabeth Thorp, Multifamily Programs Manager, and Eva Fambro-Price, Multifamily Programs Manager. Each member of the Review Committee independently evaluated and scored their assigned portions of the submitted Applications, consulting with non-committee staff and legal counsel as necessary and appropriate.
- b) At its December 2, 2015 Review Committee meeting, the individual committee members presented their scores and the Committee carried out the funding selection process in accordance with Section Five of the RFA.
- c) The RFA 2015-110 All Applications chart (provided as Exhibit E) lists the eligible and ineligible Applications. The eligible Applications (i.e., Applications that met all criteria to be eligible to be considered for funding) are listed in assigned Application number order. There was one (1) ineligible Application.
- d) The Review Committee considered the following motions:
 - (1) A motion to adopt the scoring results, as set out on [Exhibit E](#);
 - (2) A motion to tentatively select the 4 Applications set out on [Exhibit F](#) for funding and invite the Applicants to enter credit underwriting.
- e) The motions passed unanimously.
- f) As outlined in Section Six, of the RFA, at the completion of all litigation and approval by the Board of all Recommended Orders with regard to this RFA, Florida Housing shall offer all Applicants within the funding range an invitation to enter credit underwriting.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

3. **Recommendation**

- a) Approve the Committee's recommendations that the Board adopt the scoring results of the six (6) Applications (set out on Exhibit E) and authorize the tentative selection of the four (4) Applications (set out on Exhibit F) for funding and invitation to enter credit underwriting.
- b) An unallocated balance of \$5,104,020 remains. As provided in Section Four, B.8.b. of the RFA, any remaining funding will be distributed as approved by the Board. Staff recommends that the Board forward commit HOME funding and authorize the tentative selection of the remaining eligible Application. Staff further recommends that the Board authorize the tentative selection of the ineligible CHDO Application provided they can cure their threshold failure in a reasonable time frame.
- c) If no notice of protest or formal written protest is filed in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., et. al., staff will proceed to issue invitations to enter credit underwriting to the Applicants set out on Exhibit F.
- d) If a notice of protest or formal written protest is filed in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., et. al., then at the completion of all litigation, staff will present all Recommended Orders for Board approval prior to issuing the invitations to enter credit underwriting to those Applicants in the funding range.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

D. Request for Applications (RFA) 2015-115 – Multifamily Energy Retrofit Program (MERP)

1. Background

- a) On October 23, 2015, Florida Housing staff issued RFA 2015-115, offering \$7,533,084 in Multifamily Energy Retrofit Program (MERP) loans to Applicants that commit to making retrofit improvements to qualified multifamily rental Developments that result in measurable energy savings and water conservation; providing ongoing property management, staff education, and resident outreach to maximize the benefits of the retrofit; and submitting reports on energy use/savings.
- b) The deadline for receipt of Applications was 11:00 a.m., Eastern Time, Friday, November 13, 2015.

2. Present Situation

- a) Florida Housing received 33 Applications in response to this RFA. The Review Committee members, designated by the Executive Director, were Elizabeth Thorp, Multifamily Programs Manager (Chair), Elizabeth O’Neill, Multifamily Programs Manager; Kevin McCarthy, Policy Administrator. Each member of the Review Committee independently evaluated and scored their assigned portions of the submitted Applications, consulting with non-committee staff and legal counsel as necessary and appropriate.
- b) At its December 2, 2015 Review Committee meeting, the individual committee members presented their scores, and the Committee carried out the funding selection process in accordance with Section Five of the RFA.
- c) The RFA 2015-115 All Applications chart (provided as Exhibit G) lists the eligible and ineligible Applications. The eligible Applications (i.e., Applications that met all criteria to be eligible to be considered for funding) are listed in assigned Application number order. There was one (1) ineligible Application.
- d) The Review Committee considered the following motions:
 - (1) A motion to adopt the scoring results, as set out on [Exhibit G](#);
 - (2) A motion to tentatively select the Applications set out on [Exhibit H](#) for funding and invite the Applicants to enter credit underwriting.
- e) The motions passed unanimously.
- f) As outlined in Section Five, G. of the RFA, at the completion of all litigation and approval by the Board of all Recommended Orders with regard to this RFA, Florida Housing shall offer all Applicants within the funding range a Corporation letter of preliminary award.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

- g) An unallocated balance of \$263,084 remains. As provided in Section Five, F. of the RFA, the total of any unreserved funding and all Returned Funding will be distributed to additional eligible Applications on the Waiting List, in the order they were ranked as approved by the Board, also subject to the continuation of the County Award Tally and 75% Funding Test.

3. Recommendation

- a) Approve the Committee's recommendations that the Board adopt the scoring results of the 33 Applications (set out on Exhibit G), and authorize the tentative selection of the seven (7) Applications (set out on Exhibit H) for preliminary award.
- b) Delegate Staff authority to distribute the unreserved funding and all Returned Funding that may become available to additional eligible Applications on the Waiting List, in the order they were ranked as approved by the Board, also subject to the continuation of the County Award Tally and 75% Funding Test as outlined in the RFA.
- c) If no notice of protest or formal written protest is filed in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., et. al., staff will proceed to issue Corporation letters of preliminary award to the Applicants set out on Exhibit H.
- d) If a notice of protest or formal written protest is filed in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., et. al., then at the completion of all litigation, staff will present all Recommended Orders for Board approval prior to issuing Corporation letters of preliminary award to those Applicants in the funding range.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

E. Request Authority to Provide Funding to Be Used as Match Funding for Research Related to Developments funded to serve High Needs/High Cost Populations

1. Background

- a) On March 14, 2014, Florida Housing's Board of Directors awarded \$10 million from a special 2012 state appropriation to three nonprofit demonstration developments to provide permanent supportive housing (i.e., housing paired with supportive services) for extremely low income, chronically homeless populations that are high users of publicly funded crisis services and/or are living in more restrictive institutional settings than needed or desired. The developments awarded funding are:
- Duval County: Village on Wiley, 43 units (fully occupied);
 - Miami-Dade County: Coalition Lift, 34 units (under construction; should be in lease-up late 2016); and
 - Pinellas County: Pinellas Hope V, 45 units (under construction; should be in lease-up by spring 2016).
- b) These highest scoring applicants not only have experience with developing and managing properties to serve this population, they each also operate within a county partnership that coordinates a variety of agencies and resources to prioritize housing and services for the most vulnerable homeless persons in their areas.
- c) The original Request for Proposals (RFP) required each applicant to commit to partner with entities such as university researchers to carry out a multiyear study to quantify cost/benefit data showing what, if any, public savings have occurred as a result of housing the intended residents in the proposed Development. The study must also provide a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the residents' health, self-sufficiency and other outcomes over the study period. All residents at the property should be included as study participants. The RFP specified the broad expectations for this research based on reports from other parts of the country. The research objective is to develop and provide Florida-based information for legislative and other policymakers.
- d) The study must include costs of residency and services both before and after the rental housing is provided. These costs include such things as the courts and correctional system, shelters, residential and institutional housing, emergency and inpatient hospital/clinic stays, mental health hospitals and services, supportive services, permanent supportive housing and associated costs. The study period must include at least two years of resident data for the period post occupancy in these new properties.

2. Present Situation

- a) To date, all three developers have researchers on board and each research methodology plan has been reviewed by Florida Housing and our partner state agencies. Awardees have been fundraising to pay for this research, but are

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

having trouble raising all of the necessary funds. Costs for the research at each property are estimated to be upwards of \$200,000 because of the intensive and comprehensive data collection needed over several years. In some cases, costs will be greater because the organizations will be working with researchers at one of Florida's state universities, which may charge as much as an additional 50% in indirect costs (i.e., costs related to the university's broad overhead costs). Each organization is carrying out its own study with its study partners, although there is some discussion of combining efforts on the data collection efforts to save money.

- b) To assist the organizations in their fundraising, Florida Housing staff has evaluated the idea of providing funding to each nonprofit to pay a portion of research costs to be used as match funding – that is, funds would not be available from Florida Housing without a 2-to-1 match from other funds.
- c) Florida Housing has funding available from the savings that resulted from the refunding of multifamily bonds issued in 1982 for properties with federal Section 8 contracts that provided rental assistance to the tenants in those properties. Often referred to as Financial Adjustment Factor, or FAF, funds, these savings were required by the federal McKinney Vento Act (focused on federal homeless programs) to be split evenly between Treasury and state housing finance agencies. The savings were allowed to be used for housing to serve very low income households for a minimum of ten years, and can be used for any purpose, including non-housing purposes, after they have met the ten year restriction. This includes purposes other than affordable housing, including operations.
- d) Florida Housing has approximately \$219,500 in FAF funds that may be used for this purpose. While use of funds for housing is our highest and best use of funding like this, in this case the staff has agreed that the research to find out the cost-benefit of these properties is critical to understanding and making the case for whether they are a valuable approach to serving Florida's most vulnerable, high needs/high cost residents.
- e) The staff proposes to provide up to \$50,000 to each organization as match funds to pay for research and assist in fundraising efforts. Florida Housing would enter into a contract with each organization to specify criteria for use of funds, including the following:
 - For every dollar provided by Florida Housing, the organization must provide at least two dollars in other funding specifically targeted for this research;
 - If a state university is part of an organization's research team, limit the indirect cost percentage assessed by that university to 10 percent for the portion of the funds provided by Florida Housing as well as the matching funds (note that Florida Housing is assessed no more than 10 percent in indirect costs by the state universities with which it has had contracts); and
 - The funding may not be used by the organization to fund internal staffing/operations, even if these costs are related to the research project.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

3. **Recommendation**

Approve up to \$50,000 in match funding to each of the three organizations awarded financing for developments through Request for Proposals 2014-102, and enter into a contract with each organization to specify that these funds may be used only for the purpose of paying for research specified in this RFP, according to the criteria above and any other criteria specified by Florida Housing.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION (PSS)

Action

IV. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION (PSS)

A. Request for Qualifications (RFQ) 2015-06, Public Relations, Media Planning and Buying Services

1. Background

At the September 18, 2015 meeting, the Board authorized Florida Housing staff to issue a solicitation to procure one or more vendors to provide public relations, media planning and buying services, and authorized the Executive Director to establish a review committee to make a recommendation to the Board.

2. Present Situation

- a) RFQ 2015-06 was issued on Friday, September 18, 2015. The deadline for receipt of responses was 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, October 20, 2015. A copy of the RFQ is provided as [Exhibit A](#).
- b) Four responses were received by the deadline from the following:
 - (1) BG AD Group;
 - (2) Commonground/MCS;
 - (3) Evok Advertising & Design, Inc.; and,
 - (4) Kidd Group Public Relations.
- c) Members of the review committee were Cecka Green (Chairperson), Communications Director; Taylore Maxey, Communications and Business Continuity Manager; and Zachary Wegman, Multimedia Design Specialist.
- d) Each member of the Review Committee individually reviewed the proposals submitted prior to the Review Committee meeting which was held at 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, November 3, 2015.
- e) At the November 3rd meeting, the Review Committee provided final scores for each of the responses. The score sheet is provided as [Exhibit B](#).

3. Recommendation

The Review Committee recommends that the Board authorize Florida Housing to enter into contract negotiations with the top three respondents: Commonground/MCS, Evok Advertising & Design, Inc., and Kidd Group Public Relations. Should negotiations fail with two or more of these respondents, then the committee recommends entering into contract negotiations with the fourth place respondent, BG AD Group.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION (PSS)

Action

B. Request for Proposals (RFP) 2016-01, Website Design, Development and Hosting Services

1. Background

- a) Beginning with the March 2015 Board meeting, Communications staff has provided informational items focused on Florida Housing's initiative to redevelop and redesign the Corporation's website, referred to as the Website Redevelopment Project (WRP). In an effort to adhere to best practices identified by other HFAs that are in the process of updating their websites, the WRP has been broken down into several phases.
- b) On March 20, 2015, Florida Housing issued a Request for Quote to a number of qualified local public relations firms as a part of Phase I of the WRP. The purpose of this initial phase was to procure a firm that would provide an in-depth review of the Corporation's and other HFA websites and recommendations as to how the redeveloped website should be organized/structured in order to provide intuitive navigation and a framework that best represents the Corporation's mission and brand, in addition to incorporating social media.
- c) BowStern, LLC, was determined to be the firm that would provide the best value to the Corporation, and was issued a contract for these services on April 14, 2015. BowStern conducted several interviews and workshops with key stakeholders, and presented their findings and suggestions for improvement to Florida Housing staff on August 20, 2015.

2. Present Situation

Now that Phase I is complete and staff has had an opportunity to analyze the results, Florida Housing is ready to move forward with the next phase of the project.

3. Recommendation

Authorize staff to begin the RFP process and establish a review committee to make recommendations to the Board on a firm to provide website design, development and hosting services.