

FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION
Board Meeting
March 24, 2017
Action Items



LEGAL

Action

I. LEGAL

A. **SP Trail, LLC and Southport Development, Inc. d/b/a Southport Development Services, Inc. v. Florida Housing Finance Corporation; FHFC Case No. 2016-060BP**

1. **Background**

- a) This case regards a protest filed against the funding awards for projects under Request for Applications (“RFA”) 2016-109 for State Apartment Incentive Loan (“SAIL”) Financing of Affordable Multifamily Housing Developments to be used in conjunction with Tax-Exempt Bonds and Non-Competitive Housing Credits. Petitioners SP Trail, LLC and Southport Development, Inc. d/b/a Southport Development Services, Inc., (collectively “Petitioners”) applied for funding through the RFA seeking allocation for a proposed Woodlawn Trail Development to be located in Pinellas County. The Review Committee determined that the Woodlawn Trail Development did not meet the RFA Mandatory Distance Requirement of being at least 2 miles from certain established properties, rendering it ineligible for funding.
- b) Petitioners filed a timely Notice of Intent to Protest and a Formal Written Protest (“Petition”) challenging the Corporation’s scoring of its Mandatory Distance Requirement, alleging that the Woodlawn Trail Development was in fact located greater than 2 miles from certain established properties. A Notice to Bidders was issued by the Corporation, informing all bidders that their substantial interests might be affected by the Petition. No bidders have intervened.

2. **Present Situation**

- a) As a result of settlement discussions, Petitioners and Florida Housing agree that the Woodlawn Trail Development met the Mandatory Distance requirement set forth in the RFA, and in the interest of avoiding the time, expense, and uncertainty of litigation, have agreed to enter into a Consent Agreement, attached as [Exhibit A](#). The Consent Agreement results in the Woodland Trail Development being selected for funding as well as Regatta Place. The Consent Agreement results in Boulevard at West River no longer being funded. Boulevard at West River has not intervened in this proceeding.

3. **Recommendation**

- a) Staff recommends that the Board adopt the Consent Agreement and issue a Final Order in accord with the Consent Agreement.

LEGAL

Action

B. Administrative Complaints and Orders of Ineligibility

1. Background

- a) In 2008 and 2009, Pinnacle Housing Group, LLC (PHG), received, through various affiliated Applicant entities, monetized low-income housing tax credits through the Tax Credit Exchange Program (TCEP) or the Tax Credit Assistance Program (TCAP), or both, funded through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). This funding was received regarding the following Developments:
 - (1) Cypress Cove 2009-047CTX (Polk);
 - (2) Vista Mar 2009-060CTX (Miami-Dade);
 - (3) Orchid Grove 2009-061CTX (Miami-Dade); and,
 - (4) Avery Glen 2010-044CX (Broward).
- b) Applications numbered “CX” received TCEP funding only, “CTX” Applications received both TCEP and TCAP funding.
- c) In connection with the above Developments, PHG, through its affiliated General Contractor, PHG Builders, LLC (PHG Builders), ostensibly employed another affiliated entity, DAXC, LLC (DAXC), as its “shell” (external construction) contractor. DAXC, in turn, subcontracted the shell construction for the Developments to a third, unaffiliated sub-contractor, Gillette, which actually performed the work on the Developments.
- d) At all times material hereto, PHG Builders and DACX were Affiliates of PHG or otherwise included common Principals within the meaning of Fla. Admin. Code R. 67-48.002(5) and (84), respectively. These Principals were:
 - (1) Louis Wolfson III
 - (2) Michael D. Wohl
 - (3) David O. Deutch
 - (4) Mitchell M. Friedman
 - (5) Felix Braverman
- e) DAXC was dissolved in September, 2014.
- f) The US Attorney for the Southern District of Florida office has investigated PHG and its related entities, including DAXC, regarding the construction costs reported to justify the amount of funding the Developments received. The Corporation has assisted with and participated in the investigation of the persons and entities involved.

LEGAL

Action

- g) As a result of this investigation, DAXC and the US Attorney have entered into a Deferred Prosecution Agreement attached hereto as [Exhibit B](#). This Agreement provides that DAXC is responsible for the acts of its officers, directors, employees, and agents. DAXC also agreed to an attached Statement of Facts which included the following stipulations and admissions, among others:
- (1) DAXC was a shell construction contractor, which was set up to inflate the cost of [the above] four low-income housing contracts and obtain excess federal funds that ultimately went for the personal benefit of five individuals associated with DAXC and its affiliates;
 - (2) The Developer of the four properties [PHG] and the Contractor [PHG Builders] submitted construction contracts to [the Corporation] with an inflated amount for concrete shell work;
 - (3) PHG Builders signed inflated contracts for the performance of shell work with its Affiliate, DAXC on all four Developments;
 - (4) These inflated contracts increased the concrete shell cost for each of the Developments by a total of approximately \$3.4 million compared to [Gillette's] final bid prices;
 - (5) This contract inflation also inflated the Developer's [PHG] and the General Contractors [PHG Builders] fees available by approximately \$800,000;
 - (6) DAXC did not have the equipment, personnel, or manpower to complete the concrete shell work for the Developments; and
 - (7) DAXC received the inflated proceeds and distributed over \$3.1 million of them for the personal benefit of the five individuals [the Principals listed above] associated with DAXC and its Affiliates.
- h) The Deferred Prosecution Agreement further provides that DAXC acknowledge that at least \$4,212,825 were proceeds involved in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 641 (Embezzlement of Government Property, et al.), that DAXC shall forfeit these proceeds to the United States government, and pay a fine of \$1 million.

2. Present Situation

- a) Fla. Admin. Code R. 67-48.004(2) authorizes the Board to determine that an Applicant or any Principal, Financial Beneficiary, or Affiliate of an Applicant, will be ineligible for funding or allocation in any Corporation program if the Board determines that such a person or entity has made a material misrepresentation or engaged in fraudulent actions in connection with any Application for a Corporation program. Upon the service of an Administrative Complaint under this Rule, all pending transactions involving the Respondents are suspended until the Board issues a Final Order. The duration of ineligibility may be determined by the Board in consideration of the facts and circumstances, compliance history, the type of misrepresentation or fraud committed, and the degree of harm to the Corporation's programs.
- b) Per the Deferred Prosecution Agreement, DAXC has admitted to material misrepresentation and fraudulent actions regarding the Applications connected

LEGAL

Action

to the Developments listed above. The entities and persons listed herein as officers of DAXC, PHG and PHG Builders are Affiliates of DAXC or otherwise meet the definition of Principal or Financial Beneficiary of DAXC.

3. Recommendation

- a) That the Board authorize staff to issue Administrative Complaints and Orders of Ineligibility against the five individuals listed above, as well as PHG, PHG Builders and any Affiliates as necessary and appropriate, to begin the proceedings to impose a five year period of ineligibility and to suspend all pending transactions of PHG and its Affiliates, and to declare PHG and the above listed Principals ineligible to receive any Corporation funding or allocation preliminarily committed to the following five Developments that have not yet commenced construction: Caribbean Village (2014-418S); Woodland Park Phase I (2016-008C); Pineda Village (2016-293C); Suncrest Court (2016-378BS); and Verbena (2017-161C).

LEGAL

Action

C. HTG Casaluna, LLC., vs. Florida Housing Finance Corporation; FHFC 2017-012BP

1. Background

- a) This case regards a protest filed in Request for Applications 2016-114 Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments located in Miami-Dade County (the “RFA”). Petitioner Casaluna, LLC (“Casaluna”) applied for funding through the RFA seeking an allocation of Low Income Housing Tax Credits. Casaluna was deemed ineligible.
- b) Casaluna timely filed a notice of intent to protest and a formal written protest challenging its ineligibility. Specifically, Casaluna was deemed ineligible due to a funding shortfall because Florida Housing did not consider a non-corporation financing proposal from Greystone & Co. Inc. (the “Greystone Letter”).

2. Present Situation

- a) As a result of settlement discussions, Casaluna and Florida Housing have resolved certain issues in this litigation, and agreed that in the interest of avoiding the time, expense, and uncertainty of litigation to enter into a Stipulation for Dismissal, attached as [Exhibit C](#).
- b) In significant part the Stipulation for Dismissal results in:
 - (1) Florida Housing agreeing the determination of Casaluna’s ineligibility in RFA 2016-114 based on the Greystone Letter was erroneous because of Florida Housing’s consistent pattern of accepting financing letters from Greystone & Co. Inc. with the same operative language, prior administrative case law precedent, and Florida Housing’s significant past favorable experience with Greystone & Co., Inc. and its nominees Greystone Funding Corporation and Greystone Servicing Corporation.
 - (2) Florida Housing and Casaluna agreeing that the determination of ineligibility of Casaluna in RFA 2016-114 shall not be modified.
 - (3) Casaluna will voluntarily dismiss its Formal Written Protest and Petition for Administrative Hearing.

3. Recommendation

- a) Staff recommends that the Board adopt the Stipulation for Dismissal and issue a Final Order in accord with such.

LEGAL

Action Supplement

I. LEGAL

A. OASIS AT RENAISSANCE PRESERVE I, LP, Petitioner, v. FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION, Respondent, and OSCEOLA PALOS VERDES, LTD, FHFC Case No. 2016-0061BP; DOAH Case No. 17-00486BID

1. Background

- a) This case regards RFA 2016-109, SAIL Financing of Affordable Multifamily Housing Developments to be used in Conjunction with Tax-Exempt Bond Financing and Non-Competitive Housing Credits (the “RFA”). On September 19, 2016, Florida Housing issued the RFA soliciting applications to award financing. The RFA was modified on September 21, 2016, October 4, 2016, and October 5, 2016. The only modification relevant to the litigation at issue here was the October 4, 2016 modification which revised the Applicant Certification and Acknowledgement Form. On December 9, 2016, Florida Housing posted a notice of its intended decision to award funding to Osceola Palos Verdes, LTD, (“Palos Verdes”) and other applicants. Oasis at Renaissance Preserve I, LP, (“Oasis”) was deemed ineligible.
- b) Pursuant to section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, Oasis timely filed a formal written protest contesting the ineligibility of its application due to a failure to meet the submission requirement for the Applicant Certification and Acknowledgment Form. Palos Verdes intervened in the matter. Oasis submitted the un-modified Applicant Certification and Acknowledgment Form in the binder that Oasis marked as “Original.” In the three (3) binders marked “Copy,” the modified version of the Applicant Certification and Acknowledgment Form was submitted. No material facts were in dispute and the matter was heard in an informal hearing by an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) pursuant to the ALJ Services Contract.
- c) In Section 3.A.1.e, the RFA requires that the Applicant Certification and Acknowledgment Form be submitted in the binder marked “Original” with an original signature. The RFA at Section 4.A.1 explicitly states, “[i]f the Applicant provides any version of the Applicant Certification and Acknowledgment Form other than the version included in this RFA, the form will not be considered. Also, Florida Housing issued a webBoard notice regarding the October 4, 2016 modification. The webBoard notice informed Applicants of the revisions to the RFA and stated “[f]or the Application to be eligible for funding, the Applicant Certification and Acknowledgment Form reflecting the 2nd Modification posted on 10-4-16 must be submitted to the Corporation by the Application Deadline.”
- d) The issue in this case is whether Florida Housing’s review of Oasis’s application was inconsistent with Florida Housing’s governing statutes, rules, solicitation specifications; and, if so, whether such action was clearly erroneous, contrary to competition, arbitrary, or capricious.

LEGAL

Action Supplement

2. Present Situation

- a) A hearing was conducted on February 10, 2017, before ALJ June C. McKinney at the Division of Administrative Hearings in Tallahassee, Florida. After the hearing, the parties filed Proposed Recommended Orders. After reviewing the Proposed Recommended Orders, the Administrative Law Judge issued a Recommended Order on March 15, 2017. The Recommended Order recommended that Florida Housing:

[E]nter a final order consistent with its initial decisions: (1) dismissing the formal written protests of Oasis at Renaissance Preserve I, LP, and (2) awarding funding to Osceola Palos Verdes, Ltd.

- b) A copy of the Recommended Order is attached as [Exhibit A](#).
- c) Oasis filed Exceptions and Objections to Recommended Order (“Exceptions”) on March 20, 2017. A copy of the Exceptions is attached as [Exhibit B](#). Oasis takes exception to Conclusions of Law in paragraphs 44, 45, 47, and 48, which suggest that Florida Housing has the discretion to decide not to waive a minor irregularity. Oasis objects to those conclusions as not being consistent with how Florida Housing has treated all other identified minor irregularities throughout the RFA process. In support of its position, Oasis cites several prior Florida Housing cases where Florida Housing found discrepancies in Applicants’ responses to RFAs to be waivable, minor irregularities.
- d) Florida Housing filed a Response to Petitioner’s Exceptions and Objections to Recommended Order on March 21, 2017, a copy of which is attached as [Exhibit C](#). Florida Housing responded that the ALJ recognized that Fla. Admin. Code R. 67-60.008 gives Florida Housing discretion to not waive “minor irregularities.” Further, that conclusion is consistent with the First District Court of Appeal precedent. Also, the administrative case law cited by Oasis is distinguishable from the instant case in that, here, the RFA provided explicit instructions on how Florida Housing would treat the failure to provide the modified certification in the “Original” binder.
- e) Intervenor Palos Verdes filed a Joinder in Florida Housing Finance Corporation’s Response to Petitioner’s Exceptions and Objections to Recommended Order on March 21, 2017, a copy of which is attached as [Exhibit D](#). Palos Verdes joins in the Response filed by Florida Housing.

3. Recommendation

- a) Staff recommends that the Board reject Oasis’s Exceptions, accept the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation in the ALJ’s Recommended Order and issue a Final Order in accord with such decisions.

LEGAL

Action Supplement

B. Appointment of Executive Director

1. Background

- a) On January 5, 2017, Steve Auger resigned as Executive Director of Florida Housing Finance Corporation. The Corporation advertised the job opening and received 35 applications. All applications were then turned over to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for further review.
- b) DEO ultimately selected five candidates and asked Florida Housing to interview them. A committee of the Board consisting of Barney Smith, Ray Dubuque, and Natasha Bastian interviewed Harold Trey Price, Michael Liu, Charlotte Flickinger, Ken Reecy, and Sandra O'Neil on March 1, 2017. After the interviews were completed, this committee convened a public meeting to discuss the applications and decided to recommend three candidates for further consideration: Mr. Price, Ms. Flickinger, and Mr. Reecy. This recommendation was sent to the Executive Director of DEO.
- c) After interviewing the three candidates provided by the Committee, the Executive Director of DEO has selected **Harold "Trey" Price** for consideration by the Board as the new Executive Director of Florida Housing Finance Corporation ([Exhibit E](#)).

2. Present Situation

- a) Section 420.506, Fla. Stat., provides that the appointment of an executive director "shall be by the executive director of the Department of Economic Opportunity, with the advice and consent of the corporation's board of directors." At the March 24 meeting of the Board of Directors of Florida Housing, the Executive Director of DEO will present the Board with her selection for Executive Director of Florida Housing. The Board must then consider the selection and determine whether or not to consent to the appointment.
- b) By a series of resolution, the Board has previously delegated signature authority to the Executive Director, Chief Financial Officer, and Comptroller to execute corporation bonds and related documents, and has designated certain additional Corporation staff as Assistant Secretaries of the Corporation for purposes of attesting signatures on bond documents. Should the Board consent to the appointment of a new Executive Director, staff recommends that the Board adopt Resolutions 2017-05 ([Exhibit F](#)) and 2017-06 ([Exhibit G](#)) delegating signature authority and designating staff as described in the respective Resolutions.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

II. MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

A. Request for Applications (RFA) 2016-110 – Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Medium and Small Counties

1. Background/Present Situation

- a) On October 7, 2016, Florida Housing staff issued RFA 2016-110, offering an estimated \$12,789,632 of Housing Credit financing to qualified Applicants proposing the construction or rehabilitation of Developments located in Medium and Small Counties. The deadline for receipt of Applications was 11:00 a.m., Eastern Time, Friday, December 2, 2016.
- b) Florida Housing received 137 Applications in response to this RFA. The Review Committee members, designated by the Executive Director, were Elizabeth Thorp, Multifamily Housing Development Manager, Libby O’Neill, Multifamily Programs Manager, Eva Fambro-Price, Multifamily Programs Manager, Heather Greene, Multifamily Programs Manager, and Kevin Tatreau, Director of Multifamily Finance. 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 March 9, 2017 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 2016-110 All Applications chart (provided as Exhibit A) lists the eligible 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:
- f) A motion to adopt the scoring results, as set out on [Exhibit A](#); and
- g) A motion to tentatively select the Applications set out on [Exhibit B](#) for funding and invite the Applicants to enter credit underwriting.
- h) Both of the motions were passed unanimously.
- i) 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 137 Applications (set out on Exhibit A), and authorize the tentative selection of the 10 Applications (set out on Exhibit B) for funding and invitation to enter credit underwriting.
- b) An unallocated balance of \$240,983 in Competitive Housing Credits remains. The unallocated balance 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) 2016-115 - SAIL Financing for Smaller Permanent Supportive Housing Developments for Persons with Special Needs

1. Background/Present Situation

- a) On November 28, 2016, Florida Housing staff issued RFA 2016-115, offering an estimated \$16,100,000 million of State Apartment Incentive Loan (SAIL) funding to qualified Applicants proposing the construction or rehabilitation to create new Permanent Supportive Housing for Persons with Special Needs. The deadline for receipt of Applications was 11:00 a.m., Eastern Time, Thursday, January 19, 2017.
- b) Florida Housing received 7 Applications in response to this RFA. The Review Committee members, designated by the Executive Director, were Bill Aldinger, Assistant Policy Director, Karla Brown, Multifamily Programs Manager, Bill Cobb, Multifamily Programs Manager, Rachael Grice, Multifamily Programs Manager, Elaine Roberts, Senior Supportive Housing Analyst, Kevin Tatreau, Director of Multifamily Finance, and John Toman, Policy 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 March 9, 2017 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 2016-115 All Applications chart (provided as Exhibit C) lists the eligible 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 C](#); and
 - (2) A motion to tentatively select the Applications set out on [Exhibit D](#) for funding 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 7 Applications (set out on Exhibit C), and authorize the tentative selection of the 2 Applications (set out on Exhibit D) for funding and invitation to enter credit underwriting.
- b) An unallocated balance of \$6,983,211 in SAIL funding remains. Per the RFA, the unallocated balance will be distributed as approved by the Board. Staff recommends the Board approve the issuance of another RFA for Smaller Permanent Supportive Housing Developments for Persons with Special Needs utilizing the unallocated balance.
- 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 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 invitations to enter credit underwriting to those Applicants in the funding range.

MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

Action

C. 2017 Rule Development

1. Background/Present Situation

- a) A Rule development workshop was held on February 20, 2017 in order to solicit comments concerning the proposed changes to the 2016 Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) and Rule Chapters 67-21 and 67-48, F.A.C.
- b) As a result of this workshop, staff has revised the rules governing the various multifamily programs. Staff would like to proceed with the rule development process for these rules and requests the Board's approval of the proposed Rules and QAP. A supplement to the Board Package will be provided which contains the proposed Rules and the proposed 2017 QAP.
- c) If the Board approves the proposed rules and QAP as presented, the Notices of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPRs) will be published in the March 28, 2017 edition of the Florida Administrative Register. The NOPRs will announce the Rule Hearings which are scheduled for April 19, 2017, in Tallahassee. Following review of the public comments received at the Rule Hearings and the comments received from the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee following its review of the NOPRs, staff will proceed as follows:
 - (1) If modification of the proposed rules is not required, staff will file the proposed rules for adoption.
 - (2) If modification of the proposed rules is required, staff will prepare the necessary Notice of Change (NOC) to incorporate all proposed modifications to the proposed rule and, if required, will submit the NOC for Board approval.

2. Recommendation

- a) Approve the proposed rules and QAP and authorize staff to file the rules for adoption if a NOC is not required, and, if a NOC is required, authorize the Chair to determine whether a NOC makes material, substantive changes to the rule chapter. If the Chair determines that it does not, staff recommends that the Board approve such NOC without the requirement of another Board meeting. In the alternative, if the Chair determines that any NOC does make material, substantive changes to the rule chapter, staff recommends that a telephonic Board meeting be called to obtain Board approval for any required changes, with such changes to be ratified at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION (PSS)

Action

III. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION (PSS)

A. Request for Qualifications (RFQ) 2017-03, Advisor Agencies for the Hardest Hit Fund (HHF) Program

1. Background

- a) At the September 16, 2016 meeting, the Board authorized Florida Housing staff to issue a solicitation to procure qualified firms to provide Advisor Agencies for the HHF Program. At the February 3, 2017 meeting, the Board authorized second competitive solicitation for these services in an effort to procure additional firms.

2. Present Situation

- a) Request for Qualifications (RFQ) 2017-03 was issued on Friday, February 3, 2017. The deadline for receipt of responses was 2:00 p.m., Friday, February 17, 2017. A copy of the RFQ and is provided as [Exhibit A](#).
- b) Seven responsive responses were received by the deadline from the following:
 - (1) Broward County Housing Authority
 - (2) Home Ownership Resource Center of Lee County
 - (3) Housing and Neighborhood Development Services of Central Florida, Inc.
 - (4) Solita's House, Inc.
 - (5) St. Petersburg Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc. d/b/a Neighborhood Home Solutions
 - (6) Tampa Bay Community Development Corporation
 - (7) The Johnson Firm, P.A.
- c) Members of the review committee were Matt Jugenheimer, HHF Compliance Officer (Chairperson); Bradley Rich, HHF Compliance Manager; and Lisa Walker, HHF Analyst.
- d) Each member of the Review Committee individually reviewed the proposals submitted prior to convening for the Review Committee meeting which was held at 2:00 p.m., Monday, February 27, 2017.
- e) At the February 27th meeting, the Review Committee members provided their final scores for the responses received. The score sheet is provided as [Exhibit B](#).

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION (PSS)

Action

3. **Recommendation**

- a) The Review Committee recommends that the Board authorize Florida Housing to enter into contract negotiations with each of the seven of the responsive agencies.