BEFORE THE FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION

AMBAR TRAIL, LTD.,

Petitioner,

vs.

FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION,

Respondent.

________________________________________

FORMAL WRITTEN PROTEST
AND PETITION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING

Petitioner Ambar Trail, Ltd. ("Petitioner" or "Ambar Trail") files this Formal Written Protest and Petition for Administrative Hearing ("Petition") pursuant to section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, and rules 67-60.009 and 28-110.004, Florida Administrative Code. This Petition challenges the preliminary awards and scoring decisions of Respondent Florida Housing Finance Corporation ("Florida Housing") in connection with Request for Applications ("RFA") 2019-112, Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Miami-Dade County.

I. Summary

1. This petition challenges the fundamental fairness and propriety of Florida Housing's evaluation and selection process in connection with RFA 2019-112. More specifically, and as discussed in detail below, Florida Housing erred by failing to take any action regarding 15 Priority I Applications submitted by entities associated with Housing Trust Group, LLC ("HTG"), which openly avoided and defied the RFA provisions that (1) were intended to limit the number of competitive Applications submitted by each Developer to no more than "three (3) Priority I Applications" and (2) were intended to foster fair competition based on Corporation Funding Per
Set Aside Unit. Florida Housing’s failure to take any action with respect to the 15 affiliated Priority I applications placed other Applicants, including Petitioner – Applicants who followed the RFA’s limitations regarding submission of Priority I Applications, and who did not act to eliminate competition on the basis of Corporation Funding Per Set Aside Unit – at a competitive disadvantage and rendered the entire RFA’s scoring and selection process fundamentally unfair. Consequently, in accordance with longstanding procurement law requiring fairness in competitive bidding, the RFA must be withdrawn and all preliminary awards and scores must be rescinded. Florida Housing must issue a new RFA for Housing Credit financing in Miami-Dade County that treats all Applicants fairly.

2. Florida Housing’s Director of Multifamily Programs, Marisa Button, made an unprecedented statement at the Florida Housing Review Committee meeting on January 9, 2020, when the 63 Applications submitted in response to the RFA were scored, and preliminary awards were recommended to the Florida Housing Board of Directors (“Board”). Ms. Button read a detailed statement into the record noting many of the “organizational commonalities” among the 15 HTG Applications. See Transcript of Florida Housing Review Committee Meeting, pp. 23-24 (full transcript attached as Exhibit A). The Review Committee then went on to score the Applicants (including those 15 entities affiliated with HTG) and to approve recommendations of awards to the Board.¹

¹ One of the HTG Applications was recommended for funding at the January 9, 2020, meeting. (Orchid Pointe, App. No. 2020-148C, was preliminary selected to satisfy a goal of funding an Elderly Development). However, the Review Committee reconvened on January 21, 2020, to rescore the Applications after it was determined that three Applications that had been found ineligible because they or their affiliates were in financial arrears to Florida Housing were, in fact, not in arrears as of the close of business on January 8, 2020. The rescoring resulted in a different Applicant, not affiliated with HTG, being recommended for funding. The replacement of the previously recommended HTG Applicant was unrelated to the “organizational commonalities”
3. Despite the public airing of the “organizational commonalities” of the 15 HTG Applications at the Review Committee meeting, Florida Housing’s staff said nothing about the related Applications at the Board meeting on January 23, 2020, when the Review Committee’s recommendations were considered and approved. Nor did any material in the Board’s agenda packets reference the concerns that Ms. Button identified at the Review Committee meeting regarding the HTG entities’ Applications. Thus, absent some conversations outside of a public meeting, it appears Board members (who collectively serve as the governing body and “agency head” of Florida Housing) were unaware of the efforts of one Developer to manipulate the requirements of the RFA for that Developer’s own benefit.

4. The relief sought by this Petition is the withdrawal of RFA 2019-112 and all preliminary recommendations relating to scoring, ranking, and funding of the submitted Applications. Petitioner requests that a new RFA be issued, with appropriate changes to ensure a level playing field, relating to Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Miami-Dade County.

II. Parties

5. Petitioner is a legally formed entity qualified to do business in Florida that applied for funding pursuant to the RFA. Petitioner sought funding in connection with the proposed new construction of a 210-unit, mid-rise, four-story apartment complex called Ambar Trail in Miami-Dade County, Florida, to serve the family demographic. For purposes of this proceeding, Petitioner’s address, telephone number, and email address are those of its undersigned counsel. Petitioner is represented by Donna E. Blanton of the Radey Law Firm, 301 S. Bronough Street, referenced by Ms. Button, and no reference to the 15 common HTG Applications was made at the January 21 Review Committee meeting.
6. Florida Housing is the agency affected by this Petition. Florida Housing’s address is 227 North Bronough Street, Suite 5000, Tallahassee, Florida 32301. Florida Housing’s file number for Petitioner’s application is 2020-142C.

**III. Notice**

7. Petitioner received notice of Florida Housing’s intended decision to award funding pursuant to the RFA on January 23, 2020, when Florida Housing’s Board voted to approve the recommendation of its Review Committee, which previously had recommended certain applicants for funding. Copies of the formal notices posted on the Florida Housing website on January 24, 2020, concerning the Board’s action are attached as Exhibit B (RFA 2019-112 Board Approved Preliminary Awards) and Exhibit C (RFA 2019-112 Board Approved Scoring Results). Petitioner was determined to be eligible for funding, but was not among those recommended for funding.

8. Petitioner timely filed a notice of intent to protest on January 29, 2020. A copy of that notice is attached as Exhibit D.

**IV. Background**

9. Florida Housing is a public corporation created by section 420.504, Florida Statutes, to administer the governmental function of awarding various types of funding for affordable housing in Florida. RFA 2019-112 proposes to award $7,195,917 of Housing Credit financing for affordable housing Developments located in Miami-Dade County.

10. Florida Housing has the responsibility and authority to establish procedures for allocating and distributing various types of funding for affordable housing. In accordance with
that authority, Florida Housing has adopted chapter 67-60, Florida Administrative Code, which
governs the competitive solicitation process for several programs. Applicants for funding
pursuant to RFA 2019-112 are required to comply with provisions of the RFA. See RFA, § Three
F.3., p. 6.

11. The RFA was issued on August 20, 2019, and amended on September 19, 2019,
and on October 8, 2019. Applications were required to be submitted to Florida Housing by
October 22, 2019. The RFA establishes a series of mandatory eligibility requirements, as well as
a detailed process of selecting Applicants for funding. See RFA, pp. 63-69 (§ Five A. and B.).
Applicants that do not meet the identified “Eligibility Items” on page 64 of the RFA cannot be
selected for funding.

12. This RFA also established a “Priority Designation of Applications,” which
provides in relevant part:

Priority Designation of Applications

Applicants may submit no more than three (3) Priority I Applications. There is no
limit to the number of Priority II Applications that can be submitted; however, no
Principal can be a Principal, as defined in Rule Chapter 67-48.002(94), F.A.C., of
more than three (3) Priority I Applications.

For purposes of scoring, Florida Housing will rely on the Principals of the
Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Form (Rev. 05-2019) outlined below in
order to determine if a Principal is a Principal on more than three (3) Priority I
Applications. If during scoring it is determined that a Principal is disclosed as a
Principal on more than three (3) Priority I Applications, all such Priority I
Applications will be deemed Priority II.

If it is later determined that a Principal, as defined in Rule Chapter 67-48.002(94),
F.A.C., was not disclosed as a Principal and the undisclosed Principal causes the
maximum set forth above to be exceeded, the award(s) for the affected
Application(s) will be rescinded and all Principals of the affected Applications may
be subject to material misrepresentation, even if the Applications were not selected
for funding, were deemed ineligible, or were withdrawn.
RFA, pp. 6-7 (§ Four A.). According to statements of Florida Housing’s staff at workshops, the purpose of the provision was to incentivize Developers to submit their best Applications and to limit the overall number of Applications submitted, given the limited amount of Housing Credit financing available.

13. The definition of “Principal” in rule 67-48.002(94) provides:

“Principal” means:
(a) For a corporation, each officer, director, executive director, and shareholder of the corporation.
(b) For a limited partnership, each general partner and each limited partner of the limited partnership.
(c) For a limited liability company, each manager and each member of the limited liability company.
(d) For a trust, each trustee of the trust and all beneficiaries of majority age (i.e., 18 years of age) as of the Application deadline.
(e) For a Public Housing Authority, each officer, director, commissioner, and executive director of the Authority.

14. The RFA awarded five points to each Applicant that submitted a Pre-Approved Principal Disclosure Form to Florida Housing, five points relating to the Development Experience Withdrawal Disincentive, and five points for contributions from a Local Government. Because many Applicants often achieve the maximum number of points and meet the mandatory eligibility requirements, the RFA sets forth a series of tie-breakers to determine which Applications will be awarded funding. The RFA also established specific goals to fund certain types of developments. The goals and tie-breakers are as follows:

1. Goals

a. The Corporation has a goal to fund one (1) proposed Development that (a) selected the Demographic Commitment of Family at question 2.a. of Exhibit A and (b) qualifies for the Geographic Areas of Opportunity/SADDA Goal as outlined in Section Four A.11.a.
b. The Corporation has a goal to fund one (1) proposed Development that selected the Demographic Commitment of Elderly (Non-ALF) at question 2.a. of Exhibit A.

*Note: During the Funding Selection Process outlined below, Developments selected for these goals will only count toward one goal.

2. Application Sorting Order

All eligible Priority 1 Applications will be ranked by sorting the Applications as follows, followed by Priority II Applications.

a. First, from highest score to lowest score;

b. Next, by the Application’s eligibility for the Proximity Funding Preference (which is outlined in Section Four A.5.e. of the RFA) with Applications that qualify for the preference listed above Applications that do not qualify for the preference;

c. Next, by the Application’s eligibility for the Per Unit Construction Funding Preference which is outlined in Section Four A.10.e. of the RFA (with Applications that qualify for the preference listed above Applications that do not qualify for the preference);

d. Next, by the Application’s eligibility for the Development Category Funding Preference which is outlined in Section Four A.4.(b)(4) of the RFA (with Applications that qualify for the preference listed above Applications that do not qualify for the preference);

e. Next, by the Application’s Leveraging Classification, applying the multipliers outlined in Item 3 of Exhibit C of the RFA (with Applications having the Classification of A listed above Applications having the Classification of B);

f. Next, by the Application’s eligibility for the Florida Job Creation Funding Preference which is outlined in Item 4 of Exhibit C of the RFA (with Applications that qualify for the preference listed above Applications that do not qualify for the preference); and

g. And finally, by lottery number, resulting in the lowest lottery number receiving preference.

RFA, pp. 67-68 (§ Five B.1. and 2.).

15. The Leveraging Classification referenced in the Application Sorting Order is
explained in detail on pages 98-100 of the RFA. In essence, eligible Applicants are sorted into Group A or Group B based on the amount of total Corporation funding per set-aside unit that each Applicant requests. Applicants assigned to Group A are those requesting a lower amount of total Corporation funding per set-aside unit. Generally, the Leveraging Classification results in approximately 80 percent of the Applicants being assigned to Group A and 20 percent of Applicants being assigned to Group B. Group A Applicants are funded before Group B Applicants, which means that Applicants have an incentive to be efficient in estimating their costs to ensure that their requested funding places them in Group A. In separating the Group A Applicants from the Group B Applicants, the RFA provides as follows:

The total number of Applications on the New Construction List will be multiplied by 80 percent and the resulting figure will be rounded up to the next whole number (the resulting figure after rounding will be referred to as the “New Construction A/B Cut-Off”). A line will be drawn below the Application whose place on the list is equal to the New Construction A/B Cut-Off. If any Application(s) below the line has the same total Corporation funding request per set-aside unit as the Application immediately above the line, the line will be moved to a place immediately below that Application(s). Applications above the New Construction A/B Cut-Off will be classified as Group A and Applications below the New Construction A/B Cut-Off will be classified as Group B.

(Emphasis supplied). In other words, once the A/B Cut-Off line is determined, Florida Housing checks to see if the Applicant immediately below the line has the same total Corporation Funding Request Per Set-Aside unit as the Applicant above the line. If so, the line is moved down to ensure that Applicants requesting the same amount of funding are in Group A.

16. The Funding Selection Process then provides:

a. The first Application selected for funding will be the highest ranking eligible Priority I Family Application that qualifies for the Geographic Areas of Opportunity / SADDA Goal. If there are none, then the first Application selected for funding will be the highest ranking eligible Priority II Family Application that qualifies for the Geographic Areas of Opportunity / SADDA Goal.
b. The next Application selected for funding will be the highest ranking eligible Priority I Application that qualifies as an Elderly (Non-ALF) Development. If there are none, then the next Application selected for funding will be the highest ranking eligible Priority II Application that qualifies as an Elderly (Non-ALF) Development.

c. The next Application(s) selected for funding will be the highest ranking unfunded Priority I Application(s), regardless of Demographic Category until no more than three (3) total Applications are selected for funding. If less than three Applications are selected for funding and there are no eligible unfunded Priority I Applications, then the next Application(s) selected for funding will be the highest ranking unfunded Priority II Application(s), regardless of Demographic Category until no more than three (3) total Applications are selected for funding. If the third Application cannot be fully funded, it will be entitled to receive a Binding Commitment for the unfunded balance.

d. If funding remains after selecting the three (3) highest ranking eligible unfunded Applications as outlined above, or if funding remains because there are not three (3) eligible Applications that can be funded as outlined above, then no further Applications will be considered for funding and any remaining funding will be distributed as approved by the Board.

17. As previously noted, the Review Committee met on January 9 and January 21 to score the Applications and select Applicants for funding. The Committee followed the Funding Selection Process on page 68 of the RFA to recommend the following three Applications for funding: Harbour Springs (App. No. 2020-101C), which met the Geographic Areas of Opportunity/SADDA Goal; Slate Miami (App. 2020-122C), which met the Elderly (non-ALF) Goal; and Residences at Naranja Lakes, which was the next highest-ranked eligible Priority I Application. The Board approved the Committee’s recommendations at its meeting on January 23, 2020.

V. The HTG Entity Applications

18. During the process of reviewing the submitted Applications, Florida Housing noticed that 15 of the 63 submitted Applications had certain common features. Although no Principal on those Applications appeared on more than three Applications, numerous other commonalities suggested that all of the Applications were affiliated with HTG, according to the
statement read by Ms. Button at the January 9, 2020, Review Committee meeting. A complete copy of Ms. Button’s signed statement that she read into the record can be found at Exhibit E.

19. Ms. Button first read the provision in Section Four A. of the RFA relating to Priority Designation of Applications. Then she read the following:

The following Priority I designated Applications contain Principals of the Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Forms with separate designations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative: Mathew Rieber</th>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative: Randy Rieber</th>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative: Cara Balogh</th>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative: Orla Teitelbaum</th>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative: Robert Balogh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-097C</td>
<td>2020-102C</td>
<td>2020-091C</td>
<td>2020-132C</td>
<td>2020-095C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-109C</td>
<td>2020-115C</td>
<td>2020-100C</td>
<td>2020-148C</td>
<td>2020-103C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-146C</td>
<td>2020-105C</td>
<td>2020-130C</td>
<td>2020-149C</td>
<td>2020-133C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Principals of the Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Forms for these Applications do not reflect a Principal designated on more than 3 Priority I Applications. However, the designated Priority I Applications share the following organizational commonalities, including:

- Under Section Three A.4.b., of the RFA, all 15 Applications submitted an Application Fee provided by HTG United, LLC from the same account number.
- Under Section Three A.4.a., of the RFA, all 15 Applications were submitted with hard copy binders under the cover sheet of Housing Trust Group, with the address of Aviation Avenue, Coconut Grove, Florida.
- Under Section Four A.3.c.2., of the RFA, all 15 of the Advance Review of Principal Disclosure Form requests for the Applications were submitted from individuals associated with Housing Trust Group, LLC at the address 3225 Aviation Avenue, Coconut Grove, Florida.
- Under Section Four A.3.e.2., of the RFA, all of the Applications share the same operational Contact Person, Scott Osman, associated with Housing Trust Group, LLC, at 3225 Aviation Avenue, Coconut Grove, Florida.
- With the exception of Application 2020-109C, under Exhibit C Section 3 of the RFA, all of the Applications share the exact same Corporation Funding Per Set Aside Amount.

See Exhibit E; see also Exhibit A, pages 20-24 (transcript).²

² In addition to the similarities in the Applications identified by Ms. Button, all 15 of the HTG Applications had the same Housing Credit investor, Raymond James Tax Credit Funds, Inc.,
20. Ms. Button then made a statement putting HTG on notice that “if it is determined at a later point that a principal was not disclosed on any of the applications” then “the affected applications will be rescinded, and all principals of the affected applications may be subject to material misrepresentation consequences.” Exhibit A, pp. 23-24. (Emphasis supplied). As noted earlier, the Board apparently was not informed of Ms. Button’s concerns, and all HTG Applications were scored and determined to be eligible.

21. Florida Housing should have determined that all of the HTG Applications violated Florida Housing’s intent to limit Priority I Applications, given the noted commonalities. The most egregious of these commonalities is identified in the last bullet point cited by Ms. Button in her written statement, that 14 of the 15 Applications “share the exact same Corporation Funding Per Set Aside Amount.”

3 That amount, $158,961.60, was the highest requested Corporation Funding Per Set Aside Unit amount identified by any eligible Applicant. When the Review Committee did the math to compute the A/B Cut-Off line, the line fell below the first of the 14 HTG applications with the same requested funding per set-aside unit. Because all other Applications below that line had requested the exact same Corporation Funding Per Set Aside Unit, $158,961.60, the Group A line was extended to the end of the eligible Applications. Thus, all of the Priority I Applications

and each had the same first mortgage lender, JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. Additionally, a review of site control documents involving third parties in the HTG applications shows that 14 of the 15 Applications included documents that were executed by HTG entities. Matthew Rieger was the signatory in 12 of the 15 site control documents and Randy Rieger was the signatory in 2 of the site control documents, prior to assignment to the respective applicant entities, as applicable. Additionally, the Principals identified in Ms. Button’s chart have all been long-associated with HTG. Randy Rieger is Matthew Rieger’s father, and Robert and Cara Balogh are married. Orli Teitlebaum is listed on record with the State of Florida as an officer in dozens of entities controlled by Robert and Cara Balogh, as well as several entities involving Randy and Matthew Rieger, including entities with “HTG” as part of their name.

3 The one Application that is different is Shoreview Place (App. No. 2020-109C).
that had previously been determined to be eligible for funding were all in Group A, and there were no Group B Applicants. A total of 63 Applications were submitted in response to RFA 2019-112. The 14 related HTG applications with the same requested funding per set-aside unit represented 22.22% of total submitted applications. This volume of Priority I applications from one Developer, while other Developers’ Priority I applications were capped, had the effect of manipulating and rendering meaningless Florida Housing’s Leveraging Classification process described on pages 98-100 of the RFA. Put simply, the process was designed to eliminate the 20% highest request amounts per unit, but was manipulated when Florida Housing permitted one Developer to submit more than 20% of the Priority I applications as a unified blocking piece. Exhibit A, p. 41. A spreadsheet sorting all RFA 2019-112 Applications by Total Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside Unit is attached at Exhibit F. It shows that the last 14 Applications are all those affiliated with HTG entities and that each of them has a total Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside Unit amount request of $158,961.60.

22. It defies belief that each of the five HTG-related entities independently arrived at the same funding request per set-aside unit. It is not unusual for Applications submitted by the same Developer to have the same Corporation funding request per set-aside unit, assuming the proposed Developments are of a similar type, as the Developer has presumably done its best to efficiently estimate the project costs and is aiming to be in Group A. The Developer does not want to disadvantage any one of its Application over another, so the requested funding per set-aside unit is made the same so that the A/B Cut-Off line does not fall between two of the Developer’s Applications. However, it defies logic and statistics for five unrelated Applicants to have the exact same total Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside Unit.

23. By manipulating the Leveraging Classification calculations to ensure that all of its
Applications were in Group A, the HTG entities effectively rendered the Leveraging Classification procedures meaningless and placed greater emphasis on lottery numbers in determining which Applicants would be funded. Because HTG entities submitted 15 Priority I Applications instead of the three Priority I Applications other Developers were allowed, the HTG entities increased their chances of obtaining lower (better) lottery numbers. Had HTG entities submitted only three Applications, there would have been 51 total Applicants instead of 63. The mathematical chances of a rule-abiding Developer obtaining a more favorable lottery number are far worse when one Developer is allowed to submit five times the number of applications as the rule-abiding developer.⁴

VI. Substantial Interests Affected

24. Florida Housing’s scoring and selection processes are subject to the bid protest provisions in the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 120, Florida Statutes. Courts and Administrative Law Judges (“ALJs”) interpreting these provisions have held that participants in procurements, even if a participant has no chance of getting the contract, have standing to challenge the fundamental fairness of the process. *Fairbanks, Inc. v. State, Dep’t of Transp.*, 635 So. 2d 58 (Fla. 1st DCA 1994) (even nonbidders can establish standing when the fundamental fairness of the public contracting process is challenged). *See also NCS Pearson, Inc. v. Dep’t of Educ.*, DOAH Case No. 04-3976B1D, Recommended Order, ¶ 85 (February 8, 2005), where the ALJ wrote:

Both Petitioner, the protestor, and Harcourt, an Intervenor, have challenged the fundamental fairness of Respondent’s procurement process. Both vendors argue that the evaluation committee’s review of supplemental material after proposals were opened and the evaluation committee’s failure to consider proposal

⁴ Lottery numbers are assigned, at random, by Florida Housing shortly after the Applications are received and before any scoring has begun.
alternatives during the evaluation process were contrary to Respondent’s governing statutes and the RFP. These challenges to the propriety of the evaluation process provide a basis for standing of both vendors. They argue that under a fair procurement process that followed the requirements of section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes (2004), and the RFP, Harcourt or Petitioner may have received a higher score and been awarded the contract instead of CTB. They argue, further, that every vendor that participated in this flawed procurement is entitled to a rebidding under a fair process, which may result in an award to any of the bidders. . . . Both Petitioner and Harcourt were “adversely affected” by the alleged flawed process that led to Respondent’s proposed agency action.

(Emphasis supplied).

25. Other cases also have found that a low-ranked bidder who cannot effectively challenge all of the higher-ranked bidders has standing when the fairness of the process itself is under attack. E.g., Bozoll, Inc. v. State of Florida Department of the Lottery, DOAH Case No. 91-3165BID, Recommended Order, ¶ 80 (July 25, 1991) (Fourth-ranked bidder had standing not only to protect its position but to challenge “the propriety of the evaluation process.”). Barton Protective Services, LLC v. Dep’t of Transp., DOAH Case No. 06-1541BID, Recommended Order, ¶ 2 (“Petitioner has an independent basis for standing because of its challenge to the fundamental fairness of the RFP process.”).

26. In determining that parties have standing in a particular procurement, courts and ALJs have often focused on the intent behind public procurement statutes that a fair process be provided. In Fairbanks, the First District Court of Appeal noted:

The courts of this state have held on numerous occasions that the legislative intent behind such statutes is protection of the public. . . . Given such an intent, such statutes ‘should be construed to advance their purpose and to avoid their being circumvented.’ Marriott Corp. v. Metropolitan Dade County, 383 So. 2d 662, 665 (Fla. 3d DCA 1980).

. . . .

[In] Groves Watkins the court concluded that, notwithstanding the broad discretion invested in the Department by the legislature, because of the manifest overriding
concern for the integrity of the bidding process, bidders are entitled to some administrative review of the Department’s decisions.

635 So. 2d at 60.

27. The First District Court of Appeal also has commented on the need for fairness, honesty, and consistency in Florida Housing’s scoring and selection process of Applicants, stating:

Common sense and logic dictate that if such a program of economic incentives to private investors to commit to low-income housing is to succeed, the process of determining who is qualified for loans and/or tax credits must be administered fairly, honestly, and consistently according to the rules that Appellee [Florida Housing] is charged with implementing. The allegations in the petition, taken as true for purposes of appellate review, indicate that the scoring and ranking process used by Appellee to evaluate Appellant’s and Windsong II’s applications was not carried out in a manner consistent with the agency’s mandate to create and administer investment incentives. Once it became aware of perceived irregularities or improprieties in the application evaluation procedures employed by Appellee, Appellant was denied any meaningful opportunity to be heard. Were Appellee’s interpretation of its rules to be approved by this court, then an unsuccessful, simultaneous applicant for a finite, limited benefit who questions the integrity of the evaluation process itself would not have an adequate forum to be heard. An agency could act fraudulently, illegally, arbitrarily, dishonestly, or inconsistently with impunity. The administrative need for decisional finality is a nullity if the road toward closure does not permit a reasonable point of entry for an aggrieved applicant to speak and be heard.

_Ybor III, Ltd. v. Florida Housing Finance Corp., 843 So. 2d 344, 346 (Fla. 1st DCA 2003).^5_

28. Florida courts have long held that competitive bidding requirements are intended to protect the public “against collusive contracts; to secure fair competition upon equal terms to all bidders; to remove not only collusion but temptation for collusion and opportunity for gain at public expense; to close all avenues to favoritism and fraud in various forms; to secure the best values at the lowest possible expense; and to afford an equal advantage to all desiring to do

---

^5_ Ybor involved a previous version of Florida Housing’s processes for scoring and ranking Applicants, but the point remains the same: Applicants must have an opportunity to challenge a process that is inconsistent with the agency’s governing statutes, rules, policies, or the solicitation specifications. Petitioner does here, given its challenge to the fundamental fairness of the process.
business with the [government], by affording an opportunity for an exact comparison of bids.”

Wesier v. Belote, 103 Fla. 976, 138 So. 721, 723-24 (Fla. 1931); Finley Method Co. v. Standard Asphalt Co. of Florida, 104 Fla. 126, 139 So. 795, 796-97 (Fla. 1932) (“What the public has to be on guard against . . . [is] the suave and insidiously evasive arrangements which, operating in secret understandings between contractors and their privies, tend to produce an effect as harmful in result as the most direct misconduct or malfeasance.”).

29. Petitioner submitted an eligible Application in response to RFA 2019-112. Petitioner was disadvantaged by the unfair RFA review, scoring, and funding process employed by Florida Housing All other Applicants in RFA 2019-112 adhered to the requirement in the RFA that only three Priority I Applications may be submitted by the same Principal. Only the HTG entities attempted to “game the system” in a way that made it more likely that one or more of their entities would be selected for funding. Such gamesmanship is exactly what the Court in Finley Method warned about: “suave and insidiously evasive arrangements [that] tend to produce an effect as harmful in result as the most direct misconduct or malfeasance.” Id.

VII. Florida Housing’s Remedies Regarding the HTG Applications

30. Two RFA provisions, in addition to the provision Ms. Button addressed in her statement, gave Florida Housing the ability to address the concerns about the HTG Applications when they became apparent. Section Three C.2. of the RFA provides:

C. Florida Housing reserves the right to:
1. Waive Minor Irregularities; and
2. Accept or reject any or all Applications received as a result of this RFA.

RFA, p. 5, § Three C.2. (Emphasis supplied). Further, Section Six provides:

The Board may use the Applications, the Committee’s scoring, any other information or recommendation provided by the Committee or staff, and any other information the Board deems relevant in its selection of Applicants to whom to
award funding. Notwithstanding an award by the Board pursuant to this RFA, funding will be subject to a positive recommendation from the Credit Underwriter based on criteria outlined in the credit underwriting provisions in Rule Chapter 67-48, F.A.C.

RFA, p. 69, § Six.

31. Given these provisions, it is particularly surprising that Florida Housing staff chose not to advise the Board at its meeting on January 23, 2020, of staff’s concerns about the “organizational commonalities” of the 15 HTG entity, Priority I Applications. The Board may have decided to restore fairness by discarding and restarting the process (with additional safeguards against the behaviors that HTG engaged in), which it plainly has the authority to do pursuant to Section Six of the RFA.

32. Florida Housing now must withdraw RFA 2019-112 and rescind all of its scoring results and preliminary awards, given the unfairness of the process. While that action may give rise to a challenge pursuant to section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, from one or more unhappy Applicants, Florida Housing would be on solid ground, given all of the circumstances, and any challenger to that decision would bear a high burden of proof. § 120.57(3), Fla. Stat. (“In any bid-protest proceeding contesting an intended agency action to reject all bids, proposals, or replies, the standard of review by an administrative law judge shall be whether the agency’s intended action is illegal, arbitrary, dishonest, or fraudulent.”).

33. Petitioner asserts that a rejection of all Applications, a withdrawal of the RFA, and the reissuance of a new RFA is the appropriate remedy at this juncture.

---

6 A lesser remedy, such as disqualifying the HTG Applications, reassigning lottery numbers, and rescoring the Applications is not feasible at this point, given that some Applicants may have lost site control or had other changes occur since the Applications were submitted last October.
VIII. Disputed Issues of Material Fact and Law

34. Disputed issues of material fact and law include, but may not be limited to:

   a. Whether Florida Housing’s Preliminary Awards and Approved Scoring Results are contrary to the agency’s governing statutes, the agency’s rules or policies, or the solicitation specifications;

   b. Whether Florida Housing’s Preliminary Awards and Approved Scoring Results are clearly erroneous, contrary to competition, arbitrary, or capricious;

   c. Whether Florida Housing erred by failing to take any action concerning all 15 Priority I Applications submitted by entities associated with HTG;

   d. Whether the fundamental fairness and propriety of Florida Housing’s scoring and award process relating to RFA 2019-112 was compromised by Florida Housing’s failure to take any action concerning all 15 Priority I Applications submitted by entities associated with HTG;

   e. Whether it was appropriate for the five HTG-related entities that submitted Applications to structure their financial cost pro formas such that 14 of the 15 Applications had the identical total Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside Unit;

   f. Whether the five HTG-related entities that submitted Applications coordinated in an appropriate manner in connection with their Applications submitted in response to RFA 2019-112;

   g. Whether Petitioner and other Applicants who followed the provisions of the RFA relating to Priority Designation of Applications were placed at a competitive disadvantage
by the actions of the HTG entities in submitting the 15 Applications with “organizational commonalities.”

h. Whether Florida Housing staff should have taken its concerns regarding the 15 HTG entity Applications to the Board, which is the “agency head” (pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act) for Florida Housing.

IX. Statement of Ultimate Facts

35. Ultimate facts alleged are that Florida Housing’s review process in connection with RFA 2019-112, including preliminary scoring and funding decisions, was fundamentally unfair and contrary to competition.

X. Right to Amend

36. Petitioner specifically reserves the right to amend this Petition as additional information is developed through discovery or through the review of public records.

XI. Statutes and Rules that Entitle Petitioner to Relief

37. Statutes and rules entitling Petitioner to Relief are Part V of chapter 420, Florida Statutes; sections 120.569 and 120.57, Florida Statutes; and Chapters 67-48, 67-60, 67-53, 28-106, and 28-110, Florida Administrative Code.

XII. Demand for Relief

38. Petitioner respectfully requests that:

a. Florida Housing schedule a meeting with Petitioner to discuss resolution of this protest within seven business days, as required by section 120.57(3)(d)1., Florida Statutes;

b. Florida Housing refer this petition to the Division of Administrative Hearings for assignment of an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”);
c. The ALJ enter a Recommended Order determining that Florida Housing should withdraw RFA 2019-112 and all associated preliminary scoring and award decisions and issue a new RFA in connection with Housing Credit financing for affordable housing developments located in Miami-Dade County.

d. That Florida Housing adopt the Recommended Order of the ALJ as a Final Order.

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of February, 2020.

/s/ Donna E. Blanton
DONNA E. BLANTON
Florida Bar No. 948500
dblanton@radylaw.com
Radey Law Firm
301 S. Bronough Street, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Tel. 850-425-6654/ Fax: 850-425-6694
COUNSEL FOR AMBAR TRAIL, LTD.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that the foregoing Formal Written Protest and Petition for Formal Administrative Hearing has been filed by email to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation Clerk at CorporationClerk@floridahousing.org, and a copy sent via email to the following this 10th day of February, 2020:

Hugh R. Brown, General Counsel
Florida Housing Finance Corporation
227 North Bronough Street, Suite 5000
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1329
Hugh.Brown@floridahousing.org

/s/ Donna E. Blanton
Donna E. Blanton
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Thereupon,

The following proceedings began at 2:00 p.m.:

MS. NICKERSON: Good afternoon, everybody. Just a reminder, there's a sign-in sheet in the back of the room, so please be sure to sign in if you haven't already done so.

And I will go ahead and call this review committee meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 9th, 2020.

This review committee meeting is to give the scorers and to submit a recommendation to Florida Housing's Board of Directors regarding the proposal submitted in response to RFA 2019-112 for housing credit financing for affordable housing developments located in Miami-Dade County.

This meeting was noticed in the Florida Administrative Register pursuant to Section 120.525, Florida Statutes. In response to this RFA, 63 applications were received. A list of the applications is attached to the agenda.

The agenda for today includes introductions for the record. I will then open the floor for discussion and comments among the
review committee members followed by the committee providing scores for the record.
Then, based on the scores, the committee will make recommendations to the Board. And then finally, we'll adjourn the meeting.
So with that, let's go ahead and make introductions beginning with Jean.

MS. SALMONSEN: Jean Salmonsen, not on the committee.

MR. BROWN: Hugh Brown, general counsel, not on the committee.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Rebecca Sheffield, committee member.

MS. NICKERSON: Lisa Nickerson, chair and committee member.

MR. TATREAU: Kevin Tatreau, not on the committee.

MS. LEVY: Melissa Levy, committee member.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. Thank you. I will now open the floor for discussion and comments.

Okay. Hearing none, we'll begin to provide scores for the record.

Jean, would you like to tell us about the spreadsheet up on the wall?
MS. SALMONSEN: Yes. On the wall is a list of all the items that were scored. And they're separated by point items, eligibility items, tiebreakers, goal, and priority level. As we come to each of the point items, I'll go ahead and just put in the maximum number of points, five, for each item and scroll that across for the entire row. If the scorer has any exceptions to that point value, any different point values, they can identify the application number, the correct points associated with that application, and I'll make the adjustment.

And this row will populate automatically if -- it will total all the points associated with each application.

When you come to the eligibility requirements, those can be answered with yeses and nos. So when we come to each item, I'll put a Y in and scroll that across for all applications. If the scorer has a no or an exception to that, they can identify the application number and I'll make the adjustment.

And then we come down here. This row will
populate automatically. If all eligibility requirements are met, a Y will appear there. If any are not met, an N will appear there automatically.

Tiebreakers, these can also be answered with yeses and nos, so I'll do the same thing. I'll do a Y all the way across. And if there are any exceptions, then I'll make that adjustment.

And same with the goal, I'm not sure if it will be easier to put a Y in or a no in, but we'll scroll something across all the way and then make an adjustment if necessary.

And the priority levels, those are all going to be numbers with a one or a two.

The one tiebreaker that's not in here is the leveraging level or leveraging classification, and that's because that's assigned only to eligible applications. So first we'll decide which applications are eligible for funding. And then together as a group we'll be making the leveraging classification assignments. So when we get down to the bottom of this spreadsheet, Kevin, who's not on the committee, but he's entering
all the information into his laptop as a way of
doublechecking our process, so when we get down
to the bottom, I'll make sure that this
spreadsheet, Kevin's spreadsheet, and the
scorers all have the same information. And
then we'll begin working on the next tab.

This tab is similar to our application
submitter report that was posted when the apps
first came in. I'll see what I can do about
hiding some of the fields when we get to this
to make it a little bigger. But it has a lot
of the same information from the app submitter
report, but I've also added some columns. I've
added columns to -- better associated with the
first tab's information. So when we get here,
I'll be able to copy that information over,
populating this.

And then we'll be able to work on the
leveraging classification. Again, we'll use
the RFA, we'll assign those A's and B's. And
then at that point we'll have enough
information to begin our funding selection
process. We'll go through the RFA, we'll
follow the funding selection process. We'll
select applications for funding and build the
spreadsheets that will be taken to the Board on January 23rd, which we just got an announcement that said that the January 23rd Board meeting is going to be moved to this building on our first floor. So you'll see that announcement in your emails when you check, hopefully.

Okay. And that's all. Thank you.

MS. NICKERSON: All right. Thank you, Jean.

Let's go ahead and look at the scoring then.

I am up first. I did score all applications for this RFA. And so, 3C, 3B development experience withdrawal disincentive, there were no exceptions. 3D2, submission of principal disclosure forms stamped by the Corporation as preapproved, there were no exceptions.

Melissa, did you score all the applications in this RFA?

MS. LEVY: Yes, I did.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. Eleven, local government contribution points. Were there any exceptions?

MS. LEVY: No. They all received the five
1    points.
2    MS. NICKERSON: Thank you.
3    Rebecca, did you score all applications in
4    this RFA?
5    MS. SHEFFIELD: Yes.
6    MS. NICKERSON: Okay. And for submission
7    requirements met, were there any exceptions?
8    MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
9    MS. NICKERSON: For number one, applicant
10    certification form provided and meets
11    requirements.
12    MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
13    MS. NICKERSON: 2A demographic commitment
14    selected.
15    MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
16    MS. NICKERSON: 3A1, name of applicant
17    provided.
18    Oh, that's me. Thank you. I was like,
19    hmm.
20    All right. 3A1, name of applicant
21    provided, there were no exceptions.
22    3A2, evidence applicant is a legally
23    formed entity provided, there are no
24    exceptions. 3B1, name of each developer
25    provided, no exceptions. 3B2, evidence that
each developer entity is a legally formed entity provided, no exceptions. General
development experience requirement met, there were no exceptions. 3C1, principal for
applicant and developer disclosure form provided and meets requirements, no exceptions.

3D1, name of management company provided, no exceptions. 3D2, prior general management
company experience requirement met, there were no exceptions. 3E1, authorized principal
representative provided and meets requirements, no exceptions.

4A, name of proposed development provided,
Rebecca?

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. 4B1, development category selected.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 4B2, development category qualifying conditions met.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 4C, development type provided.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 5B, address of development
1. site provided?
2. MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
3. MS. NICKERSON: 5C, question whether a
   scattered sites development answered.
4. MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
5. MS. NICKERSON: 5D1, development location
   provide -- development location point provided.
6. MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
7. MS. NICKERSON: Okay. 5D2, latitude and
   longitude coordinates for any scattered sites
   provided.
8. MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
9. MS. NICKERSON: 5E, minimum transit score
   provided.
10. MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
11. MS. NICKERSON: 5E, again, minimum total
    proximity score met.
12. MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
13. MS. NICKERSON: 5F, mandatory distance
    requirement met.
14. MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
15. MS. NICKERSON: 5G, recap conditions met.
16. MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.
17. MS. NICKERSON: 6A, total number of units
    provided and within limits.
MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 6B, number of new construction units and rehab units provided.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 6C, occupancy status of any existing units provided if rehabilitation.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 6D1, minimum set-aside election provided.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 6D2, total set-aside breakdown chart properly completed.

MS. SHEFFIELD: There were no exceptions, although I would like to note for the record on application number 098 under 6B, total set-aside breakdown chart, the total set-aside percentage was not filled in. However, given the total number of units in the chart and the answer given under 6A, total number of units in the proposed development, the development is a hundred percent set-aside.

MS. SALMONSEN: So there's no failure, you were just making that --

MS. SHEFFIELD: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.
MS. NICKERSON: All right. Number 6E, unit mix provided and meets requirements.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 6F, number of residential buildings provided.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 7A, evidence of site control provided.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 7B1, appropriate zoning demonstrated.

MS. SHEFFIELD: I have one exception. It's application number 131. They did not provide the zoning form.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. 7B2, availability of electricity demonstrated.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 7B3, availability of water demonstrated.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 7B4, availability of sewer demonstrated.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 7B5, availability of roads demonstrated.
MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: 8D3, minimum additional green building features selected if rehabilitation.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: And number 9, minimum number of resident programs selected.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. Melissa, you have the next set of questions.

10A, applicant's housing credit request amount provided.

MS. LEVY: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: And 10C, development cost proforma provided and construction rehab analysis and permanent analysis.

MS. LEVY: I did have some exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay.

MS. LEVY: Application 110, the equity LOI was not executed and therefore was not included as a source. Construction and permanent funding sources did not cover uses.

On application 138C, the applicant was not cited as the borrower or direct recipient of the loan in the permanent loan financing.
proposal, therefore it was not included as a
source and permanent sources do not cover uses.

140, the applicant was not cited as the
borrower or direct recipient of the loan in the
permanent loan financing proposal, therefore it
was not included as a source and permanent
sources do not cover uses. In addition, based
on the equity LOI, the actual equity paid prior
to construction completion is less than what is
stated on the development cost proforma and
construction sources do not cover uses.

141, the applicant was not cited as the
borrower or direct recipient of the loan in the
permanent loan financing proposal, therefore it
was not included as a source and permanent
sources do not cover uses.

And application 144, the applicant
included a fee waiver as a source and -- which
should not be included as a source. Removing
it causes a shortfall in the permanent funding
sources.

That's all.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay.

MS. SALMONSEN: So there are five?

MS. LEVY: Yes.
MS. SALMONSEN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. NICKERSON: All right. Next we're going to hear from Kenny Derrikson on financial arrearage requirements.

MR. DERRIKSON: Kenny Derrikson, not on the committee.

We reviewed the past due report for the financial obligations for which an applicant or developer, principal, affiliate or financial -- of the applicant or developer is in arrears to the Corporation or any agent or assignee of the Corporation as reflected on the most recently published past due report posted to the Corporation's website but not more recently than five business days prior to today's committee meeting.

As of the close of business yesterday, there were three in arrears.

So, do you just want me to tell you those three or --

MS. SALMONSEN: Yes, please.

MR. DERRIKSON: Okay. The first one is 2020-113, 2020-116, and 2020-122.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. Thank you, Kenny.
And next will be Liz Thorp telling us about the no prior acceptance to an invitation to enter credit underwriting for the same development in a previous RFA.

MS. THORP: Elizabeth Thorp, not on the committee.

There are no exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. Thank you, Liz. Okay. And, Melissa, total development costs per unit limitation met.

MS. LEVY: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. Thank you.

And then we'll move into tiebreakers. Rebecca, proximity funding preference.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: And, Melissa, per unit funding -- per unit construction funding preference.

MS. LEVY: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. And back to Rebecca, development category funding preference.

MS. SHEFFIELD: No exceptions.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. And Florida job creation preference.
MS. SALMONSEN: That was actually on Melissa and -- let me fix that real quick.

MS. NICKERSON: Oh, okay.

MS. SALMONSEN: Sorry.

MS. LEVY: No exceptions.

MS. SALMONSEN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. And then do you want to do lottery numbers now or finish up -- you want to do lottery numbers?

MS. SALMONSEN: Yes.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. Then we have Melanie Yopp from our IG's office.

MS. SALMONSEN: Melanie, if you'd like, I'll go ahead and read them across, if you just want to verify starting with 088C, lottery number 13, 36, 16, 49, 23, 46, 47, 38, 18, 40, 12, 21, 54, 1, 45, 42, 55, 3, 59, 9, 60, 58, 61, 34, 5, 27, 8, 44, 26, 2, 56, 22, 50, 37, 4, 29, 31, 51, 7, 48, 39, 41, 52, 63, 14, 53, 62, 43, 32, 33, 35, 10, 28, 20, 24, 17, 57, 11, 19, 15, 6, 30, and 25.

MS. YOPP: Yes. Melanie Yopp, not on the committee. Those are correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

MS. NICKERSON: Thank you.
And then we'll move into our goals.

Melissa, if applicant selected the family demographic, does the application qualify for the geographic area of opportunity/SADDA funding goal.

MS. LEVY: So if you want to put no, I'll tell you the yeses.

Okay. So, yeses are 91, 94 --

MS. NICKERSON: Melissa, hold on a minute.

MS. LEVY: All right. So it was 91, 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, 104, 105, 106, 109, 112, 113, 115, 117, 120, 121, 123, 129, 131, 133, and 142.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. And then on to the priority level. What was the application priority level? And, Jean, if you'll put one all the way across and I will tell you the twos.

Okay. And the priority twos were 107C, 108C, 118C, and 150C, 1-5-0-C.

Okay. Excellent.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

MS. NICKERSON: And now we are going to hear from Marissa Button. Go ahead and say her last name.
MS. BUTTON: Come up by you, Lisa.

MS. NICKERSON: Okey doke.

MS. BUTTON: Good afternoon. Marissa Button, director of multifamily programs. I am not on the committee, though I'm a resource person referenced in your agenda.

While not impacting scores reported, I am making a comment for the public record regarding the designation of priority one and priority two applications.

Section 4A of the RFA states applicants may submit no more than three priority one applications. There is no limit to the number of priority two applications that can be submitted, however, no principal can be a principal as defined in Rule Chapter 67-48.002, Florida Administrative Code of more than three priority one applications.

For purposes of scoring, Florida Housing will rely on the principals of the applicant and developer disclosure form outlined in order to determine if a principal is a principal on more than three priority one applications. If during scoring it is determined that a principal is disclosed as a principal on more
than three priority one applications, all such priority one applications will be deemed priority two.

If it is later determined that a principal as defined in Rule Chapter 67-48.00294, Florida Administrative Code was not disclosed as a principal and the undisclosed principal causes a maximum set forth to be exceeded, the awards for the affected applications will be rescinded and all principals of the affected applications may be subject to material misrepresentation, even if the applications were not selected for funding or deemed ineligible or were withdrawn.

So the following priority one designated applications contain principals of the applicant disclosure forms with separate identifications. I am going to list these. The following applications have an authorized principal representative designated, Matthew Rieger, application 2020-097, 2020-109, and 2020-146.

The following applications have the authorized principal representative of Randy Rieger, application 2020-102, 2020-115, and 2020-105.
The following applications have the authorized principal representative designated as Cara Balogh, application 2020-091, 2020-100, and 2020-130.

The following applications have the authorized principal representative designated as Orli Teitelbaum, application 2020-132, 2020-148, and 2020-149.

And finally, the following applications have the authorized principal representative designated as Robert Balogh, applications 2020-095, 2020-103, and 2020-133.

The principals and applicant and developer disclosure forms for these applications do not reflect a principal designated on more than three priority one applications. However, the designated priority one applications share the following organizational commonalities including under Section 3, 4B of the RFA. All 15 applications submitted an application fee provided by HTG United, LLC from the same account. Under Section 3A, 4A of the RFA, all 15 applications were submitted with hard copy binders under the cover sheet of Housing Trust Group with the address of Aviation Avenue,
Coconut Grove, Florida. Under Section 4A, 3C2 of the RFA, all 15 of the advanced review of principal disclosure form requests for the applications were submitted from individuals associated with Housing Trust Group, LLC at the address of Aviation Avenue, Coconut Grove, Florida.

And under section 4A, 3E2 of the RFA, all the applications share the same operational contact person, Scott Osmond associated with Housing Trust Group, LLC at Aviation Avenue, Coconut Grove, Florida.

And finally, with the exception of application 2020-109C, under Exhibit C, section three of the RFA, all of the applications share the exact same corporate funding per set-aside amount.

At this juncture, Florida Housing cannot determine that those 15 applications I referenced share common principal as defined in Rule 67-48.002 of the Florida Administrative Code; however, this information is being noted for the public record. And if it is determined at a later point that a principal was not disclosed on any of the applications, the terms
of section four of the RFA that I referenced earlier will apply and the affected applications will be rescinded, and all principals of the affected applications may be subject to material misrepresentation consequences.

And as I reflected, this does not impact the scoring results of -- that were reported earlier.

Thank you.

MS. NICKERSON: Thank you, Marissa.

And now we will move on.

Jean, will you please confirm the scores and begin the funding selection process.

MS. SALMONSEN: Yes. Thank you.

So there were -- Lisa, there were no exceptions to development experience, withdrawal disincentive points or submission of principal disclosure forms stamped by Corporation's preapproved points.

MS. NICKERSON: That's correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: And, Melissa, no exceptions to local government contribution points.

MS. LEVY: Correct.
1     MS. SALMONSEN:  Rebecca, no exceptions to
2     submission requirements met --
3     Let me do this.
4     MS. SHEFFIELD:  Correct.
5     MS. SALMONSEN:  Applicant certification
6     form provided meets requirements or demographic
7     commitment selected.
8     MS. SHEFFIELD:  Correct.
9     MS. SALMONSEN:  Lisa, no exceptions to
10    name of applicant provided, evidence applicant
11    is legally formed entity provided, name of each
12    developer provided, evidence that each
13    developer entity is legally formed entity
14    provided, general development experience
15    requirement met, principals for applicant
16    developer disclosure form provided meets
17    requirements, name of management company
18    provided, prior general management company
19    experience requirement met.
20    Hold on.  I have to scoot over again.
21    Or authorized principal representative
22    provided meets requirements.
23    MS. NICKERSON:  That's correct.
24    MS. SALMONSEN:  And then, Rebecca, no
25    exceptions to name or proposed development
provided, development category selected,
development category qualifying conditions met,
development type provided, address of
development site provided, question whether
scattered sites development answered,
development location point provided, latitude,
longitude coordinates for any scattered sites
provided if applicable, minimum transit scoring
met, minimum total proximity score met,
mandatory distance requirement met, recap
conditions met if applicable, total number of
units provided within limits, number of new
construction units and rehab units provided,
occupancy status of any existing units provided
if rehab, minimum set-aside election provided,
total set-aside breakdown chart properly
completed, unit mix provided meets
requirements, number of residents for --
provided or evidence of site control provided.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: You had one exception to
appropriate zoning demonstrated. And that was
application 131C, correct?

Okay, Kevin?

Okay. We can request pause if needed.
No exceptions to availability of electricity demonstrated, availability of water demonstrated, sewer or roads, minimal additional green building feature selected if rehab, or minimum number of resident program selected.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: Melissa, no exceptions to applicant's housing credit request amount provided, but there were five exceptions to the development cost proforma provided with sources equaling or exceeding uses. And those five applications are 110C --

MS. LEVY: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: -- 138C, 140C, 141C, and 144C?

MS. LEVY: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: And then, Kenny -- there you are. There were three exceptions to the financial arrearage requirement met. And those were applications, let's see, 113C, 116C, and 122C? Thumbs up signal from Kenny.

Liz is there. No exceptions to no prior acceptance to an invitation to enter credit underwriting for the same development in a
previous RFA?

Thank you. Thumbs up from Liz.

And then, Melissa, no exceptions to total development costs per unit limitation met?

MS. LEVY: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: And then on the tiebreakers, there were no exceptions, Rebecca, to proximity funding preference met.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: Melissa, no exceptions on the per unit construction funding preference.

MS. LEVY: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: Rebecca, again, no exceptions, development category funding preference.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: And then, Melissa, no exceptions to job creation preference?

MS. LEVY: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: And we'll do lottery numbers again in just a few minutes.

Melissa, again, there are 21 applications that met the goal of a family demographic.

They qualified for the geographic area of opportunity/SADDA funding goal. And those 21

MS. LEVY: Correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

And, Lisa -- well, my little number didn't appear, but I believe there were three or four twos, so let me identify them.

MS. NICKERSON: Four, yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: Okay. There were -- the twos were -- priority level twos were 107, 108, 118, and 150.

MS. NICKERSON: That's correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

Okay. So now I'm going to begin copying the information and pasting it into the next tab. And as I said before, this is similar to our application submitter report, but it has these empty columns, so I'm going to start populating them with the information we just did in the first tab.

I'm going to start with priority level. I'm going to copy this whole row. And I'm going to come over here, I'm gonna right-click
and click paste special. And I'm gonna click values and number formats. This particular column didn't have any formulas that created the ones and twos, but if it had, it would delete those formulas behind it and transpose, which takes the information from a row or column or vice versa.

And I'm going to do the same thing for eligibility. And this row was created with formulas, so when I do the same thing over here, right click, paste special, click the values and number formats, it will remove that formula and just leave the data. And then I'm going to transpose again.

And I'm going to do the same for all of this information. Goal, the points. I think I can take all three of these -- because proximity funding preference, per unit construction funding preference, and development category funding preference are all together on both tabs, I'm going to take all three at the same time.

And, again, we're skipping leveraging classification for the moment, but we're just about ready to populate that. I just need
these last two fields.

And I'd like to verify one more time with Kevin when you're ready.

I'm going to try to hide some of these for the moment. I'm going to hide these three columns and see if I can make this a little bigger. That's better.

MR. TATREAU: Okay. I'm ready.

MS. SALMONSEN: Okay. So starting with the priority levels, all applications are one exception for 107, 108, 118, and 150.

MR. TATREAU: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: Applications are eligible for funding except 110, 113, 116, 122, 131, 138, 140, 141, and 144.

MR. TATREAU: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: I'm going to read out again the applications that qualify for that goal. And those are 91C, 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, 104, 105, 106, 109, 112, 113, 115, 117, 120, 121, 123, 129, 131, 133, 142.

MR. TATREAU: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: And that's it.

MR. TATREAU: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: All applications had 15
points.

MR. TATUREAU: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: They all met their proximity funding preference per unit construction funding preference and development category funding preference.

MR. TATUREAU: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: And job creation preference.

MR. TATUREAU: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: And then let's go ahead and read those lottery numbers one more time.

So starting with 88C, 13, 36, 16, 49, 23, 46, 47, 38, 18, 40, 12, 21, 54, 1, 45, 42, 55, 3, 59, 9, 60, 58, 61, 34, 5, 27, 8, 44, 26, 2, 56, 22, 50, 37, 4, 29, 31, 51, 7, 48, 39, 41, 52, 63, 14, 53, 62, 43, 32, 33, 35, 10, 28, 20, 24, 17, 57, 11, 19, 15, 6, 30, and 25.

MR. TATUREAU: That's what I have.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

And then Melanie gave a thumbs up from the back. Thank you.

Okay. So, we now have enough information to do our leveraging classification.

So first thing we're gonna do is go to our
RFA. And I'm looking at the modified version from September 19th and October 8th.

All right. I'm going to rearrange some things here. And I'm looking at page 98. And it starts out with all eligible applications will be classified as either group A or group B based on the amount of total corporation funding per set-aside unit as outlined below. Eligible priority one applications will be assigned a leveraging classification as outlined below first followed by eligible priority two applications.

And then it goes on to show a lot of math. And this math was done for you based on what the application -- what the applicant said in their application. We put that information on the application submitted report. But there are a couple things. I know of one adjustment that we want to make and that's regarding mid-rise four-story. You know, this RFA had the new multiplier of mid-rise four-story buildings which -- in which -- let's see. And in which at least 90 percent of the units were in the mid-rise building. And we have had that mid-rise multiplier for the mid-rise five, six
buildings for at a while. And in those -- the
RFAs, the applicant proposing a mid-rise five-
or six-story building are specifically asked to
confirm that at least 90 percent of the units
are in the mid-rise five- or six-story building
in order to qualify for the multiplier. We had
no such question for the mid-rise four-story
development type.

And as such, we're going to go ahead and
apply the multiplier to each application in
this RFA that selected the development,
mid-rise four-story. And this affects
applications 2020-109C, 2020-116C, 2020-138C,
2020-141C, and 2020-142C. And I have that
information here. We're going to make those
adjustments.

So the first thing I'm going to do is mark
with an asterisk which applications those are
so we can add a note at the bottom that we
changed it from the app submitted report. So
it's 109C, 116C, 138C, 141C, and 142C. And I
have the information here with the new
calculated leveraging -- the new corporation
funding per set-aside. And I'm going to make
Hugh Brown read them out to me.
These new numbers, the now -- yes, please,
starting with 109C -- oh, here.

MR. BROWN: For application 2020-109C, the
amount was 162 -- $162,494.08. The new amount
is $146,244.67.

MS. SALMONSEN: Hold on. Let me read that
back to you, 14 -- 244.67?

MR. BROWN: That's correct.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: For application 2020-116C,
original number was $139,333.33. New number is
$125,400.

MS. SALMONSEN: 125,400?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: For application 2020-138C,
original amount was $182,500, new adjusted
amount is $164,250.

MR. TATREAU: Can I get you to say it one
more time? 164 --

MR. BROWN: 164,250.

MR. TATREAU: Thank you.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: For application 2020-141C,
original amount was $183,920. New adjusted
amount is now $165,528.

MS. SALMONSEN: 165,528?

MR. BROWN: Correct.

For application 2020-142C, original amount was $104,300.95. New amount is $93,870.86.

93,870.86.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

All right. Thank you very much.

Okay. So now there might have been other adjustments made as a result of scoring, so I look to Melissa as finance scorer. Did you adjust any housing credit request amounts during the scoring?

MS. LEVY: I adjusted one, 098C. The number of set-aside units is not totaled in the set-aside chart, but adding the units in each income band provides a total set-aside unit count of 125. So I calculated the leveraging calculation off of this figure while the app submitted report showed a zero set-aside units.

So the number is 140,180.48.

MS. SALMONSEN: $140,180.48.

MS. LEVY: Yes.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

And I put these asterisk -- I'm sorry.
Did you have any other adjustments at all during --

MS. LEVY: No, that was the only one.

MS. SALMONSEN: I put these asterisk notes here. I want to put some language down here to say what we did.

Let's see. So for the first asterisk regarding the mid-rise four-story, I'm going to say the mid-rise four-story multiplier was applied at the review committee meeting which affects the Corporation funding per set-aside amount. And I'm just going to type that in.

And then, Melissa, I saw that the total set-aside -- the total Corporation funding for set-aside amount for 098C was blank, and what you did is you, you know, could figure out what the total set-aside percentage is. So I'm going to go ahead and say something like the total set-aside percentage was not included on the application submitted report, but it was presented at the review committee meeting, which affected the Corporation funding per set-aside amount.

Okay. Thank you.

Okay. It sounds like now we have enough
information to begin the leveraging.

So, the math begins on page 98 of this modified version, and that's -- we've already covered all that. So I'm going to look at page 99, letter B, all eligible applications -- again, this is only priority one first, and then we do priority two. All eligible applications will be divided into two lists. New construction list with new construction and redevelopment applications, and the rehab list. And I've looked at this list and they're all new construction, so we're only going to be doing a new construction list. There's an extra column here that would have, you know, combined new construction and redevelopment into a new construction list, but I'm just gonna hide it. In fact, I'm going to hide the development category list, too. And I can, once again, make this a little bit bigger as a result.

So, the very bottom, page 99 says, The new construction list will be compiled of applications listed in ascending order beginning with the application that has the lowest amount total Corporation funding per
set-aside unit and ending with the application
with the highest amount of total Corporation
funding per set-aside unit.

So I'm going to do a sort here. I'm going
to do a few things at once. I'm going to sort
eligible and ineligible, priority one and
priority two, and sort them by Corporation
funding per set-aside amount in that ascending
order. And then we'll just make sure I did it
right in just a minute.

And I see the ineligible applications down
here. I'll create a little space there. And I
see my priority twos here, I'm going to create
a little space here. And glancing at it looks
like I did it right.

But, Kevin, the easiest way to verify is
to verify with you. And I'll -- the easiest
way to do that is to read through those lottery
numbers again, so that's what I'd like to do,
starting with 142C. Lottery number 24, 46, 41,
50, 2, 16, 32, 21, 1, 29, 36, 12, 7, 17, 33,
13, 23, 22, 51, 15, 8, 5, 39, 18, 55, 10 --
MR. TATREAU: Wait a minute.

MS. SALMONSEN: You want me to go back?
MR. TATREAU: No. I'm good through 18.
You said 55, I see 58 on your screen.

MS. SALMONSEN: Okay.

MR. TATREAU: I had 58 on my screen.

MS. SALMONSEN: Okay. And I had 58 on my screen, too. Glad you're paying attention.

So going back to 18, which is application 96. Eighteen, 58, 10, 34, 37, 11, 31, 48, 47, 55, 59, 62, 43, 49, 38, 40, 54, 45, 42, 3, 44, 52, 14, 53, 19, 6, 30. And that's it for the priority ones. Then priority twos are 56, 9, 60, 25.

MR. TATREAU: I have the same sort.

MS. SALMONSEN: Great. And then, of course, the ineligible applications, it doesn't matter because they are not assigned an ARB.

So starting with the priority ones, I'm gonna first do a little trick for numbering these so we can identify how many apps we have and also their placement on the list. And I just did the first one was a one and then I did, like, an equals one plus the thing above it, now I can scroll that all the way down for this list. And I see it's a nice round number of 50.

And so going back to the RFA, page 100, it
1 says the total number of applications on the
2 new construction list -- and again, these are
3 only priority ones -- will be multiplied by
4 80 percent, and that resulting figure will be
5 rounded up to the next whole number, and that's
6 the A/B cutoff. So it's 50 times .8 is a
7 number I can do in my head and that's 40. So
8 that's going to be our lowest A. However, when
9 I look back at the instructions, it said a line
10 will be drawn below the applications whose
11 place on the list is equal to the new
12 construction A/B cutoff. Then it goes on to
13 say if any applications below the line have the
14 same total Corporation funding request per
15 set-aside unit as the application immediately
16 above the line, the line will be moved to a
17 place immediately below that application with a
18 paren S. So, the line actually comes down, all
19 these have identical Corporation funding per
20 set-aside amounts. And the line is drawn all
21 the way down to the bottom, so that that's our
22 lowest A. And, in fact, there are no Bs.
23 And then I'm gonna do the same thing for
24 the priority two applications. And, of course,
25 there are four applications here. When I
multiply four times .8, the answer's 3.2. And if I round that up to the nearest whole number, as it says on page 100, that would be four. So therefore, all four applications are also an A.

So I'm going to remove this column that we used for the numbers. And I'm going to put these back in application number order, and the ineligible applications as well. This could be one of the spreadsheets that we present to the Board with all the scores. And I'll clean it up and make the formatting look better, and hope to get this posted, if not today, then tomorrow to our website, but then this will be one of our Board exhibits.

Okay. And then I'm going to save this because we now have enough information to begin our funding selection process. And I'm going to page 63 of the RFA. It starts by describing the eligibility items which we've been talking about, 67 has point items. And also in 67, it begins by describing goals.

Corporation has a goal to fund one proposed development that's selected demographic commitment of family and qualifies for the geographic area of opportunity/SADDA.
goal as outlined in Section 4A 11A. And then the Corporation has a goal to fund one proposed development that's selected the demographic commitment elderly non-ALF at question 2A of Exhibit A. And then it describes the application sorting order.

So I'm going to go ahead and I'm going to make a copy of this tab and I'm going to call it funding -- funding selection, because that's what we're about to begin. I'm going to remove the ineligible applications. They'll no longer be participating. And I'm going to put the rest of these applications in sorting order as described. It's all eligible priority one applications by sorting the application as followed, followed by priority two applications. And it lists the order. I'm going to go ahead and do that real quick and then we can double-check and make sure I did a good job.

And here's one more column I can hide to make a little more room and make things bigger if you'd like.

And I can see the lottery numbers are in order. Everybody had the points of the
tiebreakers and -- except for this one down here.

MR. TATREAU: It's a two.

MS. SALMONSEN: Oh, it's a two. Thank you, Kevin. Thought I was losing my mind.

So, I can see that they're in order. I don't see a need to go through the lottery numbers again, which means that we're ready for the funding selection process.

So, on page 68, there is an amount of money associated with this. There's no funding tests. In fact, it -- we'll see in a second, the funding selection process describes how we're going to fund a maximum of -- exactly three applications, even if that third application requires a binding commitment. So there is no funding test, but I'd still like some assistance manually tracking the funding amounts, please.

Melissa, I see you brought a calculator and you're as far away from me as possible, but thank you for meeting me halfway.

On page two of the RFA, the amount of funding that we have available is described there. And the total amount, if you can write
it at the top of the spreadsheet I just gave you, Melissa, is $7,195,917. 7,195,917. And if you could, as we fund applications, write in the application number awarded, the request amount, and then the balance remaining, please. And that number should match what we have here and we also have it on this page.

MS. LEVY: Got it.

MS. SALMONSEN: Thank you.

Okay. So then when I look to page 68, the funding selection process, it describes in 2A the first application selected for funding will be the highest ranking eligible priority-one family application that qualifies for the geographic area of opportunity/SADDA goal.

So the highest ranking is this application 101C, with the request amount of 2,851,000. 2851. And I'm going to make that bigger as well. And I'm going to shade it in green on my computer. It shows up as kind of weird gray. Sorry.

Okay. Moving on to page 68 2B, the next application selected for funding will be the highest ranking eligible priority one application that qualifies as an elderly
non-ALF development. So I see here, this application, 148C, with a request amount of $2,875,950 is our highest ranking elderly non-ALF, and that's the one we're gonna fund.

Sorry.

And then going to paragraph C, the next application selected for funding will be the highest ranking eligible priority one application regardless of demographic category until no more than three total applications are selected for funding. And if less than three applications are selected, of course, we won't have that problem. We would fund a priority two.

And then at the bottom of that paragraph, though, it says if the third application cannot be fully funded, it will be entitled to receive a binding commitment for the unfunded balance. So we're not looking as applications that can be fully funded because they will be through a binding commitment, we're just looking for the highest ranking eligible unfunded application, which is 117C, with a request amount of 2,582,000.

Then it goes on in paragraph D to describe
the funding remaining, which I see there is a binding gonna be required to fund these three. It still says, No further applications will be considered for funding and any remaining funding will be distributed as approved by the Board.

So that concludes our selection process.

MS. NICKERSON: All right. Thank you, Jean.

Will you now please read the applications selected for funding into the record?


MR. TATREAU: Naranja.

MS. SALMONSEN: Naranja. Do you pronounce the J? Okay. Well, anyway, that one, it got funded.

MS. NICKERSON: All right. Thank you.

Do we have a motion from the committee to accept the scores and recommendations for funding today?

MS. LEVY: Motion.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Second.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. All those in favor.
(Members reply aye.)

MS. NICKERSON: Motion carries.

Do we have a motion to recommend to the Board that it adopt the scores and recommendations for funding of the review committee?

MS. LEVY: Motion.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Second.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. All those in favor.

(Members reply aye.)

MS. NICKERSON: Motion carries.

And then lastly, do we have a motion to adjourn this review committee meeting?

MS. LEVY: Motion.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Second.

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. All those in favor.

(Members reply aye.)

MS. NICKERSON: Okay. Motion carries.

Meeting will adjourn at 2:59 p.m.

(Meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.)

*   *   *
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>104,300.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:5</td>
<td>19:11 31:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>125,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>109C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:12</td>
<td>29:2 34:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>139,333.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>10A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:11</td>
<td>35:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>140,180.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>10C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:22</td>
<td>14:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>146,244.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:5</td>
<td>14:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>162,494.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>11C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:4</td>
<td>14:19 31:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>164,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:18</td>
<td>27:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>165,528</strong></td>
<td><strong>12C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:1</td>
<td>19:11 31:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>182,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>12C2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:17</td>
<td>27:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>183,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>12D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:25</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2,875,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:3</td>
<td>19:12 29:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7,195,917</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:1</td>
<td>31:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>93,870.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:5</td>
<td>36:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>125,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:13</td>
<td>31:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:12 29:3</td>
<td>31:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13C</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:21 34:21</td>
<td>26:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13C</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:21 34:21</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:11 31:20</td>
<td>118C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11A</strong></td>
<td>19:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>14:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12C</strong></td>
<td>10:17 32:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12C2</strong></td>
<td>11:10 31:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12C3</strong></td>
<td>12:10 31:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12C4</strong></td>
<td>13:10 31:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:12 29:3</td>
<td>150C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>39:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:15</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138C</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>164,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:21</td>
<td>165,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:3 31:15</td>
<td>39:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140,180,48</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140C</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:15</td>
<td>40:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12 31:15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:15 34:21</td>
<td>39:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>2,582,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:13 29:3</td>
<td>2,851,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:18</td>
<td>2019-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:22</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>2020-091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:13 31:11</td>
<td>2020-095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-097</td>
<td>21:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-100</td>
<td>22:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-101C</td>
<td>47:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-102</td>
<td>21:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-103</td>
<td>22:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-105</td>
<td>21:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-109</td>
<td>21:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-109C</td>
<td>23:14 34:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:3</td>
<td>2020-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-115</td>
<td>21:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-116</td>
<td>16:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-116C</td>
<td>34:13 35:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-117C</td>
<td>47:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-122</td>
<td>16:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-130</td>
<td>22:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-132</td>
<td>22:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-133</td>
<td>22:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-138C</td>
<td>34:13 35:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-141C</td>
<td>34:14 35:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-142C</td>
<td>34:14 36:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-146</td>
<td>21:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-148</td>
<td>22:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-148C</td>
<td>47:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-149</td>
<td>22:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18:17 28:22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:18 32:16</td>
<td>25 32:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18:16 32:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18:18 32:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>18:20 32:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>244.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18:21 32:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 26  | 18:18 32:15  
| 27  | 18:18 32:15  
| 28  | 18:20 32:17  
| 2851| 45:18       
| 29  | 18:19 32:16  
| 2:00| 3:2,9       
| 2A  | 9:13 43:4   
| 2B  | 45:22       
| 3   | 18:17 22:19 
| 3.2 | 42:1        
| 30  | 18:21 32:18 
| 31  | 18:19 32:16 
| 32  | 18:20 32:17 
| 33  | 18:20 32:17 
| 34  | 18:18 32:15 
| 35  | 18:20 32:17 
| 36  | 18:16 32:13 
| 37  | 18:10 32:16 
| 38  | 18:16 32:14 
| 39  | 18:19 32:16 
| 3A  | 22:22       
| 3A1 | 9:16,20     
| 3A2 | 9:22        
| 3B  | 8:13        
| 3B1 | 9:24        
| 3B2 | 9:25        
| 3C  | 8:13        
| 3C1 | 10:4        
| 3C2 | 23:1        
| 3D1 | 10:7        
| 3D2 | 8:15 10:8   
| 3E1 | 10:10       
| 3E2 | 23:0        
| 4   |             
| 4A  | 10:13 20:11 
| 4B  | 22:19       
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RFA 2019-112
Board Approved Preliminary Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Name of Development</th>
<th>Name of Authorized Principal Representative</th>
<th>Name of Developers</th>
<th>Demo</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>HC Funding Amount</th>
<th>Eligible For Funding?</th>
<th>Qualify For the Geographic Area of Opportunity/MDO-Designated SADDA Goal?</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Proximity Funding Preference</th>
<th>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</th>
<th>Development Category Funding Preference</th>
<th>Leverage Classification</th>
<th>Florida Job Creation Preference</th>
<th>Lottery Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-301C</td>
<td>Harbour Springs</td>
<td>Lewis V. Swezy</td>
<td>MS Development Corp.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,081,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-322C</td>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>William Todd Filiatr</td>
<td>The Richman Group of Florida Inc.</td>
<td>E, Non-AUP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-317C</td>
<td>Residences at Narangja Lakes</td>
<td>Robert Hopkins</td>
<td>NRNB Development Partners, Inc.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2,583,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On January 23, 2020, the Board of Directors of Florida Housing Finance Corporation approved the Review Committee’s motion and staff recommendation to select the above Applications for funding and invite the Applicants to enter credit underwriting.

Any unsuccessful Applicant may file a notice of protest and a formal written protest in accordance with Section 220.57(3), Fla. Stat., Rule Chapter 29-110, F.A.C., and Rule 67-60.009, F.A.C. Failure to file a protest within the time prescribed in Section 220.57(3), Fla. Stat., shall constitute a waiver of proceedings under Chapter 120, Fla. Stat.
## RFA 2019-112 Board Approved Scoring Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Name of Development</th>
<th>Name of Authorized Principal Representative</th>
<th>Name of Developers</th>
<th>Demo</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>HC Funding Amount</th>
<th>Eligible for Funding?</th>
<th>Family Demo and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity / HUD-designated SADDA Funding Goal?</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Proximity Funding Preference</th>
<th>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</th>
<th>Development Category Funding Preference</th>
<th>Total Corp Funding Per Set-Aside</th>
<th>Leveraging Classification</th>
<th>Florida Job Creation Preference</th>
<th>Lottery Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-008C</td>
<td>Alto Tower</td>
<td>Steve Protulis</td>
<td>6100 Development Services, LLC; Alto Tower Development, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2,795,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>142,803.16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-009C</td>
<td>Northside Transit Village III</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor</td>
<td>Northside Property III Development, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,603,980</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>134,707.59</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-010C</td>
<td>Oak Hill Transit Village IV</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor</td>
<td>Oak Hill Transit IV Development, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6,610,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>119,331.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-011C</td>
<td>Coco Parc</td>
<td>Carla Balogh</td>
<td>24785 Coco Parc Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,051.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-012C</td>
<td>San Cristobal</td>
<td>Steve Protulis</td>
<td>6100 Development Services, LLC; San Cristobal 27 Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2,115,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>142,880.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-013C</td>
<td>Culmer Apartments II</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor</td>
<td>APC Culmer Development II, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5,523,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>109,275.78</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-014C</td>
<td>City Place</td>
<td>Francisco Reyes</td>
<td>Landmark Development Corp.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,728,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,284.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-015C</td>
<td>Park Ridge</td>
<td>Robert B. Balogh</td>
<td>Park Ridge Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>158,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-016C</td>
<td>The Seattle</td>
<td>Justin Wilson</td>
<td>508 Affordable 102Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,812,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>146,021.33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-017C</td>
<td>Courtyard Apartments, Phase I</td>
<td>Matthew A. Ringer</td>
<td>AMCHTG 3 Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2,091,600</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,761.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-018C</td>
<td>Banos Station</td>
<td>Terri Murray</td>
<td>NRI Development Corp.; Neighborhood Renaissance, Inc.; Shamrock Development, Inc.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2,082,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>140,180.48</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-019C</td>
<td>Princeton Crossings</td>
<td>Lewis V. Sweezy</td>
<td>RS Development Corp; Lewis V. Sweezy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,851,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>121,338.56</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-020C</td>
<td>The Saxony</td>
<td>Carla Balogh</td>
<td>Saxony WYNNACK Development, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2,719,080</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>158,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-021C</td>
<td>Harbour Springs</td>
<td>Lewis V. Sweezy</td>
<td>RS Development Corp; Lewis V. Sweezy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,851,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>121,338.56</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-022C</td>
<td>Riverside Flats</td>
<td>Randy E. Ringer</td>
<td>2nd Avenue Flats Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,961.50</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-023C</td>
<td>The Orange Grove</td>
<td>Robert B. Balogh</td>
<td>Orange Grove Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-024C</td>
<td>Aurora Ridge</td>
<td>Francisco Repil</td>
<td>Landmark Development Corp.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,728,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,784.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-025C</td>
<td>Park Grove</td>
<td>Randy Ringer</td>
<td>Park Grove Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>158,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Name of Development</td>
<td>Name of Authorized Principal Representative</td>
<td>Name of Developers</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Priority Level</td>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>HC Funding Amount</td>
<td>Eligible for Funding?</td>
<td>Family Demo and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity / HUD-designated SADDA Funding Goal?</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>Proximity Funding Preference</td>
<td>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</td>
<td>Development Category Funding Preference</td>
<td>Total Corp Funding Per Unit</td>
<td>Leveraging Classification</td>
<td>Florida Job Creation Preference</td>
<td>Lottery Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-106C</td>
<td>Sierra Meadows</td>
<td>Francisco Rojas</td>
<td>Landmark Development Corp.</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2,827,200</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,784.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-107C</td>
<td>Quail Roost Transit Village II</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor</td>
<td>Quail Roost II Development, LLC</td>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>134,788.92</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-108C</td>
<td>Northside Transit Village V</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor</td>
<td>Northside Property V Development, LLC</td>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,802,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>134,780.52</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-109C*</td>
<td>Shapewoof Place</td>
<td>Matthew A. Rieger</td>
<td>MTI Shapewoof Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2,184,560</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>146,244.67</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-111C</td>
<td>Villa Sarena</td>
<td>Steve Protulis</td>
<td>SHDCG Development Services, LLC; Villa Sarena Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1 105</td>
<td>2,950,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>165,837.74</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-112C</td>
<td>Laurel Club</td>
<td>Oscar Sol</td>
<td>Laurel Club Dev., LLC; JGC Real Estate Ventures, LLC</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,840,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,920.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-113C</td>
<td>Parkview</td>
<td>William Todd Eberbi</td>
<td>The Richman Group of Florida, Inc.</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>153,335.35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-114C</td>
<td>Pinnacle Landings</td>
<td>David O. Deutch</td>
<td>Pinnacle Communities, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1 114</td>
<td>2,735,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,966.07</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-115C</td>
<td>Creek View</td>
<td>Randy E. Rieger</td>
<td>Creek View NMB Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>158,961.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-116C*</td>
<td>The Mosaic</td>
<td>William Todd Eberbi</td>
<td>The Richman Group of Florida, Inc.</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1 105</td>
<td>1,925,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>125,400.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-117C</td>
<td>Residences at Naruma Lakes</td>
<td>Robert Holsinis</td>
<td>Northfield Development Partners, Inc.</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,582,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>117,399.20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-118C</td>
<td>Culver Apartments</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor</td>
<td>AFC Culver Development, LLC</td>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,950,892</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>134,788.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-119C</td>
<td>Capri Place</td>
<td>Barry Goldmeier</td>
<td>DBA Development, LLC; Advanced Housing Corp.; JGC Real Estate Ventures, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1 112</td>
<td>2,675,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,214.29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-120C</td>
<td>Platform 3750 at Frankie Shannon Rollie Center</td>
<td>Maria S. Maddox</td>
<td>Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,680,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>116,863.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-121C</td>
<td>Rosemary Cove</td>
<td>Stephanie Benner</td>
<td>Cornerstone Supportive Housing, Inc.; Romero Capital, LLC</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2,859,899</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>147,857.51</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-122C</td>
<td>Dale Moors</td>
<td>William Todd Eberbi</td>
<td>The Richman Group of Florida, Inc.</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1 105</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>144,763.50</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-123C</td>
<td>HUDC The Commons Phase Two</td>
<td>Alberto Millo, Jr.</td>
<td>HUDC The Commons Phase Two Developers, LLC</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>127,760.67</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-124C</td>
<td>Vineyard Villas</td>
<td>Marc S. Piantiker</td>
<td>Gatehouse Development Corp.; Magellan Housing, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1 97</td>
<td>1,895,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>148,474.23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Name of Development</td>
<td>Name of Authorized Principal Representative</td>
<td>Name of Developers</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Priority Level</td>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>HC Funding Amount</td>
<td>Eligible For Funding?</td>
<td>Family Demo and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity / HUD-designated SADDA Funding Goal?</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>Proximity Funding Preference</td>
<td>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</td>
<td>Development Category Funding Preference</td>
<td>Total Corp Funding Per Set-Aside</td>
<td>Leveraging Classification</td>
<td>Florida Job Creation Preference</td>
<td>Lottery Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-125C</td>
<td>Teager Plaza</td>
<td>Karen M Brandtley</td>
<td>Teager Plaza Developer, LLC; Stone Soup Development, Inc.; The Teager Chiro, Inc.</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>23,000,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,561.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,946.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-126C</td>
<td>Paseo del Rio</td>
<td>Alberto Milo, Jr.</td>
<td>Paseo del Rio Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2,820,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>140,160.48</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-127C</td>
<td>Sage Pointe</td>
<td>Nikol A. Insindar</td>
<td>Sage Pointe Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,877,777</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,946.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-128C</td>
<td>Pinnacle at Heron Pointe</td>
<td>David C. Deutsch</td>
<td>Pinnacle Communities, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2,797,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,946.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-129C</td>
<td>Cordova Estates</td>
<td>Lewis V. Sweeney</td>
<td>R5 Development Corp.; Lewis V. Sweeney</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2,852,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>135,280.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-130C</td>
<td>Skyview</td>
<td>Cara Balogh</td>
<td>Skyview 79 Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,061.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-132C</td>
<td>Riverside Grove</td>
<td>QRL Teitlebaum</td>
<td>2nd Avenue Grove Developers, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>130,280.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-133C</td>
<td>Rosewood Gardens</td>
<td>Robert B. Balogh</td>
<td>Rosewood Miami Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,061.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-134C</td>
<td>Ambiar Club Residences</td>
<td>Elena M. Adams</td>
<td>Ambiar, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,946.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-135C</td>
<td>The Ambiar</td>
<td>Elena M. Adams</td>
<td>Ambiar, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,946.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-136C</td>
<td>Liberty Square Phase Four</td>
<td>Alberto Milo, Jr.</td>
<td>Liberty Square Phase Four Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27,000,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>130,964.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-137C</td>
<td>Metro Grande</td>
<td>Mara S. Modis</td>
<td>Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2,530,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>142,422.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-139C</td>
<td>Healthcare Senior Housing</td>
<td>Steven Kirk</td>
<td>Rural Neighborhoods, Incorporated; Advanced Housing Corp.; JGS Real Estate Ventures, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>146,571.43</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-142C</td>
<td>Ambiar Trail</td>
<td>Elena M. Adams</td>
<td>Ambiar, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>93,870.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-143C</td>
<td>Metro Grande III</td>
<td>Mara S. Modis</td>
<td>Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,550,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>141,946.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-145C</td>
<td>The Atalai</td>
<td>Nikol A. Insindar</td>
<td>Atalai Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>147,564.69</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-146C</td>
<td>Courtside Apartments, Phase II</td>
<td>Matthew A. Rieger</td>
<td>MACHTG 2 Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>158,961.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-147C</td>
<td>Harmony Tower</td>
<td>David C. Deutsch</td>
<td>Pinnacle Communities, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2,605,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,257.14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-148C</td>
<td>Orchid Pointe</td>
<td>QRL Teitlebaum</td>
<td>Orchid District Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E. Non-AFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>158,961.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Name of Development</td>
<td>Name of Authorized Principal Representative</td>
<td>Name of Developers</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Priority Level</td>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>HC Funding Amount</td>
<td>Eligible for Funding?</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>Proximity Funding Preference</td>
<td>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</td>
<td>Development Category Funding Preference</td>
<td>Total Corp Funding Per Set-Aside</td>
<td>Leveraging Classification</td>
<td>Florida Job Creation Preference</td>
<td>Lottery Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-14C</td>
<td>Gables 31</td>
<td>Ori Tittelbaum</td>
<td>Gables 31 Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2,248,470</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,963.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-150C</td>
<td>Brownsville Transit Village V</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor</td>
<td>APC Brownsville Village V Development, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,600,308</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>134,788.04</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# RFA 2019-112 Board Approved Scoring Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Name of Development</th>
<th>Name of Authorized Principal Representative</th>
<th>Name of Developers</th>
<th>Demo</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>HC Funding Amount</th>
<th>Eligible for Funding?</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Proximity Funding Preference</th>
<th>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</th>
<th>Development Category Funding Preference</th>
<th>Total Corp Funding Per Set-Aside</th>
<th>Leveraging Classification</th>
<th>Florida Job Creation Preference</th>
<th>Lottery Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-101C</td>
<td>Residences at Daytona</td>
<td>Robert Watkins</td>
<td>NAHCO Development</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3,667,475</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>139,064.56</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-131C</td>
<td>The Haven</td>
<td>Justin Wilson</td>
<td>KO Affordable Housing LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,451.43</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-131C*</td>
<td>Superior Manor Apartments II</td>
<td>Oliver Gross</td>
<td>SMA II Developers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-140C</td>
<td>Villages Apartments, Phase II</td>
<td>Oliver Gross</td>
<td>Villages II Developers, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>146,021.33</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-141C*</td>
<td>Serenity Grove</td>
<td>Oliver L. Gross</td>
<td>Serenity Grove Developers, LLC</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Non-ALF</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>163,520.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-144C</td>
<td>Rio Ponce on Flagler</td>
<td>Joseph F. Chapman</td>
<td>Royal American Properties, LLC</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Non-ALF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,480,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>149,568.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mid-Rise 4 story multiplier was applied at the review committee meeting which affects the Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside.
**Total Set-Aside percentage was not included on the Application Submitted Report, but it was presented at the review committee meeting which affected the Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside Amount.

On January 23, 2020, the Board of Directors of Florida Housing Finance Corporation approved the Review Committee’s motion to adopt the scoring results above.

Any unsuccessful Applicant may file a notice of protest and a formal written protest in accordance with Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., Rule Chapter 28-130, F.A.C., and Rule 67-60.009, F.A.C.. Failure to file a protest within the time prescribed in Section 120.57(3), Fla. Stat., shall constitute a waiver of proceedings under Chapter 120, Fla. Stat.
January 29, 2020

Florida Housing Finance Corporation
Ana McGlamory, CP, FCP, FRP
Corporation Clerk
227 North Bronough Street, Suite 5000
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1329

Re: RFA 2019-112 – Housing Credit Financing For Affordable Housing Developments Located In Miami-Dade County

Dear Ms. McGlamory:

On behalf of Ambar Trail, Ltd. (2019-142C), this letter constitutes a Notice of Intent to Protest ("Notice") filed pursuant to sections 120.569 and 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, Rules 28-110.003 and 67.60.009, Florida Administrative Code, and the RFA.

This Notice is being filed within 72 hours (not including weekends and holidays) of the posting of the RFA on the Florida Housing's website on January 24, 2020 at 9:03 a.m. Ambar Trail, Ltd. reserves the right to file a formal written protest within (10) days of the filing of this Notice pursuant to section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes.

Sincerely,

Michael P. Donaldson

MPD/rb

cc: Elena Adams
Section Four A. of RFA 2019-112 states:

“Applicants may submit no more than three (3) Priority I Applications. There is no limit to the number of Priority II Applications that can be submitted; however, no Principal can be a Principal, as defined in Rule Chapter 67-48.002(94), F.A.C., of more than three (3) Priority I Applications.

For purposes of scoring, Florida Housing will rely on the Principals of the Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Form (Rev. 05-2019) outlined below in order to determine if a Principal is a Principal on more than three (3) Priority I Applications. If during scoring it is determined that a Principal is disclosed as a Principal on more than three (3) Priority I Applications, all such Priority I Applications will be deemed Priority II.

If it is later determined that a Principal, as defined in Rule Chapter 67-48.002(94), F.A.C., was not disclosed as a Principal and the undisclosed Principal causes the maximum set forth above to be exceeded, the award(s) for the affected Application(s) will be rescinded and all Principals of the affected Applications may be subject to material misrepresentation, even if the Applications were not selected for funding, were deemed ineligible, or were withdrawn.”

The following Priority I designated Applications contain Principals of the Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Forms with separate designations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative:</th>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative:</th>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative:</th>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative:</th>
<th>Authorized Principal Representative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathew Rieger</td>
<td>Randy Rieger</td>
<td>Cara Balogh</td>
<td>Orli Teitelbaum</td>
<td>Robert Balogh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-097C</td>
<td>2020-102C</td>
<td>2020-091C</td>
<td>2020-132C</td>
<td>2020-095C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-109C</td>
<td>2020-115C</td>
<td>2020-100C</td>
<td>2020-148C</td>
<td>2020-103C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-146C</td>
<td>2020-105C</td>
<td>2020-130C</td>
<td>2020-149C</td>
<td>2020-133C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Principals of the Applicant and Developer(s) Disclosure Forms for these Applications do not reflect a Principal designated on more than 3 Priority I Applications. However, the designated Priority I Applications share the following organizational commonalities, including:

- Under Section Three A.4.b., of the RFA, all 15 Applications submitted an Application Fee provided by HTG United, LLC from the same account number.
- Under Section Three A.4.a., of the RFA, all 15 Applications were submitted with hard copy binders under the cover sheet of Housing Trust Group, with the address of Aviation Avenue, Coconut Grove, Florida.
- Under Section Four A.3.c.2., of the RFA, all 15 of the Advance Review of Principal Disclosure Form requests for the Applications were submitted from individuals associated with Housing Trust Group, LLC at the address 3225 Aviation Avenue, Coconut Grove, Florida.
- Under Section Four A.3.e.2., of the RFA, all of the Applications share the same operational Contact Person, Scott Osman, associated with Housing Trust Group, LLC, at 3225 Aviation Avenue, Coconut Grove, Florida.
- With the exception of Application 2020-109C, under Exhibit C Section 3 of the RFA, all of the Applications share the exact same Corporation Funding Per Set Aside Amount.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Name of Development</th>
<th>Name of Authorized Principal/Representative</th>
<th>Name of Developers</th>
<th>Demo</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>HC Funding Amount</th>
<th>Eligible for Funding?</th>
<th>Family Demo and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity / HUD-designated SADDA Funding Goal?</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Proximity Funding Preference</th>
<th>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</th>
<th>Development Category Funding Preference</th>
<th>Total Corp Funding Per Unit ($)</th>
<th>Leveraging Classification</th>
<th>Florida Job Creation Preference</th>
<th>Lottery Number</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-242C*</td>
<td>Ambar Trail</td>
<td>Elona M. Adams et al.</td>
<td>Ambar3, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>93,670.86</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-093C</td>
<td>Culver Apartments II</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor et al.</td>
<td>ARC Culver Developm.</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1,923,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>106,257.78</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>#2 Addbl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-220C</td>
<td>Cordova Estates</td>
<td>Lewis V. Swain</td>
<td>RS Development Corp; Lewis V. Swain</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>115,280.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-220C</td>
<td>Platform 3750 at</td>
<td>Maria S. Mades</td>
<td>Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,480,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>116,842.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-117C</td>
<td>Residences at</td>
<td>Robert Hockins</td>
<td>Merlock Development Partners, Inc.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3,587,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>117,759.20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-090C</td>
<td>Quail Crossing</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor</td>
<td>Quail Crossing IV Development, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2,660,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>119,334.36</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-136C</td>
<td>Liberty Square</td>
<td>Alberto Millo et al.</td>
<td>Liberty Square Four Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,370,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>130,764.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-101C</td>
<td>Arbor Springs</td>
<td>Lewis V. Swain</td>
<td>RS Development Corp; Lewis V. Swain</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,851,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>123,338.56</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-089C</td>
<td>Princeton Crossings</td>
<td>Lewis V. Swain</td>
<td>RS Development Corp; Lewis V. Swain</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,851,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>123,338.56</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-116C*</td>
<td>The Mosaic</td>
<td>William Todd Fakeli</td>
<td>The Richmond Group of Florida, Inc.</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1,925,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>125,490.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-123C</td>
<td>RUGS The Commons II</td>
<td>Alberto Millo et al.</td>
<td>RUGS The Commons II Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>288,200</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>137,768.07</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-088C</td>
<td>Northside Transit</td>
<td>Kenneth Naylor</td>
<td>Northside Transit Development LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,801,900</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>134,787.99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-126C</td>
<td>Paso del Rio</td>
<td>Alberto Millo et al.</td>
<td>Paso del Rio Developer LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>140,180.48</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-086C**</td>
<td>Banyan Station</td>
<td>Terri Murray</td>
<td>MRI Development Corp; Neighborhood Renaissance, Inc; Stone Soup Development, Inc</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>140,180.48</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-143C</td>
<td>Metro Grande I</td>
<td>Maria S. Mades</td>
<td>Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>143,142.86</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-137C</td>
<td>Metro Grande II</td>
<td>Maria S. Mades</td>
<td>Cornerstone Group Partners, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2,530,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>142,429.03</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-088B</td>
<td>Alta Tower</td>
<td>Steve Protalis</td>
<td>EDOC Development Services, LLC; Ntb Tower Development, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,765,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>142,403.36</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-092C</td>
<td>San Cristobal</td>
<td>Steve Protalis</td>
<td>EDOC Development Services, LLC; San Cristobal 27 Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2,115,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>142,600.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-122C</td>
<td>Starse Miami</td>
<td>William Todd Fakeli</td>
<td>The Richmond Group of Florida, Inc.</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>146,761.80</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>#2 Elderly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Name of Development</th>
<th>Name of Authorized Principal Representative</th>
<th>Name of Developers</th>
<th>Demo</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>HC Funding Amount</th>
<th>Eligibility For Funding?</th>
<th>Family Demo and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity / HUD designated SADDA Funding Goal?</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Proximity Funding Preference</th>
<th>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</th>
<th>Development Category Funding Preference</th>
<th>Total Corp Funding Per Unit/Lido</th>
<th>Leveraging Classification</th>
<th>Florida Job Creation Preference</th>
<th>Lottery Number</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-119C</td>
<td>Capri Place</td>
<td>Barry Goldacre</td>
<td>DDH Development, LLC, Advanced Housing Corp., JGC Real Estate Ventures, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2,675,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,214.29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-127C</td>
<td>Yeager Plaza</td>
<td>Karen B. Brandley</td>
<td>Yeager Plaza Develop, LLC; Stone Soup Development, Inc.; The Yeager Clinic, Inc.</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,345.95</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-147C</td>
<td>Harmony Tower</td>
<td>David O. Drutch</td>
<td>Pencole Communities, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2,665,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,757.14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-214C</td>
<td>Penolec Landings</td>
<td>David O. Drutch</td>
<td>Pencole Communities, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2,725,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,866.67</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-132C</td>
<td>Laurel Club</td>
<td>Oscar Sol</td>
<td>Laurel Club Dev, LLC; JGC Real Estate Ventures, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,880,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,920.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-138C</td>
<td>Penolec at Heron Pointe</td>
<td>David O. Drutch</td>
<td>Pencole Communities, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3,757,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,973.33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-406C</td>
<td>The Seattle</td>
<td>Justin Wilson</td>
<td>908 Affordable Develop, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,801,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,021.33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-108C</td>
<td>Shoreview Place</td>
<td>Matthew A. Rieger</td>
<td>HOG Shoreview Develop, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2,184,500</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,244.67</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-130C</td>
<td>Healthcare Senior Housing</td>
<td>Steven Kirk</td>
<td>Rural Neighborhoods; Incorporated; Advanced Housing Corp., JGC Real Estate Ventures, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,671.43</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-111C</td>
<td>Wiles Soana</td>
<td>Steve Protz</td>
<td>EPDCO Development Services, LLC, Wiles Soana Develop, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2,560,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,837.74</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-131C</td>
<td>Rosemary Cove</td>
<td>Stephanie Berman</td>
<td>Coastal Supportive Housing, Inc.; Renaissance Capital, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2,359,899</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>145,357.53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-149C</td>
<td>The Acala</td>
<td>Nikul A. Inamdar</td>
<td>Acala Develop, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>143,662.88</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-124C</td>
<td>Vineyard Villas</td>
<td>Marc S. Placik</td>
<td>Guelphoode Develop, Corp.; Mageilhan Housing, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1,855,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>148,474.23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-127C</td>
<td>Sage Pointe</td>
<td>Nikul A. Inamdar</td>
<td>Sage Pointe Develop, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,877,777</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>140,846.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-094C</td>
<td>City Place</td>
<td>Francesco Rajo</td>
<td>Landmark Develop, Corp.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,728,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,784.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-104C</td>
<td>Autumn Ridge</td>
<td>Francesco Rajo</td>
<td>Landmark Develop, Corp.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,728,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,784.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-106C</td>
<td>Sierra Meadows</td>
<td>Francesco Rajo</td>
<td>Landmark Develop, Corp.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2,827,200</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>150,784.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-112C</td>
<td>Parkview</td>
<td>William Todd Hotton</td>
<td>The Richman Group of Florida, Inc.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>153,535.35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Name of Development</td>
<td>Name of Authorized Principal Representative</td>
<td>Name of Developers</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Priority Level</td>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>HC Funding Amount</td>
<td>Eligible For Funding?</td>
<td>Family Demo and qualifies for the Geographical Area of Opportunity / HUD designated SADSA Funding Goal?</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>Proximity Funding Preference</td>
<td>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</td>
<td>Development Category Funding Preference</td>
<td>Total Corp Funding Per Unit Component</td>
<td>Leverage Classification</td>
<td>Florida Job Creation Preference</td>
<td>Lottery Number</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-235C</td>
<td>The Amber</td>
<td>Elena M. Adams</td>
<td>Amber3, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,342.86</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-236C</td>
<td>Amber Club Residences</td>
<td>Elena M. Adams</td>
<td>Amber3, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,342.86</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-245C</td>
<td>Park Grove</td>
<td>Randy Rieger</td>
<td>Parc Grove Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-246C</td>
<td>Orchard Pointe</td>
<td>Ori Tambahnan</td>
<td>Orchard District Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-249C</td>
<td>Riverside Grove</td>
<td>Ori Tambahnan</td>
<td>219 Avenue Grove Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-250C</td>
<td>Courtyard Apartments, Phase III</td>
<td>Matthew R. Rieger</td>
<td>AVF HFG 2 Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-251C</td>
<td>Subleas II</td>
<td>Ori Tambahnan</td>
<td>Sublet 2, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2,368,400</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-252C</td>
<td>Park Ridge</td>
<td>Robert B. Gallogh</td>
<td>Park Ridge Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-253C</td>
<td>Courtyard Apartments, Phase III</td>
<td>Matthew R. Rieger</td>
<td>AVF HFG 3 Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2,951,600</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-254C</td>
<td>The Orange Grove</td>
<td>Robert B. Gallogh</td>
<td>Orange Grove Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-255C</td>
<td>Creek View</td>
<td>Randy E. Rieger</td>
<td>Creek View MGB Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-262C</td>
<td>Riverside Flats</td>
<td>Randy E. Rieger</td>
<td>219 Avenue Flats Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-269C</td>
<td>Coco Parc</td>
<td>Cara Balogh</td>
<td>24735 Coco Parc Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-330C</td>
<td>Skyview</td>
<td>Cara Balogh</td>
<td>Skyview79 Developer, LLC</td>
<td>E, Non-ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-353C</td>
<td>Rosewood Gardens</td>
<td>Robert B. Gallogh</td>
<td>Rosewood Miami Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,875,950</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-300C</td>
<td>The Sawgrass</td>
<td>Cara Balogh</td>
<td>Saccry Wynwood Developer, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2,719,080</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,961.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Name of Development</td>
<td>Name of Authorized Principal Representative</td>
<td>Name of Developers</td>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Priority Level</td>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>HC Funding Amount</td>
<td>Eligible for Funding?</td>
<td>Family Demo and qualifies for the Geographic Area of Opportunity / HUD designated SADD-A Funding Goal?</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>Proximity Funding Preference</td>
<td>Per Unit Construction Funding Preference</td>
<td>Development Category Funding Preference</td>
<td>Total Corp Funding Per Set-Aside</td>
<td>Leveraging Classification</td>
<td>Florida Job Creation Preference</td>
<td>Lottery Number</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-310C</td>
<td>Rocklin Place, Opa- Locka</td>
<td>Robert Kotkin</td>
<td>MorRock Development Partners, Inc.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,657,475</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>130,164.56</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-331C</td>
<td>The Haven</td>
<td>Justin Wilson</td>
<td>908 Affordable II Developers, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>156,451.43</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-306C*</td>
<td>Superior Manor Apartments II</td>
<td>Oliver L. Gross</td>
<td>SMA II Developers, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>164,250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-340C</td>
<td>The Villages Apartments, Phase II</td>
<td>Oliver Gross</td>
<td>Villages II Developers, LLC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>298,200</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>146,021.33</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-241C*</td>
<td>Serenity Grove</td>
<td>Oliver L. Gross</td>
<td>Serenity Grove Developers, LLC</td>
<td>C. Non- Self</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>146,328.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-244C</td>
<td>Rio Ponto en Flagler</td>
<td>Joseph F. Chapman, IV</td>
<td>Royal American Properties, LLC</td>
<td>C. Non- Self</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,460,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>146,966.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi-Rise 4 story multiplier was applied at the review committee meeting which affects the Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside.

**Total Set-Aside percentage was not included in the Application Submitted Report, but it was presented at the review committee meeting which affected the Corporation Funding Per Set-Aside Amount.