ST. LUKE’S LIFE CENTER, LTD.

Petitioner,

FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION

Respondent.

Application No. 2005-044C
2005 Universal Cycle

PETITION FOR FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING

Petitioner St. Luke’s Life Center, Ltd. (“St. Luke’s”), pursuant to sections 120.569 and 120.57(1), Florida Statutes, and rules 28-106.201 and 67-48.005(5), Florida Administrative Code, files this petition for formal administrative hearing concerning the scoring by Florida Housing Finance Corporation (“Florida Housing”) of Application No. 2005-038C filed by Fore Summerlin Oaks, Ltd. (“Summerlin Oaks”). The issue raised in this Petition is whether Summerlin Oaks properly received 1.25 tie-breaker measurement points for its proximity to a public school.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. St. Luke’s filed an application for an allocation of housing credits in the 2005 Universal Cycle from Florida Housing. St. Luke’s applied for $1,511,082 in competitive housing credits and proposed to build a 150-unit apartment complex in Polk County, Florida. When final scores were released by Florida Housing on May 24, 2005, St. Luke’s received the
maximum possible score of 66 from Florida Housing and earned the maximum of 7.5 tie-breaker measurement points for proximity to services such as a grocery store, public school, medical facility, pharmacy, and a bus stop. However, when final ranking scores were released on August 25, 2005, St. Luke’s was not in the funding range for an allocation of housing credits in the 2005 cycle.

2. Summerlin Oaks also filed an application for an allocation of housing credits in the 2005 Universal Cycle. Summerlin Oaks applied for $928,333 in competitive housing credits and proposed to build a 144-unit apartment complex in Polk County, Florida. When final scores were released on May 24, 2005, Summerlin Oaks also received a perfect score of 66 points and 7.5 tie-breaker measurement points for proximity to certain services. Because Summerlin Oaks had a higher lottery number than St. Luke’s, Summerlin Oaks was in the funding range for housing credits when final ranking scores were released on August 25, 2005.

3. Florida Housing has more applicants seeking housing credits than it can fund each year. In order to determine which applications should receive funding, Florida Housing uses a scoring process for the allocation of housing credits pursuant to rule chapter 67-48, Florida Administrative Code, and a Qualified Allocation Plan (“QAP”). The provisions of the QAP are adopted and incorporated by reference in rule 67-48.025. Pursuant to the QAP, housing credits

---

1 To encourage the development of low-income housing for families, in 1987 Congress created federal income tax credits (also known as housing credits) that are allotted to each state, including Florida. Section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code governs this program. The tax credits equate to a dollar-for-dollar reduction of the holder’s federal tax liability, which can be taken for up to ten years, if the project satisfies the Internal Revenue Code’s requirements each year. The developer sells, or syndicates, the tax credits to generate a substantial portion of the funding necessary for the construction of the development. Each state receives an annual allotment of tax credits allocated to the state, primarily on a per capita basis. Florida Housing is the statutorily created “housing credit agency” responsible for the allocation and distribution of Florida’s tax credits to applicants for the development of rental housing for low income and very low income families.
are apportioned among the most populated counties, medium populated counties, and least populated counties. The QAP also establishes set-asides and special targeting goals.

4. An application for housing credits is comprised of numerous forms that request information from each applicant. Florida Housing has adopted its application package by reference in rule 67-48.004(1)(a), Florida Administrative Code. An applicant for housing credits may earn a maximum of 66 points. The Universal Application Instructions, which are part of the application package, provide that, in the event of a tie among competing applications receiving 66 points, a series of tie-breakers will be used to rank such applicants. Generally (in descending order), as application in “Group A” prevails over an application in “Group B”; an application with a greater amount of proximity tie-breaker points prevails over an application with fewer proximity tie-breaker points; and an application with a lower lottery number prevails over an application with a higher lottery number. The lottery number is used as the last tie-breaker when applications are otherwise scored equally.

5. Both St. Luke’s and Summerlin Oaks were competing for housing credits in the large county geographic set-aside category in Polk County, and both were designated as urban in-fill developments. Both were in Group “A” for leveraging purposes. Under the relevant set-aside unit limitations (SAUL) in Florida Housing’s Universal Application Instructions, 150 units could be funded in Polk County. Summerlin Oaks had a lottery number of 11, and St. Luke’s had a lottery number of 68, which meant that Summerlin Oaks scored just ahead of St. Luke’s based on this last tie-breaker. However, the lottery numbers only matter if both St. Luke’s and Summerlin Oaks received a perfect score and were in all other ways tied in the application process. If one of the developments failed to achieve a maximum score of 66 and earn the
maximum 7.5 in tie-breaker proximity points, then the other development would be in the funding range.

6. Summerlin Oaks improperly received 1.25 proximity tie-breaker points for its proximity to a public school during the scoring process. The Universal Application Instructions adopted by Florida Housing provide that the latitude and longitude coordinates for measuring a public school’s proximity to a development must represent “a point that is on the doorway threshold of an exterior entrance that provides direct public access to the building where the service is located.” Universal Application Instructions at page 16 (emphasis supplied). Summerlin Oaks improperly used as its measurement point a doorway intended for student and teacher access only, not the door to the school’s office, which all members of the public must use when visiting the school. Because the latitude and longitude coordinates of the school’s office – the proper location for measuring distance from the development – are more than one mile away from Summerlin Oaks’ proposed development, Summerlin Oaks should not have received the full 1.25 tie-breaker measurement points. See Universal Application Instructions at p. 17 (1.25 points are available only if the proposed development’s tie-breaker measurement point is less than or equal to 1.0 mile from the eligible service).

7. If Summerlin Oaks had not received the full 1.25 points for its proximity to a public school, it would not have been in the funding range. St. Luke’s, the next-eligible development in the large-county set-aside category located in Polk County, would have been in the funding range if Summerlin Oaks had been properly scored.

**AGENCY AFFECTED**

8. The agency affected in this proceeding is Florida Housing, 227 North Bronough Street, Suite S100, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1329. The agency’s file number is 2005-044C.
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9. The petitioner is St. Luke's, 2950 SW 27th Avenue, Suite 200, Miami, Florida 33133. The petitioner's telephone numbers are 305-476-8118 (phone) and 305-476-9674 (facsimile).

PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY

10. The petitioner's attorney is Donna E. Blanton, Raley Thomas Yon & Clark, P.A., 301 S. Bronough Street, Ste. 200, Tallahassee, Florida, 32301. The attorney's telephone numbers are 850-425-6654 (phone) and 850-425-6694 (facsimile).

NOTICE

11. St. Luke's received notice of the final rankings in the 2005 Universal Application Cycle on August 25, 2005, when Stephen P. Auger, then Deputy Development Officer of Florida Housing, sent a memorandum to all applicants that included a 2005 Universal Scoring Summary that reflected final ranking scores, as well as a notice of rights.

PETITIONER'S SUBSTANTIAL INTERESTS

12. St. Luke's substantial interests are affected by the final rankings because the improper scoring of Sunnerlin Oaks' application placed Sunnerlin Oaks in the funding range. But for this improper scoring, St. Luke's – as the next eligible development of the same type in Polk County – would have been in the funding range and, therefore, would have been included in the 2005 final rankings.

13. Rule 67-48.005(5) provides, in relevant part:

Each Applicant will be provided with a final ranking of all Applications and notice of rights, which shall constitute the point of entry to contest any ranking or scoring issue related to any other Applications for the SAIL Program, the HOME
Program or the HC Program. An Applicant that wishes to contest the final ranking or score of another Applicant may do so only if:

   

   (b) For any Application cycle closing after January 1, 2002, if the contested issue involves an error in scoring, the contested issue must (i) be one that could not have been cured pursuant to subsection 67-48.004(14), F.A.C. or (ii) be one that could have been cured, if the ability to cure was not solely within the Applicant’s control. The contested issue cannot be one that was both curable and within the Applicant’s sole control to cure. With regard to curable issues, a petition must prove that the contested issue was not feasibly curable within the time allows for cure in subsection 67-48.004(6), F.A.C.

   (c) The competing Applicant alleges facts in its petition sufficient to demonstrate that, but for the specifically identified threshold, scoring or ranking errors in the challenged Application, its Application would have been in the funding range at the time the Corporation provided the Applicant with its final ranking.

14. The issue of Summerlin Oaks’ ability to receive proximity tie-breaker points has been at issue throughout the scoring process in the 2005 cycle. When preliminary scores were released by Florida Housing on March 18, 2005, Summerlin Oaks was awarded 1.25 points for its proximity to Gibbons Street Elementary School. See Exhibit 1 (Preliminary Scores). A competing applicant filed a Notice of Possible Scoring Error (“NOPSE”) noting (1) that the tie-breaker measurement point used by the developer for proximity to services was not on the development site and (2) that the coordinates provided for Gibbons Street Elementary School described a point that is located near a service entrance to the school that is only used by janitors and the staff. See NOPSE submitted by Application No. 2005-046C, attached as Exhibit 2.

Florida Housing accepted both arguments when it released NOPSE scores on April 14, 2005. See Exhibit 3 (NOPSE Scores).

15. The Applicant attempted to cure both issues, changing the location of both the tie-breaker measurement point at its development site and at the school. See Exhibit 4 (Summerlin Oaks’ cure). The new point on the school site selected by the Applicant was the entrance to
Building # 7, an outlying building toward the rear of the campus and closest to the Applicant's development. Building # 7 does not serve as the school's public entrance; rather, it is used by students entering the particular building. As part of its use, the Applicant included a letter from the school principal stating that parents and visitors could enter Building # 7 only "after checking in at the office." Id.

16. A competing Applicant then filed a Notice of Alleged Deficiency ("NOAD") challenging the use of the outlying building as an appropriate tie-breaker measurement point and noting that the actual public entrance to the school (the office) is 1.009 miles from the tie-breaker measurement point on the development site. See Exhibit 5 (NOAD). Thus, Summerlin Oaks should have received only 1.0 proximity tie-breaker measurement point for its location near the school, not 1.25 points. The NOAD includes numerous exhibits demonstrating that the Applicant did not select as its measurement point an exterior entrance providing direct public access to the school. See id. One exhibit shows a sign posted on the school's campus stating that "VISITORS MUST CHECK WITH OFFICE BEFORE ENTERING BUILDING." Id.

17. The Universal Application Instructions concerning tie-breaker measurement points provide as follows:

The latitude and longitude coordinates for a Grocery Store, Public School, Medical Facility and Pharmacy must represent a point that is on the doorway threshold of an exterior entrance that provides direct public access to the building where the service is located. . . .

If there is no exterior public entrance to the Grocery Store, Public School, Medical Facility or Pharmacy, then a point should be used that is at the exterior entrance doorway threshold that is the closest walking distance to the doorway threshold of the interior public entrance to the service . . . .

Universal Application Instructions at p. 16 (emphasis supplied). Gibbons Street Elementary School unquestionably has a main public exterior entrance . It is the school’s office. See Exhibit
5. Thus, under the plain language of the Instructions, Summerlin Oaks should have used that public entrance – the office – as the measurement point for purposes of obtaining proximity tie-breaker measurement points.

18. Florida Housing did not accept the NOAD filed by the competing Applicant and awarded Summerlin Oaks 1.25 tie-breaker points for its proximity to the public school. Pursuant to rule 67-48.005(5), St. Luke’s opportunity to challenge that scoring decision was provided when final ranking scores were released on August 25, 2005.

19. Because St. Luke’s is challenging a scoring decision, it must demonstrate that the contested issue is not one that could have been cured during the cure period or that the issue is one that could have been cured, but the ability to cure was not solely within the applicant’s control. See r. 67-48.005(5)b, Fla. Admin Code. In this case, Summerlin Oaks could not have cured its proximity tie-breaker measurement point in a way that would have allowed it to achieve the maximum of 1.25 points for proximity to the school. As demonstrated in Exhibit 5 and its attachments, the direct public entrance of Gibbons Street Elementary School is located at latitude N27 degrees, 53 minutes, 11.4 seconds and longitude W 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 25.1 seconds. This point is 5,327.71 feet (or 1.009 miles) away from the Applicant’s tie-breaker measurement point.

20. St. Luke’s also must demonstrate that but for the error in scoring in the Summerlin Oaks application, St. Luke’s would have been within the funding range at the time of final ranking. R. 67-48.005(5), Fla. Admin. Code. As previously noted, St. Luke’s was the next development in line to be funded through the Polk County SAUL in the 2005 cycle. If Summerlin Oaks had been properly scored by Florida Housing according to the agency’s own rules, Summerlin Oaks would not have been in the funding range and St. Luke’s would have
Thus, St. Luke's substantial interests are affected by Florida Housing's issuance of its final ranking scores.

**DISPUTED ISSUES OF MATERIAL FACT**

21. Disputed issues of material fact and law include:

- Whether the entrance to Building # 7 that Summerlin Oaks used as its tie-breaker measurement point at Gibbons Street Elementary School provides direct public access to the school;

- Whether Summerlin Oaks qualifies for the maximum proximity tie breaker points permitted by Florida Housing's Universal Application Instructions for proximity to a public school;

- Whether Florida Housing erred in awarding Summerlin Oaks 1.25 proximity tie-breaker points for its proximity to a public school.

**ULTIMATE FACTS ALLEGED**

22. Ultimate facts alleged, including those that warrant reversal of the proposed agency action, are that (1) Florida Housing erred in awarding 1.25 tie-breaker measurement points to Summerlin Oaks based on its proximity to a public school, and (2) but for this error in scoring, Summerlin Oaks would not have been ranked in the funding range for the 2005 Universal Cycle and St. Luke's would have been ranked in the funding range.

**RULES AND STATUTES**

23. Rules and statutes that require reversal of the proposed agency action are the Florida Housing Finance Corporation Act (sections 420.501 - .530, Florida Statutes); sections 120.569 and 120.57(1), Florida Statutes; and rules 67-48.002, 67-48.004, and 67-48.005, Florida Administrative Code.
24. St. Luke's respectfully requests that this Petition be transferred to the Division of Administrative Hearings for a formal administrative hearing and that the Administrative Law Judge enter a Recommended Order finding that but for the scoring error in the Summerlin Oaks application, St. Luke's would have been in the funding range and would have been included in the 2005 final rankings.

Dated: 9-16-05

Respectfully submitted,

Donna E. Blanton
Florida Bar No. 948560
Radley Thomas Yon & Clark, P.A.
301 S. Bronough Street, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
850-425-6654 (phone)
850-425-6694 (facsimile)

Attorney for St. Luke's Life Center, Ltd.
# 2005 MMRB, SAIL & HC Scoring Summary

As of: 03/16/2005

**Development Name:** Summerlin Oaks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As Of:</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Net Threshold?</th>
<th>Proximity Tie-Breaker Points</th>
<th>Corporation Funding per Set-Aside Unit</th>
<th>SAIL Request Amount as Percentage of Development Cost</th>
<th>Is SAIL Request Amount Equal to or Greater than 10% of Total Development Cost?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03 - 18 - 2005</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>$48,350.68</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>$48,350.68</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOPSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Available Points</th>
<th>Preliminary</th>
<th>NOPSE</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Final-Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>Rehabilitation/Substantial Rehabilitation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.c</td>
<td>All Developments Except SRD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.c</td>
<td>SRD Developments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.e</td>
<td>Energy Conservation Features</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>Total Set-Aside Percentage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.c</td>
<td>Set-Aside Breakdown Chart</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Affordability Period</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programs for Non-Elderly &amp; Non-Homeless</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Programs for Homeless (SRD &amp; Non-SRD)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Programs for Elderly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Programs for All Applicants</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2005 MMRB, SAIL & HC Scoring Summary

**As of:** 03/16/2005  
**File #** 2005-038C  
**Development Name:** Summerin Oaks

## Threshold(s) Failed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
<th>Created As</th>
<th>Result of</th>
<th>Rescinded as</th>
<th>Result of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development Team</td>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td>NOPSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Proximity Tie-Breaker Points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Preliminary</th>
<th>NOPSE</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.a (2)(a)</td>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.b (2)(b)</td>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.a (2)(c)</td>
<td>Medical Facility</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.a (2)(d)</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.a (2)(e)</td>
<td>Public Bus Stop or Metro Rail Stop</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6P</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6(b)</td>
<td>Proximity to Developments on FRDC Development Proximity List</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional Application Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
<th>Created As</th>
<th>Result of</th>
<th>Rescinded as</th>
<th>Result of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Development Cost Adjusted</td>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td>NOPSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Applicant entered $1,008,810 as the GC fee. This figure exceeded the 14% GC fee limit and as such, the fee was adjusted to the 14% limit of $1,008,227. The adjustment in the GC fee represents the Development's Cost which caused the 14% Developer Fee to be exceeded. Therefore, the Developer Fee amount was decreased from $1,048,300 to $1,048,227. The Development's Total Development Cost was increased from $12,758,173 to $12,699,695 because of the fee adjustments.
Notice of Possible Scoring Error(s) regarding Application No. 2005-038C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part/Section/Subsection</th>
<th>Number of Issues For Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III A 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Issues For Review 2

Submitted by Authorized Representative for Application Number 2005-046C

Signature of Authorized Representative for above-designated Application.

Lloyd J. Beggio
Print Name:

All notices must be submitted in accordance with Rule Chapters 67-48.004(4) and 67-21.003(4) and should contain enough information for staff to evaluate them. This will include, but may not be limited to, a detailed description of the issue being identified and action requested by submitting Applicant, such as reduction of score or rejection of the Application. Attach additional pages if necessary. All notices should be submitted in typewritten form.
Brief Statement of Explanation regarding Application No. 2005–03SC

Provide a separate brief statement for each NOPSE

Part III. A. 10. and Exhibit 25 (Proximity)

The coordinates provided for the Public School “Gibbons St. Elementary School” describes a point that is located near a service entrance to the school that is only used by the janitors and staff. The point does not represent a point that is on the doorway threshold of an exterior entrance that provides direct public access to Gibbons St. Elementary School as required by Florida Housing’s Universal Application Instructions.

The attached Surveyor Affidavit (Exhibit 1) and the sketch attached both show that the latitude and longitude coordinates for the exterior direct public entrance to Gibbons St. Elementary School are latitude N 77 degrees, 53 minutes, 11.4 seconds and longitude W 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 25.1 seconds. This point is 5,327.71 feet away (or 1,009 miles away) from the TBMP.

Therefore, Florida Housing should only award the Applicant one (1) tie breaker proximity point for the Public School service.
Affidavit and Certification of Joseph R. Gore

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared Joseph R. Gore, who, being duly sworn, states that he personally knows the following facts and that the same are true and accurate.

1. My name is Joseph R. Gore. I am licensed by the State of Florida as a Professional Land Surveyor. My license number is LS 5188. I am a Project Manager of Hamilton Engineering and Surveying, Inc. I confirm that the method used to determine the latitude and longitude coordinates in this Affidavit and Certification conforms to Rule 61G17-6, F.A.C. I am submitting this Affidavit and Certification on behalf of Sunnybrooke Apartments, Ltd. (the "Applicant") and am not related to the Applicant or any Principals or Financial Beneficiaries of the Applicant.

2. I have reviewed the following documents:

a. Surveyor Certification, signed by Gregory A. Prather, but not dated, that says it is for Summerlin Oaks (the "Submitted Surveyor Certification");


3. I conducted and supervised field work and research regarding the site on which Summerlin Oaks would be located and the tie-breaker measurement points ("TBMPs") claimed in the Submitted Surveyor Certification. I also conducted and supervised field work and research regarding the Gibbons St. Elementary School referenced in the Submitted Surveyor Certification and Submitted Gibbons St. Elementary School Sketch.

4. Based on that work, I prepared and supervised the preparation of the attached sketch, showing the parcels on which the development would be located (the "Correct Development Site and Gibbons St. Elementary School Sketch").

The Correct Location of Gibbons St. Elementary School

5. The Submitted Surveyor Certification claims that the doorway threshold of the public entrance to Gibbons St. Elementary School is located at latitude N 27 degrees, 53 minutes, 11.2 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place) and at longitude W 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 26.8 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place). The provided coordinates identifies a point to a service entrance to the School and does not represent a point that is on the doorway threshold of an exterior entrance that provides direct public access to Gibbons St. Elementary School.
6. The latitude and longitude coordinates for the exterior direct public entrance to Gibbons St. Elementary School is: latitude N 27 degrees, 53 minutes, 11.4 seconds (truncated after 1 decimal place) and longitude W 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 25.1 seconds (truncated after 1 decimal place). This location is computed by me to be 155 feet away from the spot identified by the Submitted Surveyor Certification for the tie-breaker measurement point.

7. Although the tie-breaker measurement point is not located on the submitted development site, the correctly identified public entrance to the school is 5,327.71 feet away (or 1.009 miles away) from the closest boundary of any piece of the Summertin Oaks property.

8. The Development Site Sketch shows the exterior walls of the building sheltering the school, the latitude and longitude coordinates provided above and the public entrance that it represents, and the latitude and longitude coordinates for the service entrance to Gibbons St. Elementary School claimed in the Submitted Surveyor Certification.

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that these statements are true and correct.

[Signature]
Joseph R. Gore, P.L.S., Fl. Reg. # 5188

Dated 3/24/05

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of March, 2005, by Joseph R. Gore, who is personally known to me or has produced ____________ as identification.

WITNESS my hand and official seal, this 24th day of March, 2005.

[Signature]
Notary Public
State of FLORIDA
My commission expires: 3-14-08

(AFFIX SEAL)
Affidavit and Certification of Joseph R. Gore

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared Joseph R. Gore, who, being duly sworn, states that he personally knows the following facts and that the same are true and accurate.

1. My name is Joseph R. Gore. I am licensed by the State of Florida as a Professional Land Surveyor. My license number is LS 5188. I am a Project Manager of Hamilton Engineering and Surveying, Inc. I confirm that the method used to determine the latitude and longitude coordinates in this Affidavit and Certification conforms to Rule 61G17-6, F.A.C. I am submitting this Affidavit and Certification on behalf of Sunnybrooke Apartments, Ltd. (the "Applicant") and am not related to the Applicant or any Principal or Financial Beneficiaries of the Applicant.

2. I have reviewed the following documents:

   a. Surveyor Certification, signed by Gregory A. Prather, but not dated, that says it is for Summerlin Oaks (the "Submitted Surveyor Certification");

   b. Legal Descriptions of all eight parcels as submitted to Florida Housing in 2005 application as Exhibit A to the Amended and Restated Real Estate Purchase and Sale Contract, signed by the Purchaser, Christopher L. New, but not dated.

3. I conducted and supervised field work and research regarding the sites on which Summerlin Oaks would be located and the tie-breaker measurement point ("T BMP") claimed in the Submitted Surveyor Certification.

4. Based on that work, I prepared and supervised the preparation of the attached sketch, of which shows the parcels on which the developments would be located (the "Development Site Sketch") and the location of the submitted tie-breaker measurement point.

The Correct Location of the Tie-Breaker Measurement Point

5. The Submitted Surveyor Certification claims that the TBMP is located at latitude N 27 degrees, 53 minutes, 58.4 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place) and at longitude W 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 51.1 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place).

6. That point is not located on the development site. It is 46 feet ± South of the Southerly boundary line and 10 feet ± West of the Easterly boundary line.

7. From my review of the Legal Descriptions, it appears that the developer was claiming the southeastern-most corner of the property as its TBMP. I measured the location of the southeastern-most corner of the legal descriptions provided to be latitude N 27 degrees, 51 minutes, 58.9 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place) and the longitude to be W 81
Brief Statement of Explanation regarding
Application No. 2005 – 038C

Provide a separate brief statement for each NOPSE

Part III. A. 10. and Exhibit 25 (Proximity)

The Applicant is entitled to zero proximity points because the Tie-Breaker Measurement Point (T BMP) is not on the Development site and is therefore invalid.

The Surveyor Certification submitted by Applicant claims that the TBMP is located at latitude 27 degrees, 53 minutes, 58.4 seconds (truncated after 1 decimal place) and at longitude 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 51.1 seconds (truncated after 1 decimal place). The attached Surveyor Affidavit (Exhibit 1) and the sketch attached to it show that the above mentioned point is not located on the development site. It is 40.55 feet away from the closest boundary of any part of the site. The Florida Housing's rule 67-48.002(99) requires that the TBMP that the Applicant selects be on the Development site.

Therefore, Florida Housing should award zero points for all proximity points.
degrees, 49 minutes, 51.0 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place. This location is 47 feet ± away from the spot identified by the coordinates actually given for the TBMP.

8. The Development Site Sketch depicts the locations of the TBMP as claimed and as is relocated to the Development site.

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that these statements are true and correct.

Joseph R. Gore, P.L.S., FL. Reg. # 5188
Dated

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF HILTON HEAD

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of March, 2005 by Joseph R. Gore, who
is personally known to me or has produced ___________________________ as
identification.

WITNESS my hand and official seal, this 24th day of March, 2005.

Notary Public
State of FLORIDA
My commission expires: 5-14-08

(AFFIX SEAL)
Brief Statement of Explanation regarding
Application No. 2005 - 038C

Provide a separate brief statement for each Cure or NOAD

In response to NOSE, which challenged location of
3x3 Broker Measurement point and paper coordinates
for Griegs St. Elementary, please find enclosed:

- Surveyor Certification Form and sketches;
- Affidavit from Surveyor; and
- Letter from school principal.
SURVEYOR CERTIFICATION

Name of Development: EAST CHESNUT TERRACE, Lot Nos. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45

Development Location:

(All minor streets, roads and streets designated in the Development, the address or street name of which is not yet assigned, prior to the street name, see attached list of proposed street names)

The undersigned duly licensed surveyor certifies that the results of the survey were determined in accordance with the following latitude and longitude coordinates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey was conducted on the 10th day of April, 20X2.

CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

[Signature]

4/25/09

Robert J. Auer, Jr.

Robert A. Auer, Inc.

477 South Ave.

Ralph, FL 33930

(239) 370-5004

This certificate may not be copied or reproduced.

Table 25
GAMBRO HEALTH CARE
113C East Church Street
Bartow, FL 33830

NOTE:
Fort Heade to Bartow Bus Service
Route # 25
Stop # 5
Bus information obtained from the
Folk County Transit Authority

BUS STOP
N 27°33'55.0"  
W 81°14'52.0"

EAST CHURCH STREET

Summerlin Oaks
Exhibit C
Folk County, Florida

PICKETT & ASSOCIATES, Inc.
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Bartow, Florida 33830
Phone: (863) 527-3080
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AFFIDAVIT OF GREGORY A. PRATHER

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared GREGORY A. PRATHER, who, being duly sworn, states that he personally knows the following facts and that the same are true and accurate:

1. I am a professional surveyor licensed by the State of Florida, License No. LS 5135, and I have been a licensed professional surveyor since 1992.

2. I am currently a Vice President and the Director of Surveying for Pickett & Associates, Inc., located in Bartow, Florida, and I have held these positions at all times material hereto.

3. In February 2005, Pickett & Associates, Inc., was engaged to determine the latitude and longitude coordinates of various points to be reported and certified to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation (“FHFC”) as part of an application for 2005 tax credit funding for a project known as Summerlin Oaks.

4. Neither I nor Pickett & Associates, Inc., is related in any way to Fore Summerlin Oaks Limited Partnership (the applicant for Summerlin Oaks), or its principals or Financial Beneficiaries.

5. In preparing to perform this work, I reviewed Florida Administrative Code Rule 67-48.002(99) and pages 12 through 22 of the 2005 Universal Application Instructions published by FHFC (Form UA 1016 (Rev. 2-05)), as well as the corresponding “Surveyor Certification” form to be completed and included in the Summerlin Oaks application as Exhibit 25.

5. On February 11, 2005, I visited the site of the Summerlin Oaks project, located on
East Church Street on the north side of East Church Street and North 2nd Avenue, Bartow, Florida, 33836, as well as the sites of various service surrounding Summerlin Oaks, including Gibbons Street Elementary, located at 1860 E. Gibbons Street, Bartow, Florida, 33830, and determined the latitude and longitude coordinates required by FHFC.

7. I thereafter completed the Surveyor Certification form and prepared sketches of the various service sites, which I understand were included as Exhibit 25 in the Summerlin Oaks application.

8. In April 2005, Pickett & Associates, Inc., was engaged to confirm and re-determine the latitude and longitude coordinates of the Tie-Breaker Measurement Point on the Summerlin Oaks site and the coordinates of the previously identified entrance to Gibbons St. Elementary, which were to be reported and certified again to FHFC as part of the application for 2005 tax credit funding for Summerlin Oaks.

9. In preparing to perform this work, I again reviewed Florida Administrative Code Rule 67-48.002(99) and pages 12 through 22 of the 2005 Universal Application Instructions published by FHFC (Form UA1016 (Rev. 2-05)), as well as the corresponding “Surveyor Certification” form to be submitted to FHFC. Finally, I reviewed several “Notices of Possible Scoring Error” and accompanying documents directed to my original Surveyor Certification form and service sketches for the Summerlin Oaks project, including two affidavits from Mr. Joseph R. Gore, dated March 24, 2003.

10. On April 25, 2005, I revisited the site of the Summerlin Oaks project, as well as the site of Gibbons Street Elementary.
11. At the site of the Summerlin Oaks project, I determined the latitude and longitude coordinates of a Tie-Breaker Measurement Point on the project site, which are accurately recorded on the Surveyor Certification form, dated April 25, 2005, and attached as Exhibit A. The point on the site that I used for this Tie-Breaker Measurement Point fully complies with the requirements of FHFC’s Application Instructions, and is located on the site of the Summerlin Oaks project as set forth in the legal description of the site contained in the application. Further, the method I used to determine the stated coordinates fully complies with Florida Administrative Code Chapter 61G17-6.

12. At the site of Gibbons Street Elementary, I determined the latitude and longitude coordinates of an exterior public entrance to the school, which are accurately recorded on the Surveyor Certification form, dated April 25, 2005, and attached as Exhibit A. The point on the school site that I used for this purpose fully complies with the requirements of FHFC’s Application Instructions, and this point is located “on the doorway threshold of an exterior entrance that provides direct public access” to the school building, as required on page 16 of the 2005 Universal Application Instructions. Further, the method I used to determine the stated coordinates fully complies with Florida Administrative Code Chapter 61G17-6.

13. The three sketches accompanying the Surveyor Certification form attached as Exhibit A accurately depict the points on the relevant service sites that I used to determine the required latitude and longitude coordinates.

14. The points represented on the Surveyor Certification form and sketches attached as Exhibit A all fully comply with the requirements of FHFC’s Application Instructions, and the
method I used to determine the stated coordinates fully complies with Florida Administrative
Code Chapter 61G17-6.

15. The photographs attached to this Affidavit as Exhibits B & C accurately depict the
"Entrance to Classroom Building #7" to Gibbons St. Elementary that I used for purposes of
determining the latitude and longitude coordinates for this service as reflected on the Surveyor
Certification form and accompanying sketch, which are attached as Exhibit A.

Under penalty of perjury, I declare that these statements are true and correct.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.

GREGORY A. PRATHER

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF __________
Sworn to and subscribed before me this 30th day of April, 2003, by GREGORY A. PRATHER.

____________________________
NOTARY PUBLIC

Name of Notary, typed, printed or stamped

Personally Known OR Produced Identification

Type of Identification Produced
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Development:</th>
<th>Summation Oaks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Location:</td>
<td>12111 SUMMATION CT., IN THE CITY OF FAIRFAX, IN THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(At minimum, provide the address assigned by the United States Postal Service, including the address number, street name and city, or if the address has not yet been assigned, provide the street name, closest designated intersection and city)

The undersigned Plat Engineer surveyed and verified that the method used to determine the following latitudes and longitudes coordinates conform to Rule 1701/14, F.A.C.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N 27° 52' 53&quot;</td>
<td>58° 38' 40&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 49° 0' 49&quot;</td>
<td>51° 3' 50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (latitudinal)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (longitudinal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23' 20&quot;</td>
<td>20&quot;</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3' 50&quot;</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Development easement of Summation Oaks is a part of the boundary of each parcel located within 1/2 mile of the Ter-Speaker Measurement Point. If the Development easement or any Development consisting of more than 1/2 mile is not consistent with the current parcel, the boundary must be adjusted to conform with the current parcel.

If the Development easement or any Development consisting of more than 1/2 mile is not consistent with the current parcel, the boundary must be adjusted to conform with the current parcel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of closest Public Bus Stop to Main Road Stop</th>
<th>N 27° 52' 53&quot;</th>
<th>58° 38' 40&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49° 0' 49&quot;</td>
<td>51° 3' 50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (latitudinal)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (longitudinal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23' 20&quot;</td>
<td>20&quot;</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3' 50&quot;</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Development easement or any Development consisting of more than 1/2 mile is not consistent with the current parcel, the boundary must be adjusted to conform with the current parcel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of closest Park</th>
<th>N 27° 52' 53&quot;</th>
<th>58° 38' 40&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49° 0' 49&quot;</td>
<td>51° 3' 50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (latitudinal)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (longitudinal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23' 20&quot;</td>
<td>20&quot;</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3' 50&quot;</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of closest Elementary School</th>
<th>N 27° 52' 53&quot;</th>
<th>58° 38' 40&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49° 0' 49&quot;</td>
<td>51° 3' 50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (latitudinal)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (longitudinal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23' 20&quot;</td>
<td>20&quot;</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3' 50&quot;</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of closest Hospital</th>
<th>N 27° 52' 53&quot;</th>
<th>58° 38' 40&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49° 0' 49&quot;</td>
<td>51° 3' 50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (latitudinal)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds (longitudinal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23' 20&quot;</td>
<td>20&quot;</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3' 50&quot;</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Corporation believes that there are any false statements made in this certication, the Corporation will forward a copy to the State of Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation for investigation.

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, I declare that the foregoing statement is true and correct:

[Signature]
Name of Signatory: "4/26/05"
Signature Date: "4/26/05"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Surveyor:</th>
<th>&quot;475 South Blvd Ave.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.P. of Engineering:</td>
<td>&quot;Batavia, FL 33930&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.P. of Engineering:</td>
<td>&quot;592-593-0005&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>&quot;592-593-0005&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number (including area code):</td>
<td>&quot;592-593-0005&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This certification may not be signed by the Applicant, by any related party of the Applicant, or by any Pool (as defined in Florida Statutes). If the Applicant is not the Surveyor, the Application will not be considered for the boundary plan and will be returned without a decision. If the certification contains two signatures, the "in the presence of" or "in the presence of" must be signed by both signers and will be returned without a decision. This certification must be legible.

Exhibit A
GAMBRO HEALTH CARE
1190 East Church Street
Barlow, FL 33830

NOTE:
Fort Meade to Bartow Bus Service
Route # 23
Stop # 5
Bus information obtained from the Polk County Transit Authority
April 25, 2005

Christopher L. New
Vice President
Fore Property Company
5401 South Kirkman Road, Suite 310
Orlando, Florida 32819

Re: Gibbons Street Elementary

Dear Mr. New:

Thank you for your recent visit to our school. I have reviewed the attached sketch, labeled “Summerlin Oaks, Exhibit B, Polk County, Florida.” I have also reviewed pages 15 and 16 of the 2005 Universal Application Instructions published by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation [Form UA1016 (Rev. 2-05)].

This letter will confirm that the point indicated on the attached sketch and identified as “Entrance to Classroom Building #7” may be used by students to enter the school building. This “Entrance to Classroom Building #7” may also be used by parents and visitors to enter the school building during school hours, after checking in at the office.

As you are aware, Gibbons Street Elementary consists of several buildings, most of them connected with open-air breezeways, with each building having its own exterior entrance. Students, parents, or visitors wishing to enter any one of these buildings must use the direct access exterior entrance doors associated with that building. It is not physically possible to access the school’s multiple facilities by entering any single door.

Thank you for your interest in our community.

Sincerely,

Helene Daingneault
Principal
2005 NOTICE OF ALLEGED DEFICIENCIES (NOAD) SUMMARY FORM

This NOAD Summary Form is being submitted with regard to Application No. 2005-038C and pertains to the revisions/additions made to the Application parts, sections, subsections and exhibits listed below (please list the parts, sections, subsections and exhibits in the order they appear in the most recent Scoring Summary Report with regard to the Application revisions/additions being challenged):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part (I, II, III, IV, V)</th>
<th>Section (A, B, C, D, etc.)</th>
<th>Subsection (I, II, III, etc.)</th>
<th>Exhibit (I, II, III, etc.)</th>
<th>Reason Score Not Mixed (Provide Item No. from Application Scoring Summary)</th>
<th>Reason Failed Threshold (Provide Item No. from Application Scoring Summary)</th>
<th>Proximity Scoring Item No. (Provide Item No. from Application Scoring Summary)</th>
<th>Created by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.a.(2)(b)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2 P</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBMITTED BY APPLICATION NO. 2005-047C - I ACCORDANCE WITH RULES 67-21.003 and/or 67-43.004, F.A.C.
2005 CURE FORM

(Submit a SEPARATE form for EACH reason relative to EACH application Part, Section, Subsection, and Exhibit)

This Cure Form is being submitted with regard to Application No. 2005-033C and pertains to:

Part: 7th Section: A Subsection: 10 Exhibit No.: 25 (if applicable)

The attached information is submitted in response to the 2005 Universal Scoring Summary Report because:

☐ 1. Preliminary Scoring and/or NOPSE scoring resulted in the imposition of a failure to achieve maximum points, a failure to achieve threshold, and/or a failure to achieve maximum proximity points relative to the Part, Section, Subsection, and/or Exhibit stated above. Check applicable item(s) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Created by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No. S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No. T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No. L325P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ 2. Other changes are necessary to keep the Application consistent:

This revision or additional documentation is submitted to address an issue resulting from a cure to Part ___ Section ___ Subsection ___ Exhibit ___ (if applicable).
Brief Statement of Explanation regarding
Application No. 2005 - 038C

Provide a separate brief statement for each Cure or NOAD

In response to NOSE, which challenged location of
Tie-Operator Measurement Point and proper coordinates
for St. Elizabeth, please find enclosed:
- Survey Certification Form and sketches;
- Audit Visit From Surveyor; and
- Letter from school principal.
**SURVEYOR CERTIFICATION**

Name: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted]

Date: [Redacted]

I, [Redacted], do hereby certify that the description and survey herein shown is correct and has been done in accordance with the laws and regulations of the State of Florida, and is correct, true, and accurate, and is done by the undersigned surveyor, whose name and address are as stated above.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
GAMBRO HEALTH CARE
1190 East Church Street
Bartow, FL 33830

NOTE:
Fort Meade to Bartow Bus Service
Route # 25
Stop # 5
Bus information obtained from the
Polk County Transit Authority

PICKETT & ASSOCIATES, Inc.
Surveyors - Mappers - Engineers
475 South First Avenue
Bartow, Florida 33830
Phone: 219-585-0989
Fax: 219-585-2194

Sheet No. 1 of 1
Project No. 1224-3
Map Scale: N/S TO SCALE
W/E Scale: Date
N/SL, 14/03/03

Summerville Oaks
Exhibit C
Polk County, Florida

Sketch
AFFIDAVIT OF GREGORY A. PRATHER

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared GREGORY A. PRATHER, who, being duly sworn, states that he personally knows the following facts and that the same are true and accurate:

1. I am a professional surveyor licensed by the State of Florida, License No. LS 5135, and I have been a licensed professional surveyor since 1992.

2. I am currently a Vice President and the Director of Surveying for Pickett & Associates, Inc., located in Bartow, Florida, and I have held these positions at all times material hereto.

3. In February 2005, Pickett & Associates, Inc., was engaged to determine the latitude and longitude coordinates of various points to be reported and certified to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation ("FHFC") as part of an application for 2005 tax credit funding for a project known as Summerlin Oaks.

4. Neither I nor Pickett & Associates, Inc., is related in any way to Fore Summerlin Oaks Limited Partnership (the applicant for Summerlin Oaks), or its principals or Financial Beneficiaries.

5. In preparing to perform this work, I reviewed Florida Administrative Code Rule 67-48.002(99) and pages 12 through 22 of the 2005 Universal Application Instructions published by FHFC [Form UA1016 (Rev. 2-05)], as well as the corresponding "Surveyor Certification" form to be completed and included in the Summerlin Oaks application as Exhibit 25.

6. On February 11, 2005, I visited the site of the Summerlin Oaks project, located on
East Church Street on the north side of East Church Street and North 2nd Avenue, Bartow, Florida, 33830, as well as the sites of various services surrounding Summerlin Oaks, including Gibbons Street Elementary, located at 1860 E. Gibbons Street, Bartow, Florida, 33830, and determined the latitude and longitude coordinates required by FHFC.

7. I thereafter completed the Surveyor Certification form and prepared sketches of the various service sites, which I understand were included as Exhibit 25 in the Summerlin Oaks application.

8. In April 2005, Pickett & Associates, Inc., was engaged to confirm and re-determine the latitude and longitude coordinates of the Tie-Breaker Measurement Point on the Summerlin Oaks site and the coordinates of the previously identified entrance to Gibbons St. Elementary, which were to be reported and certified again to FHFC as part of the application for 2005 tax credit funding for Summerlin Oaks.

9. In preparing to perform this work, I again reviewed Florida Administrative Code Rule 67-48.002(99) and pages 12 through 22 of the 2005 Universal Application Instructions published by FHFC [Form UA1016 (Rev. 2-05)], as well as the corresponding "Surveyor Certification" form to be submitted to FHFC. Finally, I reviewed several "Notices of Possible Scoring Error" and accompanying documents directed to my original Surveyor Certification form and service sketches for the Summerlin Oaks project, including two affidavits from a Mr. Joseph R. Gore, dated March 24, 2005.

10. On April 25, 2005, I revisited the site of the Summerlin Oaks project, as well as the site of Gibbons Street Elementary.
11. At the site of the Summerlin Oaks project, I determined the latitude and longitude coordinates of a Tie-Breaker Measurement Point on the project site, which are accurately recorded on the Surveyor Certification form, dated April 25, 2005, and attached as Exhibit A. The point on the site that I used for this Tie-Breaker Measurement Point fully complies with the requirements of FHFC’s Application Instructions, and is located on the site of the Summerlin Oaks project as set forth in the legal description of the site contained in the application. Further, the method I used to determine the stated coordinates fully complies with Florida Administrative Code Chapter 61G17-6.

12. At the site of Gibbons Street Elementary, I determined the latitude and longitude coordinates of an exterior public entrance to the school, which are accurately recorded on the Surveyor Certification form, dated April 25, 2005, and attached as Exhibit A. The point on the school site that I used for this purpose fully complies with the requirements of FHFC’s Application Instructions, and this point is located “on the doorway threshold of an exterior entrance that provides direct public access” to the school building, as required on page 16 of the 2005 Universal Application Instructions. Further, the method I used to determine the stated coordinates fully complies with Florida Administrative Code Chapter 61G17-6.

13. The three sketches accompanying the Surveyor Certification form attached as Exhibit A accurately depict the points on the relevant service sites that I used to determine the required latitude and longitude coordinates.

14. The points represented on the Surveyor Certification form and sketches attached as Exhibit A all fully comply with the requirements of FHFC’s Application Instructions, and the
method I used to determine the stated coordinates fully complies with Florida Administrative Code Chapter 61G17-6.

15. The photographs attached to this Affidavit as Exhibits B & C accurately depict the “Entrance to Classroom Building #7” to Gibbons St. Elementary that I used for purposes of determining the latitude and longitude coordinates for this service as reflected on the Surveyor Certification form and accompanying sketch, which are attached as Exhibit A.

Under penalty of perjury, I declare that these statements are true and correct.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.

GREGORY A. PRATHER

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF _____________
Sworn to and subscribed before me this 20th day of April, 2005, by GREGORY A. PRATHER.

NOTARY PUBLIC

MICHLE BLOOM
Notary Public, State of Florida
My commission expires Aug. 14, 2006
Commission No. 024500

Name of Notary, typed, printed or stamped

Personally Known or OR Produced Identification

Type of Identification Produced
SURVEYOR CERTIFICATION

Name of Developer: 

Commons Oaks 

Development Location: 

East Chestnut Dr., North Side of East Chestnut Dr. and North Side Ave. Harrow, P.L. 22070

(As a minimum, provide the address assigned by the United States Postal Service, including the address number, street name and city, or if the address has not yet been assigned, provide the Ownership, corner designated intersection and city.)

The undersigned.Plot de licensed surveyor certifies that the recorded survey determined the following latitude and longitude coordinates conforms to Rule 61074. F.A.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Latitude (DMS)</th>
<th>Longitude (DMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N 27</td>
<td>53° 30' 28&quot; N</td>
<td>88° 7' 22&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>681</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51° 0' 35&quot; N</td>
<td>89° 0' 25&quot; W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Development Location of Commons Oaks, is a part of the boundaries of each parcel located within 1/2 mile of the Tri-Border Measurement Park: 

☑ Yes □ No ______

Tri-Border Measurement Park: No. The check mark for the Development Location of Commons Oaks is a single Development Location that is more than 1/2 mile from the Tri-Border Measurement Park.

If the Development Location of Commons Oaks is a part of the boundaries of each parcel located within 1/2 mile of the Tri-Border Measurement Park: Yes □ No ______

Location of Source Public Utility Site or Major Gas Line Stop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N 27</td>
<td>53° 30'</td>
<td>28&quot; N</td>
<td>25&quot; N</td>
<td>49° 0'</td>
<td>35&quot; W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>681</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51° 0'</td>
<td>35&quot; W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Corporation desires that there are any false statements made in this certificate, the Corporation will forward a copy to the State of Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulations for investigation.

CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, I declare that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

Gregory A. Prober

Entrepreneur

Pickett & Asso., Inc.

State of Surveyor: 475 South First Ave.

Firm of Firm Name of Surveyor: Bartle, 32300

Firm of Firm Name of Surveyor: 80-533-005

Florida License Number: Telephone Number (including area code)

This statement may not be signed by the applicant, by any related party of the Applicant, or by any Principals or Their Transactor of the Applicant. If the certificate is signed, the Application will not be considered for the surveyor position. If the certificate is not signed the Application will not receive priority for the surveyor position and will be handled to the same level as other applicants.

DA-105 (Rev. 10/98) Exhibit 25

Exhibit A
GAMBRO HEALTH CARE
1190 East Church Street
Bartow, FL 33830

NOTE:
Fort Meade to Bartow Bus Service
Route # 25
Stop # 5
Bus information obtained from the
Polk County Transit Authority
April 25, 2005

Christopher L. New
Vice President
Fore Property Company
5401 South Kirkman Road, Suite 310
Orlando, Florida 32819

Re: Gibbons Street Elementary

Dear Mr. New:

Thank you for your recent visit to our school. I have reviewed the attached sketch, labeled “Summerlin Oaks, Exhibit B, Polk County, Florida.” I have also reviewed pages 15 and 16 of the 2005 Universal Application Instructions published by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation [Form UA1016 (Rev. 2-05)].

This letter will confirm that the point indicated on the attached sketch and identified as “Entrance to Classroom Building #7” may be used by students to enter the school building. This “Entrance to Classroom Building #7” may also be used by parents and visitors to enter the school building during school hours, after checking in at the office.

As you are aware, Gibbons Street Elementary consists of several buildings, most of them connected with open-air breezeways, with each building having its own exterior entrance. Students, parents, or visitors wishing to enter any one of these buildings must use the direct access exterior entrance doors associated with that building. It is not physically possible to access the school’s multiple facilities by entering any single door.

Thank you for your interest in our community.

Sincerely,

Helene Daigleault
Principal

Helene Daigleault, Principal
Elizabeth Quirke, Assistant Principal
1850 East Gibbons Street
Barlow, Florida 33830
Phone: 863-535-7420
Fax: 863-535-7472
GIBBONS ST. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
## 2005 CURE SUMMARY FORM

This Cure Summary Form is submitted with regard to Application No. **038C**, and pertains to the Application parts, sections, subsections, and exhibits listed below (please list the parts, sections, subsections, and exhibits in the order they appear on the most recent Scoring Summary Report):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Submitted in Response to</th>
<th>Created by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B, C, D</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Mark this Column if Item No. indicated in "Submitted in Response to" column(s) resulted from Preliminary Scoring and also if Item No. indicated in "Submitted in Response to" column(s) resulted from NOPSE Tracking No. if known.

**Tracking No:** 281

**X** indicates a comment or note.
Brief Statement of Explanation regarding
Application No. 2005-038C
("Summerlin Oaks")

Provide a separate brief statement for each Cure or NOAD

Part III.A.10.a.2(b), Exhibit 25, Surveyor Certification Form submitted as a Cure for item 2P, beginning at page 6 of the Applicant’s Cure package.

Application No. 2005-038C ("Summerlin Oaks") does not qualify for full proximity points for the School. The coordinates provided for the Public School "Gibbons Street Elementary School" in the Applicant’s Cure describes a point that is located in an auxiliary building on the School’s campus and is not the direct public entrance, as required by Florida Housing’s 2005 Universal Application Instructions.

The Florida Housing Rule on Proximity measurement provides that the latitude and longitude coordinates for the applicable services “must represent a point that is on the doorway threshold of an exterior entrance that provides direct public access to the building where the service is located.” (Emphasis added.) See 2005 Universal Application Instructions, Page 16. In the event that there is no exterior public entrance, the Rule further states that:

“If there is no exterior public entrance to the Grocery Store, Public School, Medical Facility or Pharmacy, then a point should be used that is at the exterior entrance doorway threshold that is the closest walking distance to the doorway threshold of the interior public entrance to the service.” Id.

This Rule evolved after the 2003 Universal Cycle as a result of extensive abuses by Applicants who were using inconsistent Tie-Breaker Measurement Points on their subject Properties in order to reach any entrance on the site of the area services in order to establish proximity for their Developments. In 2004 Florida Housing revised and clarified its definition of measurement points, which resulted in the definitions quoted above. Florida Housing’s intent in establishing
the measurement point at the "doorway threshold of an exterior entrance that provides public access to the building where the service is located" was to ensure that Applicants use the doorway that is the primary means of access for the public and NOT any entrance on any point of the subject service. The Applicant's alleged Cure attempts to circumvent that definition.

Gibbons Street Elementary School has twelve (12) permanent buildings, eight (8) portable classrooms, one (1) storage shed, and one (1) "exterior entrance that provides direct public access" (Exhibit 1). Each building and each portable has several doors designated for student and teacher access only. Those doors are not exterior public entrances. Nonetheless, the Applicant, after correctly losing proximity points by NOPSE, has now selected one of these interior student/teacher access doors to measure proximity to its Development. In its attempt to Cure, the Applicant indicated the door to "Building #7", a building toward the rear of the campus and closest to Applicant's Development, as the entrance being utilized for proximity purposes (Exhibits 1, 2, 3). Included in the Cure was a letter from the Principal of Gibbons Street Elementary School, Helene Daigleault, which specifically states:

"[T]he point indicated on the attached sketch and identified as 'Entrance to Classroom Building #7' may be used by students to enter the school building.
This 'Entrance to Classroom Building #7' may also be used by parents and visitors to enter the school building during school hours, after checking in at the office." (Emphasis added.)

This description of the entrance used by the Applicant for proximity purposes is in direct contradiction of Florida Housing's intent. However, the doors to the classrooms, portables, and offices provide access to the public only after parents and visitors check in at the office. A sign is posted on the school's campus clearly states "VISITORS MUST CHECK WITH OFFICE BEFORE ENTERING BUILDING" (Exhibit 4). To further enforce the check-in policy, the entire perimeter of the school is surrounded by a fence designed to keep unauthorized visitors out
and students safe on the property (Exhibits 5, 6, 7). Therefore, the only exterior point of access on the school’s campus is the front entrance leading directly to the school office.

The exterior entrance of the school, designed to be the point of direct public access, is the only part of the perimeter of the campus that is not fenced and leads directly to the main office (Exhibit 8). The public is authorized to enter to “Building #7” only after having been checked in, granted access, and given directions to their destination by office staff. The Surveyor’s Sketch by Joseph R. Gore (Exhibit 3) illustrates that the direct public entrance of Gibbons Street Elementary School is located at latitude N 27 degrees, 53 minutes, 11.4 seconds and longitude W 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 25.1 seconds. This point is 5,327.71 feet (or 1.009 miles) away from the Applicant’s Tie-Breaker Measurement Point. The Applicant, in its Application, used a side service entrance in an attempt to score full proximity points. However, as indicated in the NOPSE, the original Tie-Breaker Measurement Point used by Applicant was not actually on Applicant’s site (Exhibit 9) and once this Tie-Breaker Measurement Point was cured, Applicant chose an interior non-public entry point which was closest to the northeast corner of its site (Exhibit 3), which is not the point that is the real exterior direct public entrance. No unauthorized member of the public is allowed access to the school grounds to wander about or to enter any door of their choice. The Applicant has chosen the entrance to the Building #7, the northeasternmost building on the school’s campus as well as the one of the furthest from the main entrance near the office (Exhibit 2), in an attempt to achieve maximum tie-breaker points. Accepting the Applicant’s Cure would effectively change the applicable definition from “an exterior entrance that provides direct public access” to “any door anywhere within the School’s grounds.” Clearly, this is not Florida Housing’s intent.
The intent of the Florida Housing Proximity Rule regarding Tie-Breaker Measurement Points was to create a fair and consistent means of awarding points to Applicants that select Development sites closest to area services. In the Universal Application, the Applicant did not select the exterior entrance providing direct public access to the school and was accordingly NOPSE'd. As a Cure, the Applicant again did not select an exterior entrance providing direct public access and thus did not act in good faith within the spirit of the Proximity Rule, nor is the School within one mile of the Development. Therefore, the Cure for Application No. 2005-038C ("Summerlin Oaks") should be REJECTED and the Applicant should not receive full proximity points for the School.
Aerial Photo of
Gibbons Street
Elementary School
Exhibit "2"
Affidavit and Certification of Joseph R. Gore

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared Joseph R. Gore, who, being duly sworn, states that he personally knows the following facts and that the same are true and accurate.

1. My name is Joseph R. Gore. I am licensed by the State of Florida as a Professional Land Surveyor. My license number is LS 518. I am a Project Manager of Hamilton Engineering and Surveying, Inc. I confirm that the method used to determine the latitude and longitude coordinates in this Affidavit and Certification conforms to Rule 61G17-6, F.A.C. I am submitting this Affidavit and Certification on behalf of Sunnybrooke Apartments, Ltd. (the “Applicant”) and am not related to the Applicant or any Principals or Financial Beneficiaries of the Applicant.

2. I have reviewed the following documents:
   a. Surveyor Certification, signed by Gregory A Prather, but not dated, that says it is for Summerville Oaks (the “Submitted Surveyor Certification”);
   b. A sketch, submitted by Pickett & Associates, Inc., that shows a field work date of February 11, 2005, that shows Gibbons St. Elementary School (the “Submitted Gibbons St. Elementary School Sketch”);

3. I conducted and supervised field work and research regarding the site on which Summerville Oaks would be located and the tie-breaker measurement points (“TEMPs”) claimed in the Submitted Surveyor Certification. I also conducted and supervised field work and research regarding the Gibbons St. Elementary School referenced in the Submitted Surveyor Certification and Submitted Gibbons St. Elementary School Sketch.

4. Based on that work, I prepared and supervised the preparation of the attached sketch, showing the parcels on which the development would be located (the “Correct Development Site and Gibbons St. Elementary School Sketch”).

The Correct Location of Gibbons St. Elementary School

5. The Submitted Surveyor Certification claims that the doorway threshold of the public entrance to Gibbons St. Elementary School is located at latitude N 27 degrees, 53 minutes, 11.2 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place) and at longitude W 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 26.8 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place). The provided coordinates identifies a point to a service entrance to the School and does not represent a point that is on the doorway threshold of an exterior entrance that provides direct public access to Gibbons St. Elementary School.

Exhibit '3'
6. The latitude and longitude coordinates for the exterior direct public entrance to Gibbons St. Elementary School is: latitude N 27 degrees, 53 minutes, 11.4 seconds (truncated after 1 decimal place) and longitude W 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 25.1 seconds (truncated after 1 decimal place). This location is computed by me to be 155 feet ± away from the spot identified by the Submitted Surveyor Certification for the tie-breaker measurement point.

7. Although the tie-breaker measurement point is not located on the submitted development site, the correctly identified public entrance to the school is 5,127.71 feet away (or 1.009 miles away) from the closest boundary of any piece of the Sunamerica (aka property).

8. The Development Site Sketch shows the exterior walls of the building sheltering the school, the latitude and longitude coordinates provided above and the public entrance that it represents, and the latitude and longitude coordinates for the service entrance to Gibbons St. Elementary School claimed in the Submitted Surveyor Certification.

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that these statements are true and correct.

[Signature]

Joseph R. Gore, PLS., FL. Reg. # 5188

Dated 3/24/05

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of March, 2005, by Joseph R. Gore, who is personally known to me or has produced ____________ as identification.

WITNESS my hand and official seal, this 24th day of March, 2005.

[Signature]

Notary Public
State of Florida
My commission expires: 3-14-08

(AFFIX SEAL)

Exhibit 3
2

[Stamp]
Affidavit and Certification of Joseph R. Gore

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared Joseph R. Gore, who, being duly sworn, states that he personally knows the following facts and that the same are true and accurate.

1. My name is Joseph R. Gore. I am licensed by the State of Florida as a Professional Land Surveyor. My license number is LS 5188. I am a Project Manager of Hamilton Engineering and Surveying, Inc. I confirm that the method used to determine the latitude and longitude coordinates in this Affidavit and Certification conforms to Rule 61G17-6, F.A.C. I am submitting this Affidavit and Certification on behalf of Sunnybrooke Apartments, Ltd. (the "Applicant") and am not related to the Applicant or any Principals or Financial Beneficiaries of the Applicant.

2. I have reviewed the following documents:
   a. Surveyor Certification, signed by Gregory A. Prather, but not dated, that says it is for Summerlin Oaks (the "Submitted Surveyor Certification");
   b. Legal Descriptions of all eight parcels as submitted to Florida Housing in 2005 application as Exhibit A to the Amended and Restated Real Estate Purchase and Sale Contract, signed by the Purchaser, Christopher L. New, but not dated.

3. I conducted and supervised field work and research regarding the sites on which Summerlin Oaks would be located and the tie-breaker measurement point ("TBMP") claimed in the Submitted Surveyor Certification.

4. Based on that work, I prepared and supervised the preparation of the attached sketch, of which shows the parcels on which the developments would be located (the "Development Site Sketch") and the location of the submitted tie-breaker measurement point.

The Correct Location of the Tie-Breaker Measurement Point

5. The Submitted Surveyor Certification claims that the TBMP is located at latitude N 27 degrees, 53 minutes, 58.4 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place) and at longitude W 81 degrees, 49 minutes, 51.1 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place).

6. That point is not located on the development site. It is 46 feet ± South of the Southerly boundary line and 10 feet ± West of the Easterly boundary line.

7. From my review of the Legal Descriptions, it appears that the developer was claiming the southeastern-most corner of the property as its TBMP. I measured the location of the southeastern-most corner of the legal descriptions provided to be latitude N 27 degrees, 53 minutes, 58.9 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place) and the longitude to be W 81
degrees, 49 minutes, 51.0 seconds (truncated to 1 decimal place. This location is 47 feet ± away from the spot identified by the coordinates actually given for the TBMP.

8. The Development Site Sketch depicts the locations of the TBMP as claimed and as is relocated to the Development site.

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that these statements are true and correct.

[Signature]

Joseph R. Gore, P.L.S., FL. Reg. # 5188

Dated 3/24/05

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of March, 2005 by Joseph R. Gore, who is personally known to me or has produced ________________ as identification.

WITNESS my hand and official seal, this 24th day of March, 2005.

[Signature]

Notary Public
State of Florida
My commission expires: 5-14-08

(AFFIX SEAL)

Exhibit "9"