# BOARD MEETING OF JUNE 28, 2007 Beth Anderson, Chair C. Kent Conine, Vice-Chair



Shadrick Bogany, Member Sonny Flores, Member Norberto Salinas, Member Gloria Ray, Member

# MISSION

# TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

# To Help Texans Achieve An Improved Quality of Life Through The Development of Better Communities

## TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

## BOARD MEETING June 28, 2007

## **ROLL CALL**

	Present	Absent
Anderson, Beth, Chair		
Conine, C. Kent, Vice-Chair		
Bogany, Shadrick, Member		
Ray, Gloria, Member		
Flores, Sonny, Member		
Salinas, Norberto, Member		
Number Present		
Number Absent		

\_\_\_\_\_, Presiding Officer

#### TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS BOARD MEETING

#### June 28, 2007 9:30 am 1500 N. Congress, Capitol Auditorium Austin, TX

#### AGENDA

#### CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL CERTIFICATION OF QUORUM

Elizabeth Anderson Chair of Board

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

The Board will solicit Public Comment at the beginning of the meeting and will also provide for Public Comment on each agenda item after the presentation made by the department staff and motions made by the Board.

The Board of the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs will meet to consider and possibly act on the following:

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### Item 1: Presentation, Discussion and Possible Issuance of Determination Notices for Housing Tax Credits associated with Mortgage Revenue Bond Transactions with other Issuers:

07412	Mansions at Hastings Green, Houston, Harris County, Texas
	Harris County HFC is the Issuer
	Recommended Credit Amount of \$937,247

07416 Regent I, Beaumont, Jefferson County, Texas BHC Redevelopment Corporation is the Issuer Recommended Credit Amount of \$810,175

#### Item 2: Presentation, Discussion and Possible Approval of Real Estate Analysis Items:

a) Presentation Discussion and Possible Action for the 2007 Competitive Housing Tax Credits Appeals of Credit Underwriting Reports

Appeals Timely Filed

#### Item 3: Presentation, Discussion and Possible Approval of Multifamily Division Items – Specifically Housing Tax Credit Items:

a) Presentation, Discussion and Possible Action for Housing Tax Credit Appeals

03011	Elder Street Lofts	Houston
07302	Casa Alton	Alton

Appeals Timely Filed

b) Issue a list of Approved Applications (as of June 28<sup>th</sup>) from the following list of all applications for Housing Tax Credits in accordance with §2306.6724(e) of the Texas Government Code.

07101	Carpenter's Point	Dallas
07102	Chelsea Place	Houston
07103	Oak Tree Village	Dickinson
07104	Country Lane Seniors-Greenville Community	Greenville
07108	Paseo Palms	El Paso
07109	Elrod Place	Katy

07110	Poteet Housing Authority Farm Labor	Poteet
07111	Alaniz Circle	Beeville
07114	Washington Village Apartments	Wichita Falls
07115	Heights Apartments	Big Spring
07117	Deer Creek Apartments	Levelland
07118	Lakeside Apartments	Mount Pleasant
07123	Tower Village	Nacogdoches
07124	King's Crossing Phase II	Kingsville
07126	Oak Timbers-Caplin Drive	Arlington
07131	StoneLeaf at Dalhart	Dalhart
07133	StoneLeaf at Tye	Туе
07137	Hampton Villages	Pampa
07141	Pinnacle of Pleasant Humble	Humble
07149	Residences at Eastland	Fort Worth
07151	Key West Village Phase II	Odessa
07153	Los Ebanos Apartments	Alton
07162	Pointe North	Beaumont
07164	Covington Townhomes	Texarkana
07165	Gates of Dominion North	Houston
07166	Jeremiah Seniors	Hurst
07167	Meadowlake Village Apartments	Mabank
07169	Costa Madera	Laredo
07170	Gibraltar	Clute
07171	San Juan Square II	San Antonio
07173	West End Baptist Manor Apartments	San Antonio
07174	LULAC Hacienda Apartments	Corpus Christi
07175	Austin Place	Mount Pleasant
07177	Hamilton Senior Village	Hamilton
07178	Tammye's Pointe	Eagle Pass
07179	Villas at Goose Creek	Baytown
07180	Holland House Apartments	Holland
07182	Retama Village - Phase II	McAllen
07183	Sunset Terrace	Pharr
07185	Bluebonnet Senior Village	Alamo
07189	Sunlight Manor Apartments	Beaumont
07190	Stephen Austin School Apartments	Greenville
07191	Washington Hotel Lofts	Greenville
07192	Historic Lofts of Waco High	Waco
07193	Stone Brook Senior Apartments	Palestine
07194	377 Villas	Brownwood
07198	West Durango Plaza Apartments	San Antonio
07199	Kingsville LULAC Manor Apartments	Kingsville
07202	Pimlico Apartments	Shenandoah
07203	Melbourne Apartments	Alvin
07204	Notting Hill Gate Apartments	Missouri City
07205	North Manor Estates Apartments	Weslaco
07206	Villa Estella Trevino	Edinburg
07210	New Hope Housing at Bray's Crossing	Houston
07217	Victory Place Seniors	Houston
07219	Canyons Retirement Community	Amarillo
07220	San Gabriel Crossing	Liberty Hill
07221	Wild Horse Commons	Kingsville
07222	Riverbend Trails	San Angelo

2

07223	Shady Oaks Apartments	Georgetown
07224	Sierra Ridge Apartments	Georgetown
07226	Candlewick Apartments	Brownsville
07227	Champion Home at La Joya	La Joya
07228	Las Palmas Homes	Los Fresnos
07233	Ingram Square Apartments	San Antonio
07234	Tuscany Park at Buda	Buda
07235	Woodchase Senior Community	El Paso
07236	Green Briar Village Phase II	Wichita Falls
07241	Villas of Spring Creek	Saginaw
07242	Paseo de Paz Apartments	Kerrville
07244	Alamito Place	El Paso
07245	Sphinx at Fiji Seniors	Dallas
07246	Lexington Square	Angleton
07247	Terry Street Apartments	Malakoff
07249	Bluffs Landing Senior Village	Round Rock
07252	Brooks Manor Apartments	West Columbia
07254	Evergreen at Farmers Branch	Farmers Branch
07255	Evergreen at Jollyville	Jollyville
07256	Evergreen at The Colony	The Colony
07257	Orange Palm Garden Apt Homes	Orange
07258	Trinity Garden Apt Homes	Liberty
07259	Montgomery Meadows Phase II	Huntsville
07260	Victoria Place Addition	Athens
07261	Lexington Court Phase II	Kilgore
07262	Santour Court	College Station
07263	Constitution Court	Copperas Cove
07267	Buena Vida Apartments	La Feria
07268	Mid-Towne I Apartments	Tomball
07271	Hyatt Manor Apartments	Gonzales
07272	Plantation Valley Estates	Krum
07275	Mansions at Briar Creek	Bryan
07278	Woodlen Glen Apartments	Houston
07280	Andalusia	Houston
07281	Oaks at Beeville	Beeville
07282	Palermo	Midland
07285	Anson Park Seniors	Abilene
07289	Peachtree Seniors	Balch Springs
07291	Cypress Creek at Reed Road	Houston
07292	North Eastman Residential	Longview
07293	Morningstar Villas	Texas City
07294	Grove at Brushy Creek	Bowie
07295	Bluestone	Mabank
07300	Wentworth Apartments	Atascocita
07302	Casa Alton	Alton
07303	Villas on Raiford	Carrollton
07305	Covenant Estates of Zion	Lancaster
07306	Zion Village Apartments	Houston
07309	Glenwood Trails	Deer Park
07310	Gardens at Friendswood Lakes	Friendswood
07313	Villas at Rabbit Hill	Round Rock
07318	Buena Vida Senior Village	Corpus Christi

# Item 4: Presentation, Discussion and Possible Approval of Multifamily Division Items – Specifically Waiver Request for §49.9(h)(4)(B)(iii) of the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan:

a) Presentation, Discussion and Possible Denial of a waiver of the requirement in §49.9(h)(4)(B)(iii) of the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan ("QAP")

#### Item 5: Presentation, Discussion and Possible Approval of Disaster Recovery Division Items:

- a) Presentation and Discussion of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Disaster Recovery Status Report
- b) Presentation, Discussion and Possible Approval of Requests for Amendments to CDBG contracts administered by Office of Rural Community Affairs (ORCA)

#### Item 6: Presentation, Discussion and Possible Approval of Community Affairs Division Items:

- a) Presentation, Discussion and Possible Preliminary Approval of the Future Method for Program Delivery of the Department's Section 8 Program
- b) Presentation, Discussion and Approval of 2007 Emergency Shelter Grants Program (ESGP) Funding Recommendations

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

#### Elizabeth Anderson

- a) The Board may go into Executive Session (close its meeting to the public) on any agenda item if appropriate and authorized by the Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, Chapter 551
- b) The Board may go into Executive Session Pursuant to Texas Government Code §551.074 for the purposes of discussing personnel matters including to deliberate the appointment, employment, evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline or dismissal of a public officer or employee
- c) Consultation with Attorney Pursuant to §551.071(a), Texas Government Code:
  - 1. With Respect to pending litigation styled Dever v. TDHCA Filed in Federal Court
  - 2. With Respect to pending litigation styled Ballard v. TDHCA Filed in Federal Court
  - 3. With Respect to Any Other Pending Litigation Filed Since the Last Board Meeting

#### **OPEN SESSION**

#### **Elizabeth Anderson**

Action in Open Session on Items Discussed in Executive Session

#### **REPORT ITEMS**

Executive Director's Report

- 1. 2007 Competitive Housing Tax Credit Challenges
- 2. Report on the First Time Homebuyer Program

#### ADJOURN

#### **Elizabeth Anderson**

To access this agenda & details on each agenda item in the board book, please visit our website at <u>www.tdhca.state.tx.us</u> or contact Nidia Hiroms, 512-475-3934; TDHCA, 221 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street, Austin, Texas 78701, and request the information. Individuals who require auxiliary aids, services or sign language interpreters for this meeting should contact Gina Esteves, ADA Responsible Employee, at 512-475-3943 or Relay Texas at 1-800-735-2989 at least two days before the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Non-English speaking individuals who require interpreters for this meeting should contact Nidia Hiroms, 512-475-3934 at least three days before the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Personas que hablan español y requieren un intérprete, favor de llamar a Jorge Reyes al siguiente número (512) 475-4577 por lo menos tres días antes de la junta para hacer los preparativos apropiados.

## Housing Tax Credit Program Board Action Request June 28, 2007

## **Action Item**

Request review and board determination of two (2) four percent (4%) tax credit applications with another issuer for tax exempt bond transactions.

## **Recommendation**

Staff is recommending that the board review and approve the issuance of two (2) four percent (4%) Tax Credit Determination Notices with <u>another</u> issuer for the tax exempt bond transactions known as:

Development No.	Name	Location	Issuer	Total Units	LI Units	Total Development	Applicant Proposed Tax Exempt Bond Amount	Requested Credit Allocation	Recommended Credit Allocation
07412	Mansions at Hastings Green	Houston	Harris County HFC	230	230	\$23,278,417	\$14,150,000	\$937,247	\$937,247
07416	Regent I	Beaumont	BHC Redevelopment Corporation	160	160	\$19,061,813	\$10,000,000	\$810,175	\$810,175

## MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION BOARD ACTION REQUEST June 28, 2007

## Action Item

Presentation, Discussion and Possible Issuance of Determination Notices for Housing Tax Credits associated with Mortgage Revenue Bond Transactions with other Issuers.

## **Requested Action**

Approve, Amend or Deny the staff recommendation for Mansions at Hastings Green, #07412.

## **Summary of the Transaction**

*Background and General Information:* The application was received on February 20, 2007. The Issuer for this transaction is Harris County HFC with a reservation of allocation that expires on July 22, 2007. The development is new construction and will consist of 230 total units targeting the general population, with all units affordable. The proposed development will be located in Houston, Harris County. There is no zoning required for the Houston area.

*Organizational Structure and Compliance:* The Borrower is Mansions at Hastings Green, LP and the General Partner is Mansions at Hastings Green I, LLC which is comprised of Robert R. Burchfield with 50% ownership interest and Linda Hofheinz with 50% ownership interest. The Compliance Status Summary completed on June 8, 2007 reveals that the principals of the general partner have a total of four (4) properties that have been monitored with no material non-compliance. The bond priority for this transaction is:

☑ Priority 1C: Set aside 100% of units that cap rents at 30% of 60% AMFI (Only for projects located in a census tract with median income that is greater than the median income of the county MSA, or PMSA that the QCT is located in.)

*Census Demographics:* The development is to be located at 11750 FM 1960 West in Houston. Demographics for the census tract (5524) include AMFI of \$70,851; the total population is 4,266; the percent of population that is minority is 30.83%; the percent of population that is below the poverty line is 3.54%; the number of owner occupied units is 1,085; the number of renter units is 460 and the number of vacant units is 68. The percentage of population that is minority for the entire City of Houston is 69% (Census information from FFIEC Geocoding for 2006).

Public Comment: The Department has received no letters of support or opposition.

## **Recommendation**

Staff recommends the Board approve the issuance of a Determination Notice of \$937,247 in Housing Tax Credits for Mansions at Hastings Green.



## MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION

## June 28, 2007

Development Information, Public Input and Board Summary

Mansions at Hastings Green, TDHCA Number 07412

	Mansions	at nastings G	reen, i		nper 074	12					
BASIC DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION											
Site Address:	11750 FM 1960 We	est			Development #: 0741						
City:	Houston	Region:	6	Рор	ulation Serve	ed:	General				
County:	Harris	Zip Code:	77065		Allocatio	on: U	Urban/Exurban				
HOME Set Asi	des: 🗌 CHDO	Preservation	General	F	Purpose/Activ	ity:	NC				
Bond Issuer:	Bond Issuer: Harris County HFC										
		NC=New Construction, ACQ=Ac				on and A	cquisition,				
	۲ 	NC/R=New Construction and Re		•	d Rehabilitation						
Owner:		OWNER AND Mansions at Hastings									
Owner Contac	ct and Phone	Robert R. Burchfield		(7	713) 956-0558	5					
Developer:		Robert R. Burchfield									
Housing Gene	eral Contractor:	Nations Construction	Managen	nent, Inc.							
Architect:		Mark S. Mucasey, Al	A								
Market Analys	st:	O' Conner & Associa	tes								
Syndicator:		Red Capital Markets,	, Inc								
Supportive Se	ervices:	To Be Determined									
Consultant:		Feniksas Real Estate	e Group, L	.P.							
		<u>UNIT/BUILDII</u>									
<u>30%</u> 40% 5	<u>0% 60% Eff 1 B</u>	<u>BR 2 BR 3 BR 4 BR 4</u>		Total Restricte	d I Inite		230	0			
	<u>0 230 0 58</u>			Market Rate U				0			
Type of Buildi	_	or more per building		Owner/Employ				0			
Duplex	•	ed Residence		Total Developr	nent Units:		230	0			
□ Triplex	□ Single	Room Occupancy		Total Developr	nent Cost:		\$23,278,41	7			
□ Fourplex	🗌 Transiti	onal		Number of Res	sidential Build	lings:	11	1			
	🗌 Townho	ome		HOME High To	otal Units:		(	0			
	HOME Low Total Units: 0										
	Note: If Development Cost =\$0, an Underwriting Report has not been completed.										
	FUNDING INFORMATION										
	Applicant Department Request Analysis Amort Term Rate										
4% Housing	Tax Credits with Bor	nds: \$937,247		\$937,247	0	0	) 0%				
TDHCA Bon	d Allocation Amount	\$0		\$0	0	0	0%				
HOME Activi	ity Fund Amount:	0	0	0%							

\$0

\$0

HOME CHDO Operating Grant Amount:



## MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION June 28, 2007 Development Information, Public Input and Board Summary Mansions at Hastings Green, TDHCA Number 07412

PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY										
Guide: "O" = Oppose, "S" = Support, "N" = Neutral, "NC" or	Blank = N	No comment								
State/Federal Officials with Jurisdiction:										
TX Senator: Patrick, District 7	NC	USI	Representative:	Culberson, District 7, NC						
TX Representative: Van Arsdale, District 130	NC	USS	Senator:	NC						
Local Officials and Other Public Officials:										
Mayor/Judge: Ed Emmett, Judge, Harris Cour	nty - NC	Resolution	of Support from	Local Government						
David B. Turkel, Director, Harris County Commu Economic Development Department - Consister HUD approved 2003-2007 Consolidated Plan fo County which established the need for affordabl housing in the county.	nt with tl or Harris	6								
Individuals/Businesses: In Support 0	In	n Opposition	0							
Neighborhood Input:										

#### **General Summary of Comment:**

The Department has received no letters of support and no letters of opposition.

#### **CONDITIONS OF COMMITMENT**

Per §49.12(c) of the Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules, all Tax Exempt Bond Development Applications "must provide an executed agreement with a qualified service provider for the provision of special supportive services that would otherwise not be available for the tenants. The provision of such services will be included in the Declaration of Land Use Restrictive Covenants ("LURA")."

Receipt, review and acceptance of documentation including, but not limited to a new permanent loan commitment supporting a debt coverage ratio at a minimum of 1.15.

Should the terms and rates of the proposed debt or syndication change, the transaction should be re evaluated and an adjustment to the credit amount may be warranted.



## MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION

### June 28, 2007

Development Information, Public Input and Board Summary

## Mansions at Hastings Green, TDHCA Number 07412

## RECOMMENDATION BY THE EXECUTIVE AWARD AND REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE IS BASED ON:

4% Housing Tax	Credits:	Credit Amount:	\$937,247							
Recommendation:	Recommend approval of a Housing Tax Credit Allocation not to exceed \$937,247 annually for ten years, subject to conditions.									
TDHCA Bond Iss	uance:	Bond Amount:	\$0							
Recommendation:										
HOME Activity F	unds:	Loan Amount:	\$0							
HOME CHDO Op	perating Expense Grant:	Grant Amount:	\$0							
Recommendation:										



## TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

Real Estate Analysis Division Underwriting Report

REPORT DA	TE: 06/18/07	PROGRAM: 4% HTC			FILE NUMBER: 07412						
		DE	VELOPM	ENT							
	Mansions at Hastings Green										
Location:	Location: 11750 FM 1960 West Region: 6										
City: Houst	City: Houston County: Harris Zip: 77065 QCT x DDA										
Key Attribute	es: Family, New C	Construction, Urb	an/Exurba	an							
		Α	LLOCATIO	ON							
		R	REQUEST*		RECO	MMENDA	ION				
TDHCA Prog	ram	Amount	Interest	Amort/Term	Amount	Interest	Amort/Term				
	Credit (Annual)	\$937,247			\$937,247						
* Revised do	wnward from \$985,8	34 in correspond	dence da	ted May 1, 2	007						
		C	ONDITIO	NS							
	review and accepta nmitment supporting					new peri	manent				
	ie terms and rates of					action she	auld be re				
	d and an adjustmen						Juid De le-				
				5							
		SA	LIENT ISS	UES							
		IDHCA 9	SET-ASIDES	Sfor LURA			1				
	Income Limi		Rent Limi		Number of Units						
	60% of AMI	6	50% of AN	ЛI	230						
	PROS				CONS						
The subje	ect application will ha	ave 22 fewer uni	ts	The inclusive	e capture rate is	s close to	the				
than the	previous version of th	nis development	•		llowed, and ex						
	market area (PMA) would cause the inclusive capture rate to exceed the maximum.										
				The Developer has had difficulty in completing transactions the past. (See page 3)							
				The subject	represents the f	fourth nev	w tax credit				
					elopment in a 2	2 mile rad	ius in the				
				last 12 to 18	months.						

#### PREVIOUS UNDERWRITING REPORTS

The Applicant submitted a tax credit application in 2006 (#060430), but withdrew due to non-submission of all third party documentation (including market study) 60 days prior to the scheduled board meeting. The earlier application proposed 252 units as compared to the 230 units now proposed for the subject. In addition, the Applicant recently had approved by the TDHCA Board last month, an affordable seniors development within a block of the subject, but has yet to close on the approved development.



Comments:

Multifamily Production Finance Staff have verified that the Department's experience requirements have been met and Portfolio Management and Compliance staff will ensure that the proposed owners have an acceptable record of previous participation. It should be noted, however, that at least one of the principals of the Applicant, Robert Burchfield, was a partner in the developer of record for another bond transaction with a local issuer (Montgomery Trace Apartments, TDHCA # 01420). This development has been renamed and completely reconfigured after the original development plan was abandoned and a new developer put in place to complete the project. This development has not yet submitted cost certification, and therefore additional information with regard to why these changes occurred has not been requested or received.

Additionally, Mr. Burchfield was the principal contact and developer for the Mansions at Briar Creek (TDHCA #060070) in the 2006 9% application round. This application received an award allocation in July 2006 but was unable to document the required zoning change, and therefore the allocation was rescinded.

### **IDENTITIES of INTEREST**

The Applicant, Developer, and General Contractor are related entities. These are common relationships for HTC-funded developments.

The Seller is regarded as a related party; this issue is addressed at length in the acquisition cost section below.





				E	BUILDII	NG CON	FIGURAT	ION					
Bu	ilding Type	А	В	С	D						To	tal	
	pors/Stories	3	3	3	3						Build		
	Number	1	3	3	4						1	1	
BR/	'BA SF					Units					Total	Units	Total SF
1/	'1 721		12								3	6	25,956
1/		2	2	2	2						2	2	15,972
2/				12	12						8		83,664
2/		8	8				_					2	33,056
3/				8	8						5		69,384
Unit	s per Building	10	22	22	22						23	30	228,032
Total Size	e: 14	.42	acres		Scatte	SITE ISS ered site?	UES			Yes	х	No	
Flood Zo Zoning:	one: Zo N/	ne X A			Need	100-yr flo s to be re	-zoned?			Yes Yes	x x	No No	N/A
					TDHO	CA SITE IN	ISPECTIC	DN					
Overall J Surround North South East:	Inspector:       Manufactured Housing Staff, TDHCA Staff       Date:       10/18/2006         Overall Assessment:												
			HI	GHLIC	SHTS o	f ENVIRC	ONMENTA	AL REP	ORTS				
Provider	r: Honesty	Enviroi	nment	al Serv	vices, Ir	IC.				Da	ite:	1/5/20	)07
Recogn None	nized Environn e	nental	Conce	erns (R	ECs) a	nd Other	Concern	S:					
					MA	RKET HIC	GHLIGHTS	5					
Contac Number	Provider:Patrick O'Connor & Associates, L.P.Date:4/2/2007Contact:Robert Coe, IIPhone:(713) 686-9955Fax:(713) 686-8336Number of Revisions:1Date of Last Applicant Revision:4/20/2007												
<ul> <li>Primary Market Area (PMA): 15.42 square miles ~2 mile radius</li> <li>"The subject's primary market is defined as that area within the following geographic boundaries: Little Cypress Creek and Willow Creek to the north; the North Central railroad tracks to the east; FM 1960 to the south; and Huffmeister Road to the west." (p. 10)</li> <li>Secondary Market Area (SMA): The Market Analyst did not define a secondary market for the subject development.</li> </ul>													

	TROFOJED,			CTION & L	INJIAD						,	
		PMA	Total	Comp			vvitnir	n 2 mi	les of site		Caman	
Na	ame	File #	Units	Comp Units		Nam	е	File	# Units	25%	Comp Units	
Wellington F	Park Apartme	03466	244	abilized 11/		-	(proposed	074	15 252		Outside F	
Mansions @	H. G. Senior	07413	252	Senior	Idlew	vidle Ap	artments	0606			Outside I	
					Pinna	acle Ap	artments	0441	5 248		Stabilized	
					Meado	wlands	Apartments	0606	10 236		Outside I	
					ME LIN	1ITS						
0/ 0.0.41	1.0			1	larris	4.5						
% AMI	1 Person		ersons	3 Pers			ersons		Persons		Persons	
30	\$12,800		4,650	\$16,4			8,300		19,750		21,250	
50	\$21,350		24,400	\$27,4			0,500		32,950		35,400	
60	\$25,620	\$2	9,280	\$32,9	40	\$3	6,600	\$3	39,540	\$	42,480	
			PN	A DEMA	ND by	UNIT T	YPE					
		Turne ou com	Creveth	Other	Те	tal		Ur	nstabilized			
Unit	Туре	Turnover Demand	Growth Demand	Other Demand		tal nand	Subject Ur	nits Co	omparable (PMA)	Сар	ture Rate	
1 BR/60%	Rent Limit	848	47	40 935		35	22		50		6%	
2 BR/60%	2 BR/60% Rent Limit		47	40	) 935		116		114		12%	
3 BR/60%	Rent Limit	848	47	40	935 56			80		6%		
					C		L DEMAN	חו				
		T	arget									
			seholds	Househo	ld Size	Incom	ne Eligible	T	enure	De	emand	
				P	MA DE	MAN	) from TUF	RNOV	ER			
Market Ana	alyst p. 7	0	19,568	97% 1	8,928	8%	1,527	100%	1,527	65%	992	
Underwriter	r	100%	20,894	97% 20	0,208	21%	4,325	36%	1,546	55%	848	
				PMA D	eman	D from	HOUSEH	OLD C	GROWTH			
Market Ana	alyst p. 7	0		1	,326	8%	104	100%	104	100%	104	
Underwriter	r			97%	631	21%	131	36%	47	100%	47	
				D	EMAN	D from	OTHER S	OURC	ES			
Market Ana	alyst p. 6	9									80	
Underwriter	r										40	
					INCL	USIVE	CAPTURE	RATE				
			Ur	nstabilized		bilized			Total			
		Subjec		omparable (PMA)	Comp		Total Supp	-	Demand //25% of SMA)		clusive Hure Rate	
Market Ana	alyst p. 7	1 2:	30	0	(	0	230		1,176	1	9.55%	
iviai ket Alia												

The Underwriter's inclusive capture rate is based upon the HISTA data provided in the market study and is just below the Department's 25% maximum for feasibility. Just outside the PMA there are 2 family developments (Idlewilde Apartments and Meadowlands Apartments) approved last year and including either one of them or another proposed which has a later bond reservation date (Costa Vizcaya) would result in an inclusive capture rate that is well over the maximum. Moreover, it is likely that the inclusive capture rate would exceed the maximum even if the PMA was expanded to the maximum size allowed.

#### Primary Market Occupancy Rates:

"The occupancy of the comparable rentals included in this study range from 79% (in initial lease up) to 94%, with a median occupancy of 91.2% or 94.25% excluding the comparable in their initial lease-up. The average occupancy for comparable apartments in the subject's primary market area was reported at 88.93% in the most recent O'Connor Data survey (December 2006). According to the survey, occupancy in the primary market area in December 2006 has increased slightly from the prior quarter. Average occupancy in the primary market area has remained in the high 80% to mid 90's since September 1995. The fluctuations were due to new product coming on-line. Based on our analysis of the market, moderate increases in occupancy are projected for this market." (p. 40)

Absorption Projections:

"Considering the strong absorption history of similar properties and the lack of available quality affordable units in this market, we project that the subject property will lease an average of 20-25 units per month until achieving stabilized occupancy. We anticipate that the subject property will achieve stabilized occupancy within ten to thirteen months following completion." (p. 83)

	RENT ANALYSIS (Tenant-Paid Net Rents)										
Ui	Unit Type (% AMI)		Proposed Rent	Program Maximum	Market Rent	Underwriting Rent	Savings Over Market				
1 BR	721 SF	60%	\$282	\$625	\$765	\$625	\$140				
1 BR	726 SF	60%	\$625	\$625	\$770	\$625	\$145				
2 BR	996 SF	60%	\$751	\$751	\$1,000	\$751	\$249				
2 BR	1,033 SF	60%	\$751	\$751	\$1,020	\$751	\$269				
3 BR	1,239 SF	60%	\$862	\$862	\$1,235	\$862	\$373				

Market Impact:

"Based on the high occupancy levels of the existing properties in the market, along with the strong recent absorption history, we project that the subject property will have minimal sustained negative impact upon the existing apartment market. Any negative impact from the subject property should be of reasonable scope and limited duration." (p. 83)

Houston Market Study:

The Department commissioned a market study for the Houston-Baytown-Sugar Land Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The study, completed in February 2006 by Vogt, Williams & Bowen, LLC (VWB), only considers demand from household growth, and from replacement or renovation of existing housing. It does not incorporate demand from turnover as normally considered in development-specific market studies because in an overall study the demand from turnover returns to all of the units in the market area. A development-specific market study identifies the demand from turnover as potential demand that can be attracted away from existing units and to the proposed development (and any other new developments that have not yet become fully occupied).

The proposed development is located in the West submarket within the Houston MSA. In this submarket, with a total population of 362,787, the VWB study determines total one year growth-based demand for - 41 units from households earning between 51-60% AMI. Because the VWB study is over a year old the Market Analyst in this case did not consider it a relevant item and did not comment on it further but has historically called it into question because of its inconsistencies with the market study requirements for project specific market studies.

Comments:

The Underwriter has serious concerns about the impact on the inclusive capture rate if either of the new developments just outside the boundary are considered. Being that this is a bond transaction with a local issuer, concerns of over saturation and concentration have had more opportunity to be addressed at the local level. This market study provided marginally sufficient information on which to base a positive funding recommendation, however an equally strong argument could be made to not recommend the transaction particularly if it was not being sponsored by the local housing finance corporation which has the most to risk in over saturating their own market.

		OPERATING PR	OFORMA ANALYSIS	
Income:	Number of Revisions:	4	Date of Last Applicant Revision:	5/1/2007
allowar prograr income garage garage income	nces as of April 1, 2006, m m gross rent limits. Tenant e assumption at \$10 per u es. The Applicant did not es could be achieved in t e. Their vacancy and colle	naintained by the ts will be required unit is low, howev provide any doo his market and the ection loss at 7.5	ait were calculated by subtracting e Harris County Housing Authority I to pay electric utility costs. The A er they also included additional s cumentation to support that the a herefore the Underwriter did not i % is in line with current TDHCA un s within 1% of the Underwriter's est	, from the 2007 Applicant's secondary secondary income for additional rent for nclude this source of derwriting guidelines.
Expense:	Number of Revisions:	3	Date of Last Applicant Revision:	5/1/2007
Underw Primary propert Conclusion The App therefor capaci The pro underw decrea the peri the con	rriter's estimate of \$4,340, differences occur in ger y taxes (\$46K lower). n: plicant's expenses and n re, the Underwriter's year ty. forma and estimated de rriting minimum guideline se in the permanent mor	, derived from th heral and admini et operating inco- one proforma w bt service result of 1.15. Therefor rtgage based or mentation submit	projection at \$3,962 per unit is no e TDHCA database, and third-pa strative expenses (Applicant's co ome are not within 5% of the Und <i>i</i> ll be used to determine the deve in a debt coverage ratio (DCR) b re, the recommended financing s the interest rate and amortizatio tted at application. This is discuss sis" section (below).	arty data sources. sts are \$20K lower) and erwriter's estimates; elopment's debt below the current structure reflects a in period indicated in
Feasibility:				
growth Underw resulting	factor for expenses in ac riter's base year effective	ccordance with o e gross income, io that remains a	Innual growth factor for income a current TDHCA guidelines. As not expense and net operating incor bove 1.15 and continued positive ble for the long-term.	ed above, the me were utilized
		ACQUISITIO	N INFORMATION	
			SED VALUE	
Land Only: Existing Bui	Idings:	\$396,693 \$14,111	Tax Year: Valuation by:	2006 Harris CAD
I OTAL ASSES	sed Value:	\$410.804	Tax Rate:	3.0261

EVIDENCE of PROPERTY CONTROL									
Type: Purchase and Sale Agreement	Acreage: 14.42								
Contract Expiration: 10/31/2007	Valid Through Board Date? X Yes No								
Acquisition Cost: \$1,884,262	Other:								
Seller: Robert R. Burchfield	Related to Development Team? X Yes No								
CONSTRUCTION	COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION								
COST SCHEDULE Number of Revisions:	3 Date of Last Applicant Revision: 5/12007								
Acquisition Value:									
	veloper and managing member of the General Partner; ntity of interest. The proposed acquisition cost for the subject ost schedule is \$1,884,406.								
Partners, Ltd. and AIMCO Properties, LP and subject property was purchased as part of a acquisition cost for Tracts 1, 2 & 3 was \$2,89 total of \$298,105. The resulting cost for the s	nents dated December 28, 2006 between Hastings Green Robert Burchfield for four tracts of land. A portion of the a transaction involving three of the four tracts. The 7,020, or \$130,702 per acre, and tract 4 was purchased for a subject 14.42 acres (tracts 1, 3 & 4) is \$1,884,532. The tion cost of \$1,884,406 as proposed by the Applicant as the ng analysis.								
Sitework Cost:									
	6,681 per unit appear to be low based on the proposed acceptable under current Department guidelines.								
Direct Construction Cost:									
Swift Residential Cost Handbook-derived es	imate is \$7K or 0.06% higher than the Underwriter's Marshall & timate.								
Ineligible Costs:									
	as an eligible cost. These costs are generally regarded to be nants, therefore, the Underwriter reduced the Applicant's								
Interim Interest Expense:									
	gible interim financing fees by \$322K to bring the eligible Irawn interest expense. This results in an equivalent stimate.								
Contingency & Fees:									
based on their own construction costs. Cor been reduced by the same amount with th Applicant's developer fee also exceeds 155	e 14% maximum allowed by HTC guidelines by a total of \$42K nsequently the Applicant's eligible fees in these areas have e overage effectively moved to ineligible costs. The % of the Applicant's adjusted eligible basis by \$84K and nt's developer fee must be reduced by the same amount.								
Conclusion:									
cost is within 5% of the Underwriter's estimat determine the development's need for per- basis of \$19,909,954 supports annual tax cre	and to eligible costs above the Applicant's total development se; therefore, the Applicant's cost schedule will be used to manent funds and to calculate eligible basis. An eligible edits of \$939,551. This figure will be compared to the culated based on the gap in need for permanent funds to								
l									

	FINANCING STRUCTURE										
SOURCES &	& USES Number of Revisions: 4	Date of La	st Applicant Revision: 5/1/2007								
Issuer:	Harris County Housing Finance Corp.										
Source:	Red Stone Partners	Туре:	Interim to Permanent Bond Financing								
Taxable:	\$14,150,000 Interest Rate: 5.75%	б Х	Fixed Term: months								
Source:	Red Capital	Type:	Syndication								
Proceeds:	\$9,713,640 Syndication Rate:	95%	Anticipated HTC: \$ 1,022,591								
Amount:	\$225,464	Туре:	Deferred Developer Fees								
	CONCLUSIO	ONS									
Recommer	nded Financing Structure:										
minimur but not of 1.15 is perman	Recommended Financing Structure: As stated above, the proforma analysis results in a debt coverage ratio below the Department's minimum guideline of 1.15. Therefore, receipt, review and acceptance of documentation including, but not limited to a new permanent loan commitment supporting a debt coverage ratio at a minimum of 1.15 is a condition of this report. The current underwriting analysis assumes a decrease in the permanent loan amount to \$12,855,000 based on the terms reflected in the application materials. The Applicant's total development cost estimate less the adjusted permanent loan of \$12,855,000										

indicates the need for \$10,432,417 in gap funds. Based on the submitted syndication terms, a tax credit allocation of \$1,097,312 annually would be required to fill this gap in financing. Of the three possible tax credit allocations, Applicant's revised request of (\$937,247), the gap-driven amount (\$1,097,312), and eligible basis-derived estimate (\$939,551), the Applicant's request of \$937,247 is recommended resulting in proceeds of \$8,920,949 based on a syndication rate of 95%.

The Underwriter's recommended financing structure indicates the need for \$1,520,464 in additional permanent funds. Deferred developer and contractor fees in this amount appear to be repayable from development cashflow within ten years of stabilized operation.

Underwriter:		Date:	June 18, 2007
	Diamond Unique Thompson		
Director of Real Estate Analysis:		Date:	June 18, 2007
	Tom Gouris		

## MULTIFAMILY COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Mansions at Hastings Green, Houston, 4% HTC #07412

Type of Unit N TC 60%	Number	No. of Baths	Size in SF	Gross Rent Lmt.	Rent Collected	Rent per Month	Rent per SF	Tnt-Pd Util	WS&T
	36	1	721	\$686	\$625	\$22,500	\$0.87	\$61.00	\$32.31
TC 60%	22	1	726	\$686	625	13,750	0.86	61.00	32.31
TC 60%	84	2	996	\$823	751	63,084	0.75	72.00	37.31
TC 60%	32	2	1,033	\$823	751	24,032	0.73	72.00	37.31
TC 60%	56	2	1,239	\$951	862	48,272	0.70	89.00	49.31
TOTAL:	230	AVERAGE:	991		\$746	\$171,638	\$0.75	\$73.37	\$38.97
<b>INCOME</b> T	Total Net F	entable Sq Ft:	228,032		TDHCA	APPLICANT	COUNTY	IREM REGION	COMPT. REGION
POTENTIAL G					\$2,059,656	\$2,059,656	Harris	Houston	6
Secondary Inco	ome	P	er Unit Per Month:	\$15.00	41,400	27,600	\$10.00	Per Unit Per Month	
Other Support I	Income:	garages			0	32,856	\$11.90	Per Unit Per Month	
POTENTIAL G	GROSS	INCOME			\$2,101,056	\$2,120,112			
Vacancy & Coll				-7.50%	(157,579)	(159,012)	-7.50%	of Potential Gross I	ncome
Employee or O			or Concession	าร	0	<b>.</b>			
EFFECTIVE G	ROSS				\$1,943,477	\$1,961,100			ar of for
EXPENSES		<u>% OF EGI</u>	PER UNIT	PER SQ FT	<b>#00.400</b>	¢70.040	PER SQ FT	PER UNIT	<u>% OF EGI</u>
General & Adm	ninistrativ	4.74%	\$401	0.40	\$92,138	\$72,219	\$0.32	\$314	3.68%
Management		4.00%	338	0.34	77,739	78,470	0.34	341	4.00%
Payroll & Payro		11.43%	966	0.97	222,093	210,855	0.92	917	10.75%
Repairs & Main	ntenance	5.15%	435	0.44	100,082	86,251	0.38	375	4.40%
Utilities		2.60%	220	0.22	50,622	35,595	0.16	155	1.82%
Water, Sewer,		4.11%	347	0.35	79,917	98,572	0.43	429	5.03%
Property Insura	ance	4.11%	347	0.35	79,811	79,350	0.35	345	4.05%
Property Tax		10.74%	908	0.92	208,801	162,917	0.71	708	8.31%
Reserve for Re	eplaceme	2.96%	250	0.25	57,500	57,500	0.25	250	2.93%
TDHCA Compli	liance Fe	0.47%	40	0.04	9,200	9,200	0.04	40	0.47%
Other: Sup. Se	ervs	1.04%	88	0.09	20,262	20,262	0.09	88	1.03%
TOTAL EXPE	NSES	51.36%	\$4,340	\$4.38	\$998,166	\$911,191	\$4.00	\$3,962	46.46%
NET OPERAT	ING IN	48.64%	\$4,110	\$4.15	\$945,311	\$1,049,909	\$4.60	\$4,565	53.54%
DEBT SERVIC	<u>CE</u>								
First Lien Mortga	age	46.56%	\$3,934	\$3.97	\$904,843	\$900,821	\$3.95	\$3,917	45.93%
Additional Finan	ncing	0.00%	\$0	\$0.00	0		\$0.00	\$0	0.00%
Additional Finan	· ·	0.00%	\$0	\$0.00	0		\$0.00	\$0	0.00%
Additional Finan	· ·	0.00% 2.08%	\$0 \$176	\$0.00 \$0.18	0 \$40,468	\$149,088	\$0.00 \$0.65	\$0 \$648	
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D	LOW DEBT CO	2.08% VERAGE RA	\$176 TIO		_	\$149,088 1.17			0.00%
NET CASH FL	LOW DEBT CO	2.08% VERAGE RA	\$176 TIO		\$40,468				0.00%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE	\$176 TIO		\$40,468 1.04				0.00%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT TION CO	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE	\$176 TIO		\$40,468 1.04				0.00%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT <b>TION CO</b>	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <u>ST</u>	\$176 TIO RATIO	\$0.18	\$40,468 1.04 1.15	1.17	\$0.65	\$648	0.00%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT <b>TION CO</b>	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <u>ST</u> <u>% of TOTAL</u>	\$176 TIO RATIO <u>PER UNIT</u>	\$0.18 PER SQ FT	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA	1.17 APPLICANT	\$0.65 PER SQ FT	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u>	0.00% 7.60% % of TOTAL
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT <b>TION CO</b>	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <u>ST</u> <u>% of TOTAL</u> 8.13%	\$176 TIO RATIO <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406	1.17 APPLICANT \$1,884,406	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193	0.00% 7.60% <u>% of TOTAL</u> 8.10%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT TION CO DD DSt (site o	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00%	\$176 TIO RATIO <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0	1.17 APPLICANT \$1,884,406 0	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0	0.00% 7.60% <u>% of TOTAL</u> 8.10% 0.00%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT TION CO DD DSt (site o	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> 8.13% 0.00% 6.63%	\$176 TIO RATIO <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560	1.17 APPLICANT \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681	0.00% 7.60% <u>% of TOTAL</u> 8.10% 0.00% 6.60%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT TON CO DOST (site o	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66%	\$176 TIO RATIO <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083	0.00% 7.60% <u>% of TOTAL</u> 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT TON CO Dost (site o uction	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73%	\$176 TIO RATIO <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742	0.00% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fe	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT TON CO Dost (site o Loction eees ruction	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88%	\$176 TIO RATIO \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865	1.17 APPLICANT \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130	0.00% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fe Indirect Constru	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO DOST (site o Juction Sees ruction ts	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80%	\$176 TIO RATIO \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813	0.00% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fe Indirect Constru Ineligible Costs Developer's Fe	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO DOST (site o DOST (site o uction reces ruction ts ees	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 1.80% 4.78%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621	\$0.65 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655	0.00% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79% 4.76% 11.52%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fo Indirect Constr Ineligible Cost Developer's Fo Interim Financ	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO DOST (site o DOST (site o uction reces ruction ts ees	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 11.20% 6.95%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286 7,008	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38 7.07	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819 1,611,891	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621 1,611,891	\$0.65 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76 7.07	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655 7,008	0.00% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79% 4.76% 11.52% 6.92%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fe Indirect Constru Ineligible Costs Developer's Fe	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO Dost (site o uction eees ruction ts ees cing	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 1.80% 4.78%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621	\$0.65 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655	0.00% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79% 4.76% 11.52%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fo Indirect Constru Ineligible Cost Developer's Fo Interim Financ Reserves	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO Dost (site o uction eees ruction ts eees cing	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 11.80% 6.95% 1.25%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286 7,008 1,260	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38 7.07 1.27	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819 1,611,891 289,718	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621 1,611,891 250,000	\$0.65 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76 7.07 1.10	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655 7,008 1,087	0.00% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79% 4.76% 11.52% 6.92% 1.07%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fo Indirect Constru Ineligible Costs Developer's Fo Interim Financ Reserves TOTAL COST Construction C	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO DOST (site o Juction sees ruction ts ees sing Cost Rec	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 11.20% 6.95% 11.25% 100.00% 65.89%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286 7,008 1,260 \$100,799	\$0.18 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38 7.07 1.27 \$101.67	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819 1,611,891 289,718 \$23,183,792	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621 1,611,891 250,000 \$23,278,417	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76 7.07 1.10 \$102.08 \$67.21	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655 7,008 1,087 \$101,211	0.00% 7.60% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79% 4.76% 11.52% 6.92% 1.07% 100.00%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contractor's Fe Indirect Constru Ineligible Cost: Developer's Fe Interim Financ Reserves TOTAL COST Construction C SOURCES OF	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO Dost (site o uction eees ruction ts eees cing Cost Rec F FUND	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 11.20% 6.95% 1.25% 100.00% 65.89% <b>S</b>	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286 7,008 1,260 \$100,799 \$66,420	\$0.18 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38 7.07 1.27 \$101.67 \$66.99	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819 1,611,891 289,718 \$23,183,792 \$15,276,570	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621 1,611,891 250,000 \$23,278,417 \$15,326,112	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76 7.07 1.10 \$102.08 <b>\$67.21</b> <u>RECOMMENDED</u>	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655 7,008 1,087 \$101,211 <b>\$66,635</b>	0.00% 7.60% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79% 4.76% 11.52% 6.92% 1.07% 100.00% 65.84%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contractor's Fe Indirect Constru Ineligible Costs Developer's Fe Interim Financ Reserves TOTAL COST Construction C SOURCES OF First Lien Mortge	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO Dost (site o uction eees ruction ts eees sing Cost Rec F FUND age	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE ST % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 11.20% 6.95% 1.25% 100.00% 65.89% S 61.03%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286 7,008 1,260 \$100,799 <b>\$66,420</b> \$61,522	\$0.18 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38 7.07 1.27 \$101.67 \$66.99 \$62.05	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819 1,611,891 289,718 \$23,183,792 \$15,276,570 \$14,150,000	1.17 APPLICANT \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621 1,611,891 250,000 \$23,278,417 \$15,326,112 \$14,150,000	\$0.65 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76 7.07 1.10 \$102.08 <b>\$67.21</b> <u>RECOMMENDED</u>	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655 7,008 1,087 \$101,211 <b>\$66,635</b> Developer F	0.00% 7.60% 7.60% 8.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79% 4.76% 11.52% 6.92% 1.07% 100.00% 65.84%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fo Indirect Constru Ineligible Costs Developer's Fo Interim Financ Reserves TOTAL COST Construction C SOURCES OF First Lien Mortga Additional Financ	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO Dost (site o uction eees ruction ts ees cing Cost Rec F FUND age ccing	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 1.80% 4.78% 1.80% 4.78% 1.25% 100.00% 65.89% <b>S</b> 61.03% 0.00%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286 7,008 1,260 \$100,799 <b>\$66,420</b> \$61,522 \$0	\$0.18 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38 7.07 1.27 \$101.67 \$66.99 \$62.05 \$0.00	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819 1,611,891 289,718 \$23,183,792 \$15,276,570 \$14,150,000 0	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621 1,611,891 250,000 \$23,278,417 <b>\$15,326,112</b> \$14,150,000 0	\$0.65 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76 7.07 1.10 \$102.08 <b>\$67.21</b> <u>RECOMMENDED</u> \$12,855,000 0	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655 7,008 1,087 \$101,211 <b>\$66,635</b> Developer F \$2,59	0.00% 7.60% 7.60% 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79% 4.76% 11.52% 6.92% 1.07% 100.00% 65.84% Fee Available 6,950
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE <b>CONSTRUCT</b> Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fe Indirect Constru Ineligible Costs Developer's Fe Interim Financ Reserves TOTAL COST <b>Construction C</b> <b>SOURCES OF</b> First Lien Mortga Additional Financ	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO Dost (site o uction eees ruction ts eees cing Cost Rec F FUND age age n Procee	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 11.20% 6.95% 1.25% 100.00% 65.89% <b>S</b> 61.03% 0.00% 41.90%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286 7,008 1,260 \$100,799 \$66,420 \$61,522 \$0 \$42,233	\$0.18 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38 7.07 1.27 \$101.67 \$66.99 \$62.05 \$0.00 \$42.60	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819 1,611,891 289,718 \$23,183,792 \$15,276,570 \$14,150,000 0 9,713,640	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621 1,611,891 250,000 \$23,278,417 \$15,326,112 \$14,150,000 0 8,902,952	\$0.65 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76 7.07 1.10 \$102.08 \$67.21 <u>RECOMMENDED</u> \$12,855,000 0 8,902,953	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655 7,008 1,087 \$101,211 \$66,635 Developer F \$2,59 % of Dev. F	0.00% 7.60% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 6.92% 1.07% 100.00% 65.84% Fee Available 6,950 fee Deferred
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE <b>CONSTRUCT</b> Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contingency Contractor's Fd Indirect Constru Ineligible Cost Developer's Fd Interim Financ Reserves TOTAL COST <b>Construction C</b> <b>SOURCES OF</b> First Lien Mortga Additional Financ HTC Syndication Deferred Develo	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO Dost (site o Juction eees ruction ts ees cing Cost Rec F FUND age cong n Procee poper Fee:	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 11.20% 6.95% 1.25% 100.00% 65.89% <b>S</b> 61.03% 0.00% 41.90% 0.97%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286 7,008 1,260 \$100,799 \$66,420 \$61,522 \$0 \$42,233 \$980	\$0.18 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38 7.07 1.27 \$101.67 \$66.99 \$62.05 \$0.00 \$42.60 \$0.99	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819 1,611,891 289,718 \$23,183,792 \$15,276,570 \$14,150,000 0 9,713,640 225,464	1.17 APPLICANT \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621 1,611,891 250,000 \$23,278,417 \$15,326,112 \$14,150,000 0 8,902,952 225,464	\$0.65 <u>PER SQ FT</u> \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76 7.07 1.10 \$102.08 <b>\$67.21</b> <u>RECOMMENDED</u> \$12,855,000 0 8,902,953 1,520,464	\$648 <u>PER UNIT</u> \$8,193 0 6,681 50,083 1,742 8,130 1,813 4,819 11,655 7,008 1,087 \$101,211 \$66,635 Developer F \$2,59 % of Dev. F 55	0.00% 7.60% 7.60% % of TOTAL 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 6.92% 1.07% 6.92% 1.07% 6.92% 1.07% 6.92% 6.92% 2.07% 6.92% 1.00,00% 6.684% % See Available 6,950 see Deferred 0%
NET CASH FL AGGREGATE D RECOMMENDE CONSTRUCT Description Acquisition Co Off-Sites Sitework Direct Constru Contractor's Fe Indirect Constru Contractor's Fe Indirect Constru Ineligible Costs Developer's Fe Interim Financ Reserves TOTAL COST Construction C SOURCES OF First Lien Mortga Additional Financ	LOW DEBT CO ED DEBT ION CO Dost (site o Juction eees ruction ts ees ting Cost Rec F FUND age cong n Procee poper Fee: ess) Func	2.08% VERAGE RA COVERAGE <b>ST</b> % of TOTAL 8.13% 0.00% 6.63% 49.66% 1.73% 7.88% 1.80% 4.78% 11.20% 6.95% 1.25% 100.00% 65.89% <b>S</b> 61.03% 0.00% 41.90% 0.97%	\$176 TIO RATIO PER UNIT \$8,193 0 6,681 50,054 1,742 7,943 1,813 4,819 11,286 7,008 1,260 \$100,799 \$66,420 \$61,522 \$0 \$42,233	\$0.18 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.49 1.76 8.01 1.83 4.86 11.38 7.07 1.27 \$101.67 \$66.99 \$62.05 \$0.00 \$42.60	\$40,468 1.04 1.15 TDHCA \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,512,475 400,670 1,826,865 417,000 1,108,387 2,595,819 1,611,891 289,718 \$23,183,792 \$15,276,570 \$14,150,000 0 9,713,640	1.17 <b>APPLICANT</b> \$1,884,406 0 1,536,560 11,519,091 400,670 1,869,791 417,000 1,108,387 2,680,621 1,611,891 250,000 \$23,278,417 \$15,326,112 \$14,150,000 0 8,902,952	\$0.65 PER SQ FT \$8.26 0.00 6.74 50.52 1.76 8.20 1.83 4.86 11.76 7.07 1.10 \$102.08 \$67.21 <u>RECOMMENDED</u> \$12,855,000 0 8,902,953	\$648           PER UNIT           \$8,193           0           6,681           50,083           1,742           8,130           1,813           4,819           11,655           7,008           1,087           \$101,211           \$66,635           Developer F           \$2,59           % of Dev. F           52           15-Yr Cumula	0.00% 7.60% 7.60% 8.10% 0.00% 6.60% 49.48% 1.72% 8.03% 1.72% 8.03% 1.79% 4.76% 11.52% 6.92% 1.07% 100.00% 65.84% ree Available 6,950 ree Deferred

## MULTIFAMILY COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS (continued)

Mansions at Hastings Green, Houston, 4% HTC #07412

#### DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

Marshall & Swift Residential Cost Handbook

Average Quality Multiple Residence Basis

CATEGORY	UNITS/SQ FT	PER SF	AMOUNT
Base Cost		\$54.13	\$12,342,840
Adjustments			
Exterior Wall Finish		\$1.30	\$296,228
9-Ft. Ceilings		1.79	407,314
Roofing		0.00	0
Subfloor		(0.82)	(187,746)
Floor Cover		2.43	554,118
Breezeways/Balconies	31,332	3.06	697,760
Plumbing Fixtures	516	1.82	415,380
Rough-ins	0	0.00	0
Built-In Appliances	230	1.87	425,500
Exterior Stairs	92	0.73	165,600
Enclosed Corridors	0	0.00	0
Heating/Cooling		1.73	394,495
Garages/Carports		0.00	0
Comm &/or Aux Bldgs	5,333	1.47	335,299
Other: fire sprinkler	228,032	1.95	444,662
SUBTOTAL		71.44	16,291,450
Current Cost Multiplier		(1.43)	(325,829)
Local Multiplier		(7.86)	(1,792,060)
TOTAL DIRECT CONSTRU	ICTION COSTS	\$62.16	\$14,173,562
Plans, specs, survy, bld prm	nts	(\$2.42)	(\$552,769)
Interim Construction Interes		(2.10)	(478,358)
Contractor's OH & Profit		(7.15)	(1,629,960)
NET DIRECT CONSTRUCT	TION COSTS	\$50.49	\$11,512,475

#### **PAYMENT COMPUTATION**

Primary	\$14,150,000	Amort	480
Int Rate	5.75%	DCR	1.04
Secondary	\$0	Amort	
Additional	\$8,902,952	Amort	
Int Rate		Aggregate DCR	1.04

#### RECOMMENDED FINANCING STRUCTURE:

Primary Debt Servi Secondary Debt Se Additional Debt Se NET CASH FLO	ervice rvice	\$822,032 0 0 \$123,279	
Primary	\$12,855,000	Amort	480
Int Rate	Int Rate 5.75%		1.15
			-
Secondary	\$0	Amort	0
Int Rate	0.00%	Subtotal DCR	1.15
Additional	\$8,902,952	Amort	0
Int Rate	0.00%	Aggregate DCR	1.15

#### **OPERATING INCOME & EXPENSE PROFORMA: RECOMMENDED FINANCING STRUCTURE**

INCOME at	3.00%	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 10	YEAR 15	YEAR 20	YEAR 30
POTENTIAL GRO	OSS RENT	\$2,121,446	\$2,185,089	\$2,250,642	\$2,318,161	\$2,687,384	\$3,115,415	\$3,611,619	\$4,853,714
Secondary Inco	me	42,642	43,921	45,239	46,596	54,018	62,621	72,595	97,562
Other Support Ir	ncome: garages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
POTENTIAL GRO	OSS INCOME	2,164,088	2,229,010	2,295,881	2,364,757	2,741,402	3,178,036	3,684,214	4,951,276
Vacancy & Colle	ection Loss	(162,307)	(167,176)	(172,191)	(177,357)	(205,605)	(238,353)	(276,316)	(371,346)
Employee or Ot	her Non-Rental	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EFFECTIVE GRO		\$2,001,781	\$2,061,835	\$2,123,690	\$2,187,400	\$2,535,796	\$2,939,683	\$3,407,898	\$4,579,930
EXPENSES at	4.00%								
General & Admi	nistrative	\$95,823	\$99,656	\$103,642	\$107,788	\$131,141	\$159,553	\$194,120	\$287,345
Management		80,071	82,473	84,948	87,496	101,432	117,587	136,316	183,197
Payroll & Payrol	II Tax	230,977	240,216	249,825	259,818	316,108	384,594	467,917	692,632
Repairs & Maint	enance	104,085	108,249	112,579	117,082	142,448	173,309	210,857	312,121
Utilities		52,647	54,753	56,943	59,221	72,051	87,661	106,653	157,872
Water, Sewer &	Trash	83,114	86,439	89,896	93,492	113,747	138,391	168,374	249,235
Insurance		83,004	86,324	89,777	93,368	113,596	138,207	168,150	248,903
Property Tax		217,153	225,839	234,873	244,268	297,189	361,576	439,912	651,177
Reserve for Rep	placements	59,800	62,192	64,680	67,267	81,840	99,571	121,144	179,322
Other	_	21,072	21,915	22,792	23,704	28,839	35,087	42,689	63,190
TOTAL EXPENS	ES	\$1,027,747	\$1,068,056	\$1,109,953	\$1,153,502	\$1,398,391	\$1,695,537	\$2,056,133	\$3,024,995
NET OPERATING		\$974,034	\$993,779	\$1,013,736	\$1,033,898	\$1,137,405	\$1,244,146	\$1,351,766	\$1,554,935
DEBT SE	RVICE								
First Lien Financi	ng	\$822,032	\$822,032	\$822,032	\$822,032	\$822,032	\$822,032	\$822,032	\$822,032
Second Lien		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Financing	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NET CASH FLOW	N	\$152,002	\$171,746	\$191,704	\$211,866	\$315,373	\$422,114	\$529,733	\$732,903
DEBT COVERAG	E RATIO	1.18	1.21	1.23	1.26	1.38	1.51	1.64	1.89

#### HTC ALLOCATION ANALYSIS - Mansions at Hastings Green, Houston, 4% HTC #07412

	APPLICANT'S	TDHCA	APPLICANT'S	TDHCA
	TOTAL	TOTAL	REHAB/NEW	<b>REHAB/NEW</b>
CATEGORY	AMOUNTS	AMOUNTS	ELIGIBLE BASIS	ELIGIBLE BASIS
Acquisition Cost				
Purchase of land	\$1,884,406	\$1,884,406		
Purchase of buildings				
Off-Site Improvements				
Sitework	\$1,536,560	\$1,536,560	\$1,536,560	\$1,536,560
Construction Hard Costs	\$11,519,091	\$11,512,475	\$11,519,091	\$11,512,475
Contractor Fees	\$1,869,791	\$1,826,865	\$1,827,791	\$1,826,865
Contingencies	\$400,670	\$400,670	\$400,670	\$400,670
Eligible Indirect Fees	\$417,000	\$417,000	\$417,000	\$417,000
Eligible Financing Fees	\$1,611,891	\$1,611,891	\$1,611,891	\$1,611,891
All Ineligible Costs	\$1,108,387	\$1,108,387		
Developer Fees			\$2,596,950	
Developer Fees	\$2,680,621	\$2,595,819		\$2,595,819
Development Reserves	\$250,000	\$289,718		
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS	\$23,278,417	\$23,183,792	\$19,909,954	\$19,901,281

	3.63%	3.63%
TOTAL QUALIFIED BASIS	\$25,882,940	\$25,871,665
Applicable Fraction	100%	100%
TOTAL ADJUSTED BASIS	\$25,882,940	\$25,871,665
High Cost Area Adjustment	130%	130%
TOTAL ELIGIBLE BASIS	\$19,909,954	\$19,901,281
Historic Credits (on residential portion only)		
Non-qualified portion of higher quality units [42(d)(3)]		
Non-qualified non-recourse financing		
All grant proceeds used to finance costs in eligible basis B.M.R. loans used to finance cost in eligible basis		

Total Tax Credits (Eligible Basis Method)	\$939,551	\$939,141
Syndication Proceeds	\$8,924,836	\$8,920,949
Requested Tax Credits	\$937,247	
Syndication Proceeds	\$8,902,953	
Gap of Syndication Proceeds Needed	\$10,423,417	
Total Tax Credits (Gap Method)	\$1,097,312	
Estimated Taxpayer's Reasonably Expected Basis (TREB)	\$2,254,225	\$21,282,183



	Applicant Evaluation	
Project ID # 07412 Name	Mansions at Hastings Green	City: Houston
LIHTC 9% 🗌 LIHTC 4% 🗹	HOME BOND HTF	SECO ESGP Other
$\Box$ No Previous Participation in Texas		nent team have been disbarred by HUD
National Previous Participation C	ertification Received: $\mathbf{V}_{N/A}$	$\Box_{\text{Yes}}$ $\Box_{\text{No}}$
Noncompliance Reported on Nati	onal Previous Participation Certification:	□ Yes □ No
	Portfolio Management and Compliance	
Total # of Projects monitored:4Projectszero to nine:4groupedten to nineteen:0by scoretwenty to twenty-nine:0	Projects in Material Noncompliance         Yes       No       Image: Colspan="2">Image: Colspan="2"         Yes       No       Image: Colspan="2"       Image: Colspan="2">Image: Colspan="2"         # monitored with a score less than thirty:       4         # not yet monitored or pending review:       0	
Portfolio Monitoring	Single Audit	Portfolio Analysis
Not applicableImage: Constraint of the second s	Not applicableImage: Constraint of the second s	Not applicableImage: Constraint of the sector o
Unresolved issues found that warrant disqualification (Comments attached) Reviewed by Karen Curtice	Issues found regarding fate cert Issues found regarding late audit Unresolved issues found that warrant disqualification (Comments attached)	Not current on draws
Multifamily Finance Production	НОМЕ	Real Estate Analysis
Not applicable	Not applicable	(Workout) Not applicable
Review pending	Review pending	Review pending
No unresolved issues	No unresolved issues	No unresolved issues
Unresolved issues found Unresolved issues found that warrant disqualification (Comments attached)	Unresolved issues found Unresolved issues found that warrant disqualification (Comments attached)	Unresolved issues found Unresolved issues found that warrant disqualification (Comments attached)
Reviewer Shannon Roth	Reviewer Sandy M. Garcia	Reviewer D. Burrell
Date 6/8/2007	Date <u>6 /8 /2007</u>	Date 6 /8 /2007
Community Affairs	Office of Colonia Initiatives	Financial Administration
No relationship       ✓         Review pending       □         No unresolved issues       □         Unresolved issues found       □         Unresolved issues found that warrant disqualification (Comments attached)       □	Not applicable       Image: Constraint of the second	No delinquencies found   ✓ Delinquencies found
ReviewerEEFDate6 /11/2007	ReviewerRAUL GONZALESDate6 /8 /2007	ReviewerMelissa M. WhiteheadDate6 /9 /2007

## MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION BOARD ACTION REQUEST June 28, 2007

## Action Item

Presentation, Discussion and Possible Issuance of Determination Notices for Housing Tax Credits associated with Mortgage Revenue Bond Transactions with other Issuers.

## **Requested Action**

Approve, Amend or Deny the staff recommendation for Regent I, #07416.

## **Summary of the Transaction**

*Background and General Information:* The application was received on March 13, 2007. The Issuer for this transaction is BHC Redevelopment Corporation with a reservation of allocation that expires on August 9, 2007. The development is new construction and will consist of 160 total units targeting the general population, with all units affordable. The proposed development will be located in Beaumont, Jefferson County. The site is currently zoned for such a development.

It should be noted that the Development has an expense to income ratio that exceeds 65%, a topic that was discussed by the Board at the June 14 Board meeting. However, unlike that discussion, in this case the situation is mitigated by the on-going operating subsidy from the 70 public housing units.

*Organizational Structure and Compliance:* The Borrower is Regent I Beaumont, LP and the General Partner is Regent I Beaumont GP, LLC. The Compliance Status Summary completed on June 8, 2007 reveals that the principals of the general partner have a total of fifteen (15) properties that have been monitored with no material non-compliance. The bond priority for this transaction is:

Priority 3: Any qualified residential development.

*Census Demographics:* The development is to be located at the 2900 Gulf Street in Beaumont. Demographics for the census tract (9.00) include AMFI of \$21,469; the total population is 1,631; the percent of population that is minority is 92.46%; the percent of population that is below the poverty line is 45.49%; the number of owner occupied units is 283; the number of renter units is 279 and the number of vacant units is 142. The percentage of population that is minority for the entire City of Beaumont is 57% (Census information from FFIEC Geocoding for 2006).

Public Comment: The Department has received no letters of support or opposition.

## **Recommendation**

Staff recommends the Board approve the issuance of a Determination Notice of \$810,175 in Housing Tax Credits for Regent I.



## MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION

June 28, 2007

Development Information, Public Input and Board Summary

## Regent I, TDHCA Number 07416

		BASIC DEVELOPM	MENT INFORMATIC	<u>DN</u>	
Site Address:	2900 Gulf Street			Development #:	07416
City:	Beaumont	Region: 5	;	Population Served:	General
County:	Jefferson	Zip Code: 7	7703	Allocation:	Urban/Exurban
HOME Set Asi	des: 🗌 CHDO	$\Box$ Preservation $\Box$ (	General	Purpose/Activity:	NC
Bond Issuer:	BHC Redev	velopment Corp.			
		NC=New Construction, ACQ=Acqu NC/R=New Construction and Reha			d Acquisition,
		OWNER AND D	EVELOPMENT TEAI	M	
Owner:		Regent I Beaumont, LF	D		
Owner Contac	ct and Phone	Robert L. Reyna		(409) 951-7200	
Developer:		Carleton Development,	, Ltd./Golden Trian	lge Redevelopment C	Corp.
Housing Gene	eral Contractor:	Carleton Construction,	Ltd.		
Architect:		KAI			
Market Analys	st:	O' Connor & Associate	S		
Syndicator:		Red Capital Group, Inc	2.		
Supportive Se	ervices:	Housing Authority of th	e City of Beaumon	t	
Consultant:		Not Utilized			

## UNIT/BUILDING INFORMATION

<u>30%</u> <u>40%</u> <u>50%</u>	<u>60% Eff 1 BR 2 BR 3 BR 4 BR 5 BR</u>	Total Restricted Units:	160
0 0 0	160 0 22 94 44 0 0	Market Rate Units:	0
Type of Building:	4 units or more per building	Owner/Employee Units:	0
Duplex	Detached Residence	Total Development Units:	160
☐ Triplex	□ Single Room Occupancy	Total Development Cost:	\$19,061,813
Fourplex	Transitional	Number of Residential Buildings:	35
•	✓ Townhome	HOME High Total Units:	0
		HOME Low Total Units:	0

Note: If Development Cost =\$0, an Underwriting Report has not been completed.

	FUNDING INFO	<u>DRMATION</u>				
	Applicant Request	Department Analysis	Amort	Term	Rate	
4% Housing Tax Credits with Bonds:	\$810,175	\$810,175	0	0	0%	
TDHCA Bond Allocation Amount:	\$0	\$0	0	0	0%	
HOME Activity Fund Amount:	\$0	\$0	0	0	0%	
HOME CHDO Operating Grant Amount:	\$0	\$0				



## MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION June 28, 2007 Development Information, Public Input and Board Summary Regent I, TDHCA Number 07416

PUB	LIC COMMENT SU	MMARY
Guide: "O" = Oppose, "S" = Support, "N" = Neutral, "NC" or	Blank = No comment	
State/Federal Officials with Jurisdiction:		
TX Senator: Williams, District 4	NC	US Representative: Poe, District 2, NC
TX Representative: Deshotel, District 22	NC	US Senator: NC
Local Officials and Other Public Officials:		
Mayor/Judge: Guy N. Goodson, Mayor, City of Beaumont - NC	f Reso	ution of Support from Local Government
Stephen C. Richardson, Planning Manager, City Beaumont - The new residential development is conformance with the City of Beaumont's Develo Strategies Plan.	in	
Individuals/Businesses: In Support 0 Neighborhood Input:	In Oppositior	0

#### **General Summary of Comment:**

The Department has received no letters of support and no letters of opposition.

#### **CONDITIONS OF COMMITMENT**

Per §49.12(c) of the Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules, all Tax Exempt Bond Development Applications "must provide an executed agreement with a qualified service provider for the provision of special supportive services that would otherwise not be available for the tenants. The provision of such services will be included in the Declaration of Land Use Restrictive Covenants ("LURA")."

Receipt, review and acceptance of a letter from a certified public accountant stating which site work costs are includable in eligible basis.

Should the terms and rates of the proposed debt or syndication change, the transaction should be re evaluated and an adjustment to the credit amount may be warranted.



## MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION

## June 28, 2007

## Development Information, Public Input and Board Summary

## Regent I, TDHCA Number 07416

## RECOMMENDATION BY THE EXECUTIVE AWARD AND REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE IS BASED ON:

4% Housing Tax	Credits:	Credit Amount:	\$810,175
Recommendation:	Recommend approval of a Housing Tax Credit Allocation not to exceed \$ to conditions.	810,175 annually for ter	n years, subject
TDHCA Bond Iss	uance:	Bond Amount:	\$0
Recommendation:			
HOME Activity Fu	unds:	Loan Amount:	\$0
HOME CHDO Op	perating Expense Grant:	Grant Amount:	\$0
Recommendation:			



## TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

Real Estate Analysis Division Underwriting Report

REPORT DATE	: 06/15/07	PROGRAM:	4% HTC		FILE NUMB	ER: 07416		
		D	evelopm	ENT				
			Regent	I				
Location: 29	00 Gulf Street					Region:	5	
City: Beaumo	nt	County: Jeffe	erson	Zip:	77703	х ост х	( DDA	
Key Attributes:	Family, Urban	Exurban, New (	Constructio	on, and Multi	family			
		A	LLOCATIO	ON				
		[	REQUEST		PECO	MMENDATION		
TDHCA Progra	n	Amount	Interest	Amort/Term	Amount	Interest Amo	ort/Term	
Housing Tax Cre		\$810,175	interest		\$810,175			
		(		NS				
costs are in 2 Should the	view, and accepta cludable in eligible terms and rates of and an adjustmen	e basis. the proposed o t to the credit a	debt or syr	ndication cha amount may	inge, the trans	action should b		
<u> </u>								
	Incomolimi		SET-ASIDES		Number of	Lipita		
	Income Limit 60% of AMI		Rent Lim 60% of AN		Number of Units 160			
	PROS			···	CONS			
supplemen during the F	pros oment is designed t housing that was furricane of 2005. oment will include	lost or damage	ed	ratio over 65 ongoing ope	ment has an e %, but this is m erating subsidy	expense to inco itigated by the to be provided nree other unsta	d.	
units to pot	entially help serve community.	•	-		ith 288 compa			
were forwa returned cr	the 2007 9% tax cr rd committed last edits, this may be t s made available t	year and abseithe only new ta	nt	being ineffic credit, as the after issuanc thereby usin	iently used to g ey plan to refu e with Federal	npt bond resou gain access to nd the bonds sł I HOPE VI funds : limited resourc Irpose.	the tax nortly	





3 of 9 07416 Regent I.xls, printed: 6/18/2007

					E	BUILDI	NG C	ONFIGURA	ATION				
Г	Buildin	д Туре	1	2	3	4	5					Total	
		Stories	2	2	2	2	2					Buildings	
	Nun	nber	11	4	4	10	6					35	
Г	BR/BA	SF					Uı	nits				Total Units	Total SF
	1/1	727	2									22	15,994
	2/1	919	4									44	40,436
	2/2	1,016		1	2	2	3					50	50,800
	3/2	1,335		2	2		3					34	45,390
	3/2	1,251				1			_			10	12,510
	Units per	Building	6	3	4	3	6					160	165,130
							SITE	ISSUES					
	al Size: od Zone: ing:	Х	.89 C-MD	acres		Withir		te? rr floodplair e re-zoned?			Yes Yes Yes	X No X No X No	□ N/A
						TDHO	CA SIT	E INSPECTI	ON				
Ove Surre	erall Asse Exce ounding North:	ellent	X A	.ccept nter, p :ion bu	able ool, ai iilding	nd par	k	stionable East: West:	retail	and sir	and fa	te: <u>4/19/2</u> Unacce mily violence mily resident	eptable e center
				HI	GHLIC	GHTS c	of ENV	'IRONMEN'	TAL REI	PORTS			
Prov	/ider:	Alpha Te	sting, I	nc.							Da	te: 2/9/20	007
	ognized None	Environm	nental	Conce	erns (R	ECs) a	nd Ot	her Concei	ns:				
						MA	RKET	HIGHLIGH	TS				
Cor Nun Prim T F	hary Mar The subje PMA are	irregular	). Coe, (PMA) ary ma due to	II 0 : arket is o the u	81.41 define	Date square ed as t	of Las e miles hat ar	t Applicant	adius ne City (	n:	N/A	Fax: (713)	686-8336
		Market Ar dary mark			dentifie	ed in tl	ne Ma	rket Study.					

	PROPOSED	UNI	der C	ONSTR	UCTION	& U	NSTAB	ILIZED	COMPAR	AB	le dev	/ELOPN	JENTS	
		ΡM	А							Ś	SMA			
Na	ame	Fil	e #	Total Units				Nam	e	F	ile #	Tota Units		Comp Units
Timber Cree	k at Sienna Trail	060	0239	36	36					ſ	N/A			
Stone Hearst		060	0248	216	216	ó								
Beaumont D	owntown Lofts	060	0202	36	36									
Sunlight Mar	nor (prop. 120)	07	189	0	0									
Pointe North	(prop. 158)	07	162	0	0									
					IN	CON	vie lin	IITS						
						Jeff	ferson							
% AMI	1 Person		2 P	ersons	3 F	Perso			6 Pe	6 Persons				
60	\$21,240		\$2	4,300	\$2	27,30	00	\$3	0,360 \$32,760 \$3				5,220	
			MA	ARKET A	ANALYST'	S PN	/IA DEI	MAND	by UNIT T	YPE	Ξ			
Uni	t Type		nover mand	Growt Demar			To Dem	tal iand	Subject Ur	nits	Comp	bilized arable /IA)	Capt	ure Rate
1 BR/ 60%	6 Rent Limit	4	13	-3	0		410 13 74		4	21.2%				
2 BR/ 60%	6 Rent Limit	3	34	-6	0		32	28	57		17	71	69	9.5%
3 BR/ 60%	6 Rent Limit	2	39	-18	0		22	22	20		12	28	66	5.7%
							С	VERAL	L DEMAN	D				
				arget seholds	House	eholo	d Size		e Eligible		Tenur	re	Dei	mand
						PI	MA DE	MANE	) from TUF	RNC	OVER			
Market An	alyst p. 7	6	100%	39,10	2 96%		7,518	include	d in Tenure %	13	3% 4	,949	70%	3,464
Underwrite	r		100%	39,11			,530	30%	11,428	45		,196	65%	3,377
					PM	a de		D from	HOUSEH					
Market An		6			96%		7		d in Tenure %	13		1	100%	1
Underwrite	1				96%		-21	30%	-6	45	5%	-3	100%	-3
							INCL	USIVE	CAPTURE	RA				
			Subjec	ct Units	Unstabiliz Compara (PMA)	ble		oilized arable SMA)	Total Supp	oly	Dem	tal hand 5% of 1A)		e Captu ate
		7	1/	· ^	607		-	、 	7/7		4.0	200	17	.51%
Market An	alyst p. 7	/	16	50	607		(	)	767		4,3	080	17	.3170

Primary Market Occupancy Rates:

The average occupancy for apartments in the subject's primary market area was reported at 97.50% in the most recent Apartment MarketData survey (December 2006). According to the survey, occupancy in the primary market area in December 2006 has remained stable from the prior quarter. Average occupancy in the primary market area has remained relatively stable since September 1999. Based on our analysis of the market, moderate increases in occupancy are projected for this market. (p. 48)

Absorption Projections:

Absorption in the subject's primary market area over the past twelve months has been minimal due to the limited new construction and the high average occupancy, as well as the effects of Hurricane Rita. The limited amount of new product that entered the market in 2000 through 2006 was readily absorbed. Based on our research, most projects that are constructed in the Southeast Texas area typically lease up within 12 months. Pre-leasing should commence prior to the completion of the construction. (p. 12)

5 of 9 07416 Regent I.xls, printed: 6/18/2007

				RENT ANAL	YSIS (Tenant-Pai	d Net Rents)	
Unit	Type (% .	AMI)	Proposed Rent	Program Maximum	Market Rent	Underwriting Rent	Savings Ove Market
1 BR	689 SF	(60%)	\$511	516	\$835	516	\$319
2 BR	875 SF	(60%)	\$610	615	\$945	615	\$330
2 BR	952 SF	(60%)	\$610	615	\$995	615	\$380
3 BR 1	1,206 SF	(60%)	\$702	707	\$1,155	707	\$448
3 BR 1	1,266 SF	(60%)	\$702	707	\$1,155	707	\$448
recent a	absorpti	on history	we project the	at the subject r	roperty will have	e minimal sustai	h the strong ned negative
impact	upon th	e existing	y, we project that apartment mat d limited duration	rket. Any nega	property will have tive impact from		ned negative

OPERATING PROFORMA ANALYSIS				
Income:	Number of Revisions:	0	Date of Last Applicant Revision:	N/A
The Applicant indicated that 70 units would be reserved as public housing units and as such would be subsidized through an operating subsidy agreement up to their proportionate share of operating expenses but could service no debt. The Applicant's projected rents for the PHA units at \$300 per unit as an average for all unit types. The Applicant's projected rents for the non-PHA units were calculated by subtracting tenant-paid utility allowances as of May 2006, maintained by The Housing Authority of the City of Beaumont, from the 2007 program gross rent limits. The Applicant's rent projections are slightly lower than the maximum rents allowed under HTC guidelines.				
The Underwriter separated the standard \$15 per unit secondary income from the non-PHA units from the additional operating subsidy for the PHA units for which the Underwriter included no additional tenant fees. The Underwriter did calculate the amount of additional PHA subsidy (in addition to the \$300 per unit per month rent) that would be needed to meet those units' prorata share of operating expenses at \$11,971 in year one, increasing thereafter. As a result, the Applicant's effective gross income estimate is \$5,400 less than the Underwriter's estimate.				
Expense:	Number of Revisions:	1	Date of Last Applicant Revision:	5/15/2007
The Applicant's total annual operating expense projection at \$3,652 per unit is not within 5% of the				

Underwriter's estimate of \$3,986, derived from the TDHCA database. In addition the Applicant's budget shows several line item estimates that deviate significantly when compared to the database averages, particularly: general and administrative (\$30K lower), payroll (\$69K lower), and repairs and maintenance (\$27K higher). The underwriting analysis assumes the development will have no property tax expense because the Applicant provided a ninety-nine year lease from the Housing Authority of the City of Beaumont. Direct PHA ownership of the underlying land allows for the property tax exemption.
### Conclusion:

The Applicant's total estimated operating expense and net operating income are inconsistent with the Underwriter's expectations. Therefore, the Underwriter's Year 1 proforma will be used to evaluate debt service capacity. The proforma and estimated debt service result in a debt coverage ratio (DCR) below the current underwriting minimum guideline of 1.15. Therefore, the recommended financing structure reflects a decrease in the permanent mortgage based on the interest rate and amortization period indicated in the permanent financing documentation submitted at application.

### Feasibility:

The underwriting 30-year proforma utilizes a 3% annual growth factor for income and a 4% annual growth factor for expenses in accordance with current TDHCA guidelines. As noted above, the Underwriter's base year effective gross income, expense and net operating income were utilized resulting in a debt coverage ratio that is slightly below a 1.15 initially suggesting a slightly smaller permanent loan can be serviced. This will be discussed more in the financing section below. It should also be noted that both the Applicant and Underwriter's proforma reflect an expense to income ratio well above the 65% maximum guideline in 10TAC §1.32(i)(4), however the rule allows for mitigation of this concern in the form of an ongoing operating subsidy. Therefore, the development can be characterized as feasible.

APPRAISED VALUE         Provider:       O'Connor & Associates       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       N/A         Number of Revisions:       0       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       N/A         Land Only:       11.9 acres       \$280,000       As of:       1/31/2007         ASSESSED VALUE         Land Only:       11.9 acres       \$0       Tax Year:       2006         Existing Buildings:       \$0       Yaluation by:       Jefferson CAD         Total Assessed Value:       \$0       Tax Rate:       2.727382         Contract for Lease         Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X Yes       No         Comments:       T       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       5/17/2007         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         COST SCHEDULE         Number of Revisions:       1       Date of Last Ap	ACQUISITION INFORMATION						
Number of Revisions:       0       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       N/A         Land Only:       11.9 acres       \$280,000       As of:       1/31/2007         ASSESSED VALUE         Land Only:       11.9 acres       \$0       Tax Year:       2006         Existing Buildings:       \$0       Valuation by:       Jefferson CAD         Total Assessed Value:       \$0       Tax Rate:       2.727382         EVIDENCE of PROPERTY CONTROL         Type:       Contract for Lease       Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION		APPRAISED V	VALUE				
Land Only:       11.9 acres       \$280,000       As of:       1/31/2007         ASSESSED VALUE         Land Only:       11.9 acres       \$0       Tax Year:       2006         Existing Buildings:       \$0       Tax Year:       2006         Total Assessed Value:       \$0       Tax Rate:       2.727382         EVIDENCE of PROPERTY CONTROL         Type:       Contract for Lease       Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167.869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.         COST SCHEDULE       Number of Revisions:       1       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       5/17/2007         Acquisition Value:       1       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       5/17/2007         Acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's c			licant Revision				
ASSESSED VALUE         Land Only:       11.9 acres       \$0       Tax Year:       2006         Existing Buildings:       \$0       Valuation by:       Jefferson CAD         Total Assessed Value:       \$0       Tax Rate:       2.727382         EVIDENCE of PROPERIY CONTROL         Type:       Contract for Lease         Contract for Lease         Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X       Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167.869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:         The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         Construction Cost ESTIMATE EVALUATION         Cost scheDule         Number of Revisions:       1       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       5/17/2007         Acquisition Value:							
Land Only:       11.9 acres       \$0       Tax Year:       2006         Existing Buildings:       \$0       Valuation by:       Jefferson CAD         Total Assessed Value:       \$0       Tax Rate:       2.727382         EVIDENCE of PROPERTY CONTROL         Type:       Contract for Lease       Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X       Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         COST SCHEDULE         Number of Revisions:       1       Date of Last Applicant Revision: 5/17/2007         Acquisition Value:       The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no doccumentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Th	Land Only: 11.9 acres	\$280,000	As of: 1/31/200	07			
Existing Buildings:       \$0       Valuation by:       Jefferson CAD         Total Assessed Value:       \$0       Tax Rate:       2.727382         EVIDENCE of PROPERTY CONTROL         Type:       Contract for Lease       Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X       Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         Construction value:         The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of		ASSESSED V	ALUE				
Existing Buildings:       \$0       Valuation by:       Jefferson CAD         Total Assessed Value:       \$0       Tax Rate:       2.727382         EVIDENCE of PROPERTY CONTROL         Type:       Contract for Lease       Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X       Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         Construction value:         The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of	Land Only: 11.9 acres	02	Tay Vear	2006			
Total Assessed Value:       \$0       Tax Rate:       2.727382         EVIDENCE of PROPERTY CONTROL         Type:       Contract for Lease       Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X       Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         Cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used			_				
Type:       Contract for Lease       Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X       Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.       No         COST SCHEDULE       Number of Revisions:       1       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       5/17/2007         Acquisition Value:       The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.							
Type:       Contract for Lease       Acreage:       11.891         Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X       Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.       No         COST SCHEDULE       Number of Revisions:       1       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       5/17/2007         Acquisition Value:       The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.							
Contract Expiration:       12/31/2007       Valid Through Board Date?       X       Yes       No         Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         Construction value:         The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.							
Acquisition Cost:       \$167,869       Other:       Ninety-nine year lease at \$100 per year         Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.       No         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION       COST SCHEDULE       Number of Revisions:       1       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       5/17/2007         Acquisition Value:       The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.	Type: Contract for Lease			Acreage: 11.891			
Seller:       Housing Authority of the City of Beau       Related to Development Team?       X       Yes       No         Comments:       The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year.       No         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION         Construction Value         The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.	Contract Expiration: 12/3	1/2007 Valid Th	rough Board Date?	X Yes No			
Comments: The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year. CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION COST SCHEDULE Number of Revisions: 1 Date of Last Applicant Revision: 5/17/2007 Acquisition Value: The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.	Acquisition Cost: \$167,869	Other:	Ninety-nine year leas	se at \$100 per year			
The subject property is currently owned by the City of Beaumont who will sell the property to the Beaumont Housing Authority, who will in turn lease the subject site under a 99-year lease at \$100 per year. CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE EVALUATION COST SCHEDULE Number of Revisions: 1 Date of Last Applicant Revision: 5/17/2007 Acquisition Value: The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.	Seller: Housing Authority of th	e City of Beau Related	to Development Tear	m? X Yes No			
COST SCHEDULE       Number of Revisions:       1       Date of Last Applicant Revision:       5/17/2007         Acquisition Value:       The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.	The subject property is currer Beaumont Housing Authority,	• • •					
Acquisition Value: The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.	CC	ONSTRUCTION COST EST	IMATE EVALUATION				
The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.	COST SCHEDULE Number of Re	evisions: 1	Date of Last Applica	nt Revision: <u>5/17/2007</u>			
7 of 9	Acquisition Value: The site cost of \$167,869 (\$14,360/acre, or \$1,049/unit) is substantiated by the appraisal value of \$280,000; however, the housing authority appears to own the property currently and provided no documentation of original acquisition and holding cost. Thus the transfer amount will be reduced to the first year's rent of \$100 in the underwriting analysis and if the Applicant's costs are used to determine the appropriate uses of funds, the sources of funds will be reduced by the difference in the acquisition cost to ensure that no excess profit or cash out on the transfer results.						

07416 Regent I.xls, printed: 6/18/2007

Sitework Cost:

The Applicant claimed sitework costs over the Department's maximum guideline of \$9,000 per unit and provided sufficient third party certification through a detailed certified cost estimate by John Holm a registered engineer to justify these costs. A letter from a certified public accountant, however, stating which costs are includable in eligible basis, is a condition of this report.

### Direct Construction Cost:

The Applicant's direct construction cost estimate is \$357.3K or 4% higher than the Underwriter's Marshall & Swift Residential Cost Handbook-derived estimate, and is therefore regarded as reasonable as submitted.

### Interim Interest Expense:

The Underwriter reduced the Applicant's eligible interim financing fees by \$8.7K to reflect an apparent overestimation of eligible construction loan interest, to bring the eligible interest expense down to one year of fully drawn interest expense. This results in an equivalent reduction to the Applicant's eligible basis estimate.

### Contingency & Fees:

The Applicant's contractor's fees are all within the maximums allowed by TDHCA guidelines. However the Applicant's developer fee exceeds 15% of the Applicant's adjusted eligible basis by \$139,585 and therefore the eligible portion of the Applicant's developer fee must be reduced by the same amount.

### Conclusion:

The Applicant's total development cost is within 5% of the Underwriter's estimate; therefore, the Applicant's cost schedule, adjusted for overstated acquisition cost and eligible basis, will be used to determine the development's need for permanent funds and to calculate eligible basis. An eligible basis of \$17,760,085 supports annual tax credits of \$840,407. This figure will be compared to the Applicant's request and the tax credits calculated based on the gap in need for permanent funds to determine the recommended allocation.

		FINANCI	NG STRU	CTURE			
SOURCES	& USES Number of Re	evisions: 0	D	ate of L	ast Applic	cant Revision:	N/A
Source:	Red Capital Group			Type:	Interin	n to Permanent Fi	nancing
	\$3,147,427 s: ed with bonds through nent financing.	Interest Rate: n BNC Redevelopme	5.5% ent Corp	X	Fixed bonds will	Convert 24 Amort: 360 remain and conv	months months vert to
Source:	Red Capital Group			Type:	Interin	n Financing	
Principal: Comment	\$6,852,573 s:	Interest Rate:	3.8%	Х	Fixed	Amort: 24	months
costs a credits.	Financed with bonds through BNC Redevelopment Corp. to insure that at least 50% of the development costs are funded with private activity bond proceeds so that the development is eligible for 4% tax credits. These bond will be repaid with HOPE VI funds and will terminate shortly after construction is completed.						
Source:	HOPE VI			Type:	Perma	anent Financing	
Amount:       \$8,189,495       Interest Rate:       N/A       Fixed       Amort:       N/A       months         Comments:       This will replace the majority of the private activity bonds and may b in the form of a deferred loan but will likely ultimately be forgiven or granted once the partnership returns full ownership of the property to the Housing Authority.							

8 of 9 07416 Regent I.xls, printed: 6/18/2007

Source:	Red Capital Group		Туре:	Syndication					
Proceeds:	\$7,695,892	Syndication Rate:	95%	Anticipated HTC:	\$ 810,175				
Amount:	\$196,768		Туре:	Deferred Develop	er Fees				
	CONCLUSIONS								
The Und debt) wi Applica HOPE VI adjustm allocatio credit al derived The Und perman	III be reduced to \$3,08 nt's total developmen Funds projected to be ent for the land transfe on of \$819,484 annual locations, Applicant's estimate (\$840,407), th erwriter's recommend	cts a likelyhood that the 18,000 in order to allow t 1t cost estimate less the 1e \$8,189,495 indicates the 1e value is made. Based 2 would be required to 1request (\$810,175), the 1ne Applicant's request of 1ed financing structure in 1eveloper fees in this am	he debt serv revised perm ne need for \$ d on the subr fill this gap in gap-driven a of \$810,175 is ndicates the	ice ratio to be at lea anent loan of \$3,08 7,784,318 in gap fur nitted syndication te financing. Of the th amount (\$819,484), a recommended. need for \$88,426 in	ast 1.15. The 8,000 and the ads once the erms, a tax credit nree possible tax and eligible basis- additional				
Underwriter	:			Date:	June 15, 2007				
		Carl Hoover							
Director of	Real Estate Analysis:	Tom Gouris		Date:	June 15, 2007				

### MULTIFAMILY COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Regent I, Beaumont, 4% HTC #07416

Type of Unit	Number	Bedrooms	No. of Baths	Size in SF	Gross Rent Lmt.	Rent Collected	Rent per Month	Rent per SF	Tnt-Pd Util	WS&T
PHU	9	1	1	727	#N/A	\$300	\$2,700	\$0.41	\$53.00	\$32.00
TC 60%	13	1	1	727	\$569	516	6,708	0.71	53.00	32.00
PHU	18	2	1	919	#N/A	300	5,400	0.33	67.00	37.00
TC 60%	26	2	1	919	\$682	615	15,990	0.67	67.00	37.00
PHU	19	2	1.5	1,016	#N/A	300	5,700	0.30	67.00	37.00
TC 60%	31	2	1.5	1,016	\$682	615	19,065	0.61	67.00	37.00
PHU	3	3	2	1,251	#N/A	300	900	0.24	82.00	41.00
TC 60%	7	3	2	1,251	\$789	707	4,949	0.57	82.00	41.00
PHU	21	3	1.5	1,335	#N/A	300	6,300	0.22	82.00	41.00
TC 60%	13	3	1.5	1,335	\$789	707	9,191	0.53	82.00	41.00
TOTAL:	160		AVERAGE:	1,032		\$481	\$76,903	\$0.47	\$69.20	\$37.41
INCOME		Total Net I	Rentable Sq Ft:	165,130		TDHCA	APPLICANT	COUNTY	IREM REGION	COMPT. REGION
POTENTIA	AL GROSS	RENT				\$922,836	\$917,436	Jefferson		5
Secondary	Income		Per non-F	PH Unit Per Month:	\$15.00	16,200	28,224	\$14.70	Per Unit Per Month	
	upport for PH					11,971	<b>*</b> 2.15.000	\$0.00	Per Unit Per Month	
	AL GROSS					\$951,007	\$945,660			
	Collection L			ntial Gross Income:	-7.50%	(71,325)	(70,920)	-7.50%	of Potential Gross	ncome
	OF Other Nor		ts or Concessi	ons		\$879.681	\$874.740			
EXPENSE		NOOME	% OF EGI	PER UNIT	PER SQ FT	φ073,001	ψ07 -,7 -το	PER SQ FT	PER UNIT	% OF EGI
	<u>.o</u> Administrativ		7.37%	\$405	0.39	\$64,839	\$34,000	\$0.21	\$213	3.89%
Manageme			3.91%	\$405 215	0.39	34,352	43,737	٥.26	۶213 273	5.00%
Payroll & P			18.50%	1,017	0.99	162.749	93,600	0.57	585	10.70%
	Maintenance					- , -	,			
Utilities	Maintenance		9.08% 5.78%	499 318	0.48 0.31	79,846 50,807	107,100 62,328	0.65 0.38	669 390	12.24% 7.13%
							,			
	wer, & Trash		7.55%	415	0.40	66,380 116,980	64,872 116,980	0.39	405	7.42%
Property In			13.30%	731	0.71	-		0.71	731	13.37%
Property Ta		2.727382	0.00%	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00%
	or Replaceme		4.55%	250	0.24	40,000	40,000	0.24	250	4.57%
	ompliance Fe	es	0.73%	40	0.04	6,400	6,400	0.04	40	0.73%
Other: Sup			1.75%	96	0.09	15,360	15,360	0.09	96	1.76%
TOTAL EX		•	72.49%	\$3,986	\$3.86	\$637,713	\$584,377	\$3.54	\$3,652	66.81%
			27.51%	\$1,512	\$1.47	\$241,968	\$290,363	\$1.76	\$1,815	33.19%
DEBT SEF				<b>A</b> ( <b>A</b> ( <b>A</b>	<b>6</b> / 66	¢014.440	¢014.440			
Red Capital			24.38%	\$1,340	\$1.30	\$214,449	\$214,449	\$1.30	\$1,340	24.52%
Hope VI			0.00%	\$0	\$0.00	0		\$0.00	\$0	0.00%
Additional Fi	Ũ		0.00%	\$0 \$172	\$0.00	0 \$27,519	\$75,914	\$0.00	\$0 \$474	0.00%
			3.13%	φ17Z	\$0.17	1	. ,	\$0.46	<b>\$</b> 474	0.00%
	TE DEBT CC NDED DEBT					1.13 1.15	1.35			
						1.15				
	ription	Factor	% of TOTAL	PER UNIT	PER SQ FT	TDHCA	APPLICANT	PER SQ FT	PER UNIT	% of TOTAL
	n Cost (site o	r bldg)	0.00%	\$1	\$0.00	\$100	\$167,869	\$1.02	\$1,049	0.87%
Off-Sites			0.00%	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00%
<b>•</b> ••									12,114	10 0001
Sitework			10.52%	12,114	11.74	1,938,221	1,938,221	11.74		10.08%
Direct Con		_	48.30%	55,625	53.90	8,899,972	9,257,260	56.06	57,858	48.14%
Direct Con Contingen	су	5.00%	48.30% 2.94%	55,625 3,387	53.90 3.28	8,899,972 541,910	9,257,260 559,774	56.06 3.39	57,858 3,499	48.14% 2.91%
Direct Con Contingent Contractor	cy 's Fees	5.00% 14.00%	48.30% 2.94% 8.23%	55,625 3,387 9,483	53.90 3.28 9.19	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955	56.06 3.39 9.43	57,858 3,499 9,737	48.14% 2.91% 8.10%
Direct Con Contingend Contractor Indirect Co	cy 's Fees onstruction		48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61%
Direct Con Contingend Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs	14.00%	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683	56.06 3.39 9.43	57,858 3,499 9,737	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 1.79%
Direct Con Contingend Contractor Indirect Co	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs		48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61%
Direct Con Contingend Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees	14.00%	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 1.79%
Direct Con Contingent Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C Developer <sup>4</sup> Interim Fin Reserves	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees lancing	14.00%	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87% 12.23%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148 14,089	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08 13.65	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683 2,254,169 667,342 801,385	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683 2,456,118 667,342 818,360	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08 14.87	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148 15,351	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 1.79% 12.77%
Direct Con Contingent Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C Developer' Interim Fin Reserves TOTAL CC	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees hancing DST	14.00%	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87% 12.23% 3.62%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148 14,089 4,171 5,009 \$115,170	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08 13.65 4.04	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683 2,254,169 667,342 801,385 \$18,427,129	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683 2,456,118 667,342 818,360 \$19,229,582	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08 14.87 4.04 4.96 \$116.45	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148 15,351 4,171	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 1.79% 12.77% 3.47%
Direct Con Contingent Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C Developer' Interim Fin Reserves TOTAL CC	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees lancing	14.00%	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87% 12.23% 3.62% 4.35%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148 14,089 4,171 5,009	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08 13.65 4.04 4.85	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683 2,254,169 667,342 801,385	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683 2,456,118 667,342 818,360	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08 14.87 4.04 4.96	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148 15,351 4,171 5,115	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 1.79% 12.77% 3.47% 4.26%
Direct Con Contingence Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C Developer' Interim Fin Reserves TOTAL CC Constructor	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees hancing DST	14.00% 15.00% <b>ap</b>	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87% 12.23% 3.62% 4.35% 100.00%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148 14,089 4,171 5,009 \$115,170	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08 13.65 4.04 4.85 \$111.59	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683 2,254,169 667,342 801,385 \$18,427,129	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683 2,456,118 667,342 818,360 \$19,229,582	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08 14.87 4.04 4.96 \$116.45	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148 15,351 4,171 5,115 \$120,185	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 1.79% 12.77% 3.47% 4.26% 100.00%
Direct Con Contingence Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C Developer' Interim Fin Reserves TOTAL CC Constructor	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees ancing OST OST <b>Cost Rec</b> <b>S OF FUND</b>	14.00% 15.00% <b>ap</b>	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87% 12.23% 3.62% 4.35% 100.00%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148 14,089 4,171 5,009 \$115,170	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08 13.65 4.04 4.85 \$111.59	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683 2,254,169 667,342 801,385 \$18,427,129	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683 2,456,118 667,342 818,360 \$19,229,582	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08 14.87 4.04 4.96 \$116.45 \$80.62	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148 15,351 4,171 5,115 \$120,185 \$83,208	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 1.79% 12.77% 3.47% 4.26% 100.00%
Direct Con Contingene Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C Developer' Interim Fin Reserves TOTAL CC Construction SOURCES	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees ancing OST OST <b>Cost Rec</b> <b>S OF FUND</b>	14.00% 15.00% <b>ap</b>	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87% 12.23% 3.62% 4.35% 100.00% 69.99%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148 14,089 4,171 5,009 \$115,170 \$80,609	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08 13.65 4.04 4.85 \$111.59 \$78.10	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683 2,254,169 667,342 801,385 \$18,427,129 \$12,897,450	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683 2,456,118 667,342 818,360 \$19,229,582 \$13,313,210	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08 14.87 4.04 4.96 \$116.45 \$80.62 <u>RECOMMENDED</u>	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148 15,351 4,171 5,115 \$120,185 \$83,208 Developer F	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 1.79% 12.77% 3.47% 4.26% 100.00% 69.23%
Direct Con Contingend Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C Developer' Interim Fin Reserves TOTAL CC Constructio SOURCES Red Capital Hope VI	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees ancing OST OST <b>Cost Rec</b> <b>S OF FUND</b>	14.00% 15.00% <b>ap</b> <u><b>S</b></u>	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87% 12.23% 3.62% 4.35% 100.00% 69.99% 17.08%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148 14,089 4,171 5,009 \$115,170 \$80,609 \$19,671	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08 13.65 4.04 4.85 \$111.59 \$78.10 \$19.06	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683 2,254,169 667,342 801,385 \$18,427,129 \$12,897,450 \$3,147,427	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683 2,456,118 667,342 818,360 \$19,229,582 \$13,313,210 \$3,147,427	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08 14.87 4.04 4.96 \$116.45 \$80.62 <u>Recommended</u> \$3,088,000	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148 15,351 4,171 5,115 \$120,185 \$83,208 Developer F \$2,31	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 1.79% 12.77% 3.47% 4.26% 100.00% 69.23%
Direct Con Contingene Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C Developer' Interim Fin Reserves TOTAL CC Construction SOURCES Red Capital Hope VI HTC Syndic	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees hancing OST on Cost Rec S OF FUND	14.00% 15.00% <b>ap</b> <u><b>S</b></u> ds	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87% 12.23% 3.62% 4.35% 100.00% 69.99% 17.08% 44.44%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148 14,089 4,171 5,009 \$115,170 \$80,609 \$19,671 \$51,184	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08 13.65 4.04 4.85 \$111.59 \$78.10 \$19.06 \$49.59	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683 2,254,169 667,342 801,385 \$18,427,129 \$12,897,450 \$3,147,427 8,189,495	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683 2,456,118 667,342 818,360 \$19,229,582 \$13,313,210 \$3,147,427 8,189,495	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08 14.87 4.04 4.96 \$116.45 \$80.62 <u>RECOMMENDED</u> \$3,088,000 8,189,495	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148 15,351 4,171 5,115 \$120,185 \$83,208 Developer F \$2,31 % of Dev. F	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 12.77% 3.47% 4.26% 100.00% 69.23%
Direct Con Contingend Contractor Indirect Co Ineligible C Developer' Interim Fin Reserves TOTAL CC Construction SOURCES Red Capital Hope VI HTC Syndic Deferred De	cy 's Fees onstruction Costs 's Fees hancing OST on Cost Rec S OF FUND	14.00% 15.00% <b>ap</b> <u><b>S</b></u> ds	48.30% 2.94% 8.23% 7.94% 1.87% 12.23% 3.62% 4.35% 100.00% 69.99% 17.08% 44.44% 41.76%	55,625 3,387 9,483 9,144 2,148 14,089 4,171 5,009 \$115,170 \$80,609 \$19,671 \$51,184 \$48,099	53.90 3.28 9.19 8.86 2.08 13.65 4.04 4.85 \$111.59 \$78.10 \$19.06 \$49.59 \$46.61	8,899,972 541,910 1,517,347 1,463,000 343,683 2,254,169 667,342 801,385 \$18,427,129 \$12,897,450 \$3,147,427 8,189,495 7,695,892	9,257,260 559,774 1,557,955 1,463,000 343,683 2,456,118 667,342 818,360 \$19,229,582 \$13,313,210 \$3,147,427 8,189,495 7,695,892	56.06 3.39 9.43 8.86 2.08 14.87 4.04 4.96 \$116.45 \$80.62 <u>RECOMMENDED</u> \$3,088,000 8,189,495 7,695,892	57,858 3,499 9,737 9,144 2,148 15,351 4,171 5,115 \$120,185 \$83,208 Developer F \$2,31 % of Dev. F	48.14% 2.91% 8.10% 7.61% 12.77% 3.47% 4.26% 100.00% 69.23% Fee Available 6,533 Fee Deferred

### MULTIFAMILY COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS (continued)

Regent I, Beaumont, 4% HTC #07416

#### DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

Marshall & Swift Residential Cost Handbook

Average Quality Townhouse Residence Basis						
CATEGORY	FACTOR	UNITS/SQ FT	PER SF	AMOUNT		
Base Cost			\$59.43	\$9,813,074		
Adjustments						
Exterior Wall Finish	5.75%		\$3.42	\$564,252		
Elderly			0.00	0		
9-Ft. Ceilings			0.00	0		
Roofing			0.00	0		
Subfloor			(0.93)	(152,745)		
Floor Cover			3.08	508,600		
Breezeways/Balconies	\$21.67	9,654	1.27	209,202		
Plumbing Fixtures	\$965	10	0.06	9,650		
Rough-ins	\$425	160	0.41	68,000		
Built-In Appliances	\$2,425	160	2.35	388,000		
Stairs	\$2,100	95	1.21	199,500		
Enclosed Corridors	\$48.04		0.00	0		
Heating/Cooling			1.90	313,747		
High Wind Adjustment	\$0.94		0.94	155,222		
Comm &/or Aux Bldgs	\$67.85	2,888	1.19	195,958		
Other: fire sprinkler	\$1.95	165,130	1.95	322,004		
SUBTOTAL			76.27	12,594,464		
Current Cost Multiplier	0.98		(1.53)	(251,889)		
Local Multiplier	0.89		(8.39)	(1,385,391)		
TOTAL DIRECT CONSTRU	CTION COST	rs	\$66.35	\$10,957,183		
Plans, specs, survy, bld prm	3.90%		(\$2.59)	(\$427,330)		
Interim Construction Interes	3.38%		(2.24)	(369,805)		
Contractor's OH & Profit	11.50%		(7.63)	(1,260,076)		
NET DIRECT CONSTRUCT	ION COSTS		\$53.90	\$8,899,972		

#### **PAYMENT COMPUTATION**

Primary	\$3,147,427	Amort	360
Int Rate	5.50%	DCR	1.13
Secondary	\$8,189,495	Amort	0
Int Rate		Subtotal DCR	1.13
Additional		Amort	
Int Rate		Aggregate DCR	1.13

#### RECOMMENDED FINANCING STRUCTURE:

Primary Debt Serv	ice	\$210,400	
Secondary Debt S	ervice	0	
Additional Debt Se	rvice	0	
NET CASH FLO	W	\$31,568	
Primary	\$3,088,000	Amort	360
Int Rate	5.50%	DCR	1.15
-			
Secondary	\$8,189,495	Amort	0
Int Rate	0.00%	Subtotal DCR	1.15
Additional	\$0	Amort	0
Int Rate	0.00%	Aggregate DCR	1.15

#### OPERATING INCOME & EXPENSE PROFORMA: RECOMMENDED FINANCING STRUCTURE

INCOME at	3.00%	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 10	YEAR 15	YEAR 20	YEAR 30
POTENTIAL GRO	SS RENT	\$922,836	\$950,521	\$979,037	\$1,008,408	\$1,038,660	\$1,204,092	\$1,395,872	\$1,618,199	\$2,174,723
Secondary Incom	ne	16,200	16,686	17,187	17,702	18,233	21,137	24,504	28,407	38,176
Operating support	for PH Units	11,971	14,696	18,164	21,564	25,180	46,910	75,939	114,263	310,968
POTENTIAL GRO	SS INCOME	951,007	981,903	1,014,387	1,047,674	1,082,073	1,272,139	1,496,315	1,760,868	2,523,868
Vacancy & Collec	ction Loss	(71,325)	(73,643)	(76,079)	(78,576)	(81,155)	(95,410)	(112,224)	(132,065)	(189,290)
Employee or Oth	er Non-Rental	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EFFECTIVE GRO	SS INCOME	\$879,681	\$908,260	\$938,308	\$969,098	\$1,000,918	\$1,176,729	\$1,384,092	\$1,628,803	\$2,334,578
EXPENSES at	4.00%									
General & Admin	istrative	\$64,839	\$67,432	\$70,129	\$72,935	\$75,852	\$92,285	\$112,279	\$136,605	\$202,209
Management		34,352	35,468	36,641	37,844	39,086	45,952	54,049	63,605	91,166
Payroll & Payroll	Тах	162,749	169,259	176,030	183,071	190,394	231,643	281,829	342,888	507,558
Repairs & Mainte	enance	79,846	83,040	86,362	89,816	93,409	113,646	138,268	168,225	249,013
Utilities		50,807	52,840	54,953	57,151	59,437	72,315	87,982	107,043	158,450
Water, Sewer & T	Trash	66,380	69,035	71,796	74,668	77,655	94,479	114,949	139,852	207,016
Insurance		116,980	121,659	126,526	131,587	136,850	166,499	202,572	246,459	364,820
Property Tax		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reserve for Repla	acements	40,000	41,600	43,264	44,995	46,794	56,932	69,267	84,274	124,746
Other	_	21,760	22,630	23,536	24,477	25,456	30,971	37,681	45,845	67,862
TOTAL EXPENSE	s	\$637,713	\$662,964	\$689,237	\$716,543	\$744,934	\$904,723	\$1,098,876	\$1,334,797	\$1,972,840
NET OPERATING	INCOME	\$241,968	\$245,297	\$249,071	\$252,555	\$255,984	\$272,005	\$285,215	\$294,006	\$361,738
DEBT SEF	RVICE									
First Lien Financin	g	\$210,400	\$210,400	\$210,400	\$210,400	\$210,400	\$210,400	\$210,400	\$210,400	\$210,400
Second Lien		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Financing	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NET CASH FLOW		\$31,568	\$34,897	\$38,671	\$42,155	\$45,584	\$61,606	\$74,816	\$83,606	\$151,338
DEBT COVERAGE	E RATIO	1.15	1.17	1.18	1.20	1.22	1.29	1.36	1.40	1.72

### HTC ALLOCATION ANALYSIS -Regent I, Beaumont, 4% HTC #07416

	APPLICANT'S	TDHCA	APPLICANT'S	TDHCA
	TOTAL	TOTAL	REHAB/NEW	<b>REHAB/NEW</b>
CATEGORY	AMOUNTS	AMOUNTS	ELIGIBLE BASIS	ELIGIBLE BASIS
Acquisition Cost				
Purchase of land	\$167,869	\$100		
Purchase of buildings				
Off-Site Improvements				
Sitework	\$1,938,221	\$1,938,221	\$1,938,221	\$1,938,221
Construction Hard Costs	\$9,257,260	\$8,899,972	\$9,257,260	\$8,899,972
Contractor Fees	\$1,557,955	\$1,517,347	\$1,557,955	\$1,517,347
Contingencies	\$559,774	\$541,910	\$559,774	\$541,910
Eligible Indirect Fees	\$1,463,000	\$1,463,000	\$1,463,000	\$1,463,000
Eligible Financing Fees	\$667,342	\$667,342	\$667,342	\$667,342
All Ineligible Costs	\$343,683	\$343,683		
Developer Fees			\$2,316,533	
Developer Fees	\$2,456,118	\$2,254,169		\$2,254,169
Development Reserves	\$818,360	\$801,385		
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS	\$19,229,582	\$18,427,129	\$17,760,085	\$17,281,961

Deduct from Basis:			
All grant proceeds used to finance costs in eligible basis			
B.M.R. loans used to finance cost in eligible basis			
Non-qualified non-recourse financing			
Non-qualified portion of higher quality units [42(d)(3)]			
Historic Credits (on residential portion only)			
TOTAL ELIGIBLE BASIS		\$17,760,085	\$17,281,961
High Cost Area Adjustment		130%	130%
TOTAL ADJUSTED BASIS		\$23,088,110	\$22,466,549
Applicable Fraction		100%	100.00%
TOTAL QUALIFIED BASIS		\$23,088,110	\$22,466,549
Applicable Percentage		3.64%	3.64%
TOTAL AMOUNT OF TAX CREDITS		\$840,407	\$817,782
Syndication Proceeds	0.9499	\$7,983,069	\$7,768,155

Total Tax Credits (Eligible Basis Method) Syndication Proceeds	\$840,407 \$7,983,069	\$817,782 \$7,768,155
, 	.,,,	<i><b>\$</b>7,700,133</i>
Requested Tax Credits Syndication Proceeds	\$810,175 \$7,695,892	
Gap of Syndication Proceeds Needed	\$7,784,318	
Total Tax Credits (Gap Method)	\$819,484	



	<b>Applicant Evaluation</b>	
Project ID # 07416 Name	e: Regent I Beaumont	City: Beaumont
LIHTC 9% 🗋 🛛 LIHTC 4% 🗹	HOME 🗍 BOND 🗌 HTF 🗌	SECO ESGP Other
□ No Previous Participation in Texas		nent team have been disbarred by HUD
National Previous Participation C	Certification Received: V/A	□ Yes □ No
Noncompliance Reported on Nat	ional Previous Participation Certification:	□ Yes □ No
	Portfolio Management and Compliance	
Total # of Projects monitored:       12         Projects       zero to nine:         grouped       ten to nineteen:         by score       twenty to twenty-nine:	Projects in Material Noncompliance         Yes       No       Image: Colspan="2">Image: Colspan="2"         Yes       No       Image: Colspan="2"       Image: Colspan="2">Image: Colspan="2"         # monitored with a score less than thirty:       12         # not yet monitored or pending review:       4	# in noncompliance:       0         Projects not reported       Yes         in application       No         # of projects not reported       0
Portfolio Monitoring	Single Audit	Portfolio Analysis
Not applicable       Image: Constraint of the second	Not applicable       ✓         Review pending       □         No unresolved issues       □         Issues found regarding late cert       □         Issues found regarding late audit       □         Unresolved issues found that       □         warrant disqualification       □	Not applicableImage: Constraint of the sector o
Reviewed by Karen Curtice	(Comments attached)	Date6/8/2007
Multifamily Finance Production	номе	Real Estate Analysis (Workout)
Not applicable       Image: Constraint of the system         Review pending       Image: Constraint of the system         No unresolved issues       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found that       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found that       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found that       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found <td>Not applicable       Image: Constraint of the system         Review pending       Image: Constraint of the system         No unresolved issues       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found that warrant disqualification (Comments attached)       Image: Constraint of the system         Reviewer       Sandy M. Garcia</td> <td>Not applicable       □         Review pending       □         No unresolved issues       ✓         Unresolved issues found       □         Reviewer       D. Burrell</td>	Not applicable       Image: Constraint of the system         Review pending       Image: Constraint of the system         No unresolved issues       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found       Image: Constraint of the system         Unresolved issues found that warrant disqualification (Comments attached)       Image: Constraint of the system         Reviewer       Sandy M. Garcia	Not applicable       □         Review pending       □         No unresolved issues       ✓         Unresolved issues found       □         Reviewer       D. Burrell
Date 6 /8 /2007	Date 6/8/2007	Date 6 /8 /2007
Community Affairs	Office of Colonia Initiatives	Financial Administration
No relationshipImage: Comparison of the second second second second second second second that warrant disqualification (Comments attached)ReviewerEEF	Not applicableImage: Constraint of the second s	No delinquencies found Delinquencies found Reviewer Melissa M. Whitehead
Date 6 /11/2007	Date 6 /8 /2007	Date 6 /9 /2007

### None at this time

# 03011

### **Elder Street Lofts**

### MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION BOARD ACTION REQUEST June 28, 2007

### Action Item

Presentation, Discussion and Possible Action for a 2003 Housing Tax Credit ("HTC") Amendment Appeal.

### **Requested Action**

Approve, Deny or Approve with Amendments a determination on the appeal.

### **Background and Recommendations**

### HTC #03011, Elder Street Lofts (formerly Jefferson Davis Artist Lofts)

On April 4, 2007 the owner requested approval of amendments to the original application. The owner proposed laundry hook-ups in each unit but did not provide the hook-ups as proposed. To compensate, the owner installed a computer line/phone jack in all bedrooms and mini-blinds or window coverings for all windows. The substitution was greater in point value than the original proposal and a community laundry room was constructed to satisfy the laundry needs of the property. Garbage disposers were also proposed but not installed. Although disposers were not a threshold item in 2003, the owner requested that microwave ovens in each unit, sound isolation in each bedroom and green space on the built-up section of the roof that were all included in the development in excess of the amenities originally proposed, be accepted as substitutes for the disposers that were proposed but not installed.

On June 1, 2007 the amendments were approved administratively however the owner has requested a waiver of the penalty points associated with the amendments. The owner's request to have the penalties waived is the action for the Board's consideration.

§49.9(c) of the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules, entitled, "Adherence to Obligations," states in part:

Effective December 1, 2006, if a Development Owner does not produce the Development as represented in the Application and in any amendments approved by the Department subsequent to the Application, or does not provide the necessary evidence for any points received by the required deadline:

(1) the Development Owner must provide a plan to the Department, for approval and subsequent implementation, that incorporates additional amenities to compensate for the non-conforming components; and

(2) the Board will opt either to terminate the Application and rescind the Commitment Notice, Determination Notice or Carryover Allocation Agreement as applicable or the Department must:

(A) reduce the score for Applications for tax credits that are submitted by an Applicant or Affiliate related to the Development Owner of the non-conforming

Development by ten points for the two Application Rounds concurrent to, or following, the date that the non-conforming aspect, or lack of financing, was identified by the Department; and

(B) prohibit eligibility to apply for tax credits for a Tax-Exempt Bond Development that are submitted by an Applicant or Affiliate related to the Development Owner of the non-conforming Development for 12 months from the date that the non-conforming aspect, or lack of financing, was identified by the Department.

Owner:	Jefferson Davis Artist Loft, LP
General Partner:	Jeff Davis, LLC
Developers:	Avenue Community Development Corporation; Artspace Projects,
	Inc. (Developer and sole member of GP)
Principals/Interested Parties	: Same as above – nonprofit organizations
Syndicator:	Apollo Housing Capital, L.L.C.
Interim/Mortgage Lenders:	Southwest Bank of Texas, N.A.
	City of Houston
	Avenue Community Development Corporation
	Artspace Projects, Inc.
City/County:	Houston/Harris
Set-Aside:	General
Type of Area:	Urban
Type of Development:	Rehabilitation
Population Served:	General Population
Units:	27 HTC units and 7 market rate units
2003 Allocation:	\$280,733
Allocation per HTC Unit:	\$10,398
Prior Board Actions:	7/03 – Approved award of tax credits
Underwriting Reevaluation:	
Staff Recommendation:	Staff recommends denying the waiver of the penalty points.
Penalty Assessment:	Ten points will be deducted from the scores of any nine percent
	applications submitted by affiliates of the applicant in the two
	application rounds that are concurrent with or immediately
	succeeding (i.e., the 2007-2008 rounds) the date that a
	nonconforming use was identified by the Department. No four
	percent applications will be accepted from any affiliate until
	twelve months after the date that the nonconforming uses were
	identified by the Department (such date to be determined).

# 03011

# Appeal Documentation

### LOCKE LIDDELL & SAPP LLP

**ATTORNEYS & COUNSELORS** 

100 Congress Suite 300 Austin, TX 78701-4042

AUSTIN • DALLAS • HOUSTON • NEW ORLEANS • WASHINGTON, D.C.

(512) 305-4700 (512) 305-4800 www.lockeliddell.com

Direct Number: (512) 305-4707 email: cbast@lockeliddell.com

June 15 2007

Mr. Michael Gerber Executive Director Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs 221 West 11<sup>th</sup> Street Austin, Texas 78701 JUN 18 2007

Re: Elder Street Lofts/Houston (the "**Project**") TDHCA No. 003011

Dear Mr. Gerber:

We have been engaged to represent the owner of the above-referenced Project. The Owner submitted an amendment request, seeking TDHCA approval for the omission of certain amenities in the Project and the inclusion and substitution of other amenities. The amendment was approved administratively by TDHCA staff in a letter dated June 1, 2007. That letter indicated that the penalties of Section 49.9(c) of the 2007 QAP would apply to this circumstance. This letter serves as an appeal of the imposition of penalties on the owner and its affiliates, Artspace Projects, Inc. ("Artspace") and Avenue Community Development Corporation ("Avenue CDC").

### **Background Information**

Elder Street Lofts is an adaptive reuse of the historic Jefferson Davis Hospital in Houston. The project was co-developed by affiliates of Artspace and Avenue CDC. As the 51% owner of the general partner, Artspace controlled the development process and made all day-to-day decisions related to the Project.

Shortly after closing of the financing for the Project, the staff member of Artspace who worked on the tax credit application left the organization and his tasks were assumed by another Artspace employee as project coordinator. The project coordinator had significant experience with tax credit and historic properties, but no prior experience in Texas. Consequently, as rehabilitation of this adaptive reuse project proceeded, decisions were made by Artspace without knowledge of the implications under the Texas rules.

The decisions made include the omission of certain amenities and the inclusion and substitution of other amenities in the Project. The owner believes these changes benefit the Project overall and result in a more livable community for the residents. The omissions and substitutions do not impact the Project's satisfaction of tax credit threshold or selection criteria. Appeal Letter Page 2

 $\cdot \mathbf{r}$ 

As you know, the process by which TDHCA considers and approves amendment requests has evolved over time. The TDHCA Process and Requirements for Obtaining Approval of Application Amendments provides in relevant part as follows:

In general, if a request is not deemed to be a "material alteration" as indicated by government code, the Executive Director will approve or deny the amendment request. For material alterations, the Board must vote on whether to approve the amendment.

Section 49.17(d)(4) of the 2007 QAP defines the term "material alteration" as follows:

(4) Material alteration of a Development includes, but is not limited to:

(A) a significant modification of the site plan;

(B) a modification of the number of units or bedroom mix of units;

(C) a substantive modification of the scope of tenant services;

(D) a reduction of three percent or more in the square footage of the units or common areas;

(E) a significant modification of the architectural design of the Development;

(F) a modification of the residential density of the Development of at least five percent;

(G) an increase or decrease in the site acreage of greater than 10% from the original site under control and proposed in the Application; and

(H) any other modification considered significant by the Board. (emphasis added).

Effective December 1, 2006, the stakes regarding amendment requests were raised. Section 49.9(c) of the 2007 QAP indicates that penalties can be applied in connection with certain changes to tax credit projects. As TDHCA staff began to administer these penalties, it became apparent that there were differences in interpretation among TDHCA staff and the ownership community as to how the penalties would be applied. Discussions were held, at the Board's request, and TDHCA General Counsel published an interpretive memo, which was ratified by the TDHCA Board on March 20, 2007.

That interpretive memo states in relevant part as follows:

"Amendments that do not require Board approval or amendments that are approved by the Board are <u>not</u> subject to penalty points." (emphasis added)

and

"For amendments that are not currently considered by the Board and therefore not considered material by the Board, the penalty points would also <u>not</u> apply." (emphasis added).

Appeal Letter Page 3

Moreover, when the interpretive memo was presented to the Board, staff stated:

For amendments that are not currently considered by the Board, and therefore not considered material by the Board, the penalty points would also not apply.

Because the amendment request for the Project was approved by you without being submitted to the Board for consideration, it must be assumed that the approved amendment did not constitute a "material alteration" pursuant to Section 49.17(d) of the QAP. Accordingly, the application of penalty points pursuant to Section 49.9(c) of the 2007 QAP to the Project's approved amendment request seems to be directly opposed to the General Counsel's statement in his interpretive memo.

### **Conclusion and Request**

We hereby request that the penalties of Section 49.9(c) of the 2007 QAP be deemed to <u>not</u> apply to the owner and its affiliates, Artspace and Avenue.

- Because the amendment request was not submitted to the Board but was approved by staff, it is deemed to be non-material.
- General Counsel's interpretive memo indicates that these penalties do not apply to non-material amendments approved by the staff and not submitted to the Board.
- The omission and substitution of amenities do not impact threshold or selection criteria for this Project.
- The amenities omitted and substituted have resulted in a better overall home and community for the residents.

Finally, if this appeal is denied and a determination is made to apply the penalties, we respectfully request that the penalties be applied to Artspace but not to Avenue CDC. All of these decisions were made by Artspace, and Avenue CDC, as a minority participant, had no control over them.

If the Executive Director denies this appeal, the applicant requests to have it heard by the Board at the next available Board meeting. Feel free to contact us if additional information would be helpful to your decision. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cynthia XBast

Cynthia L. Bast

4 ' ' '

Appeal Letter Page 4

cc: Robbye Meyer Audrey Martin *TDHCA* 

> Mary Lawler Avenue CDC

Will Law *Artspace* 

Erin Jones Winthrop & Weinstine

3272715v2

# 03011

# **Executive Director Amendment Approval**



### **TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS**

www.tdhca.state.tx.us

Rick Perry Governor

Michael Gerber Executive Director

June 1, 2007

BOARD MEMBERS Elizabeth Anderson, *Chair* Shadrick Bogany C. Kent Conine Sonny Flores Gloria Ray Norberto Salinas

Ms. Erin Jones Attorney-at-Law Winthrop & Weinstine, P.A. 225 South Sixth Street, Suite 3500 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-4629

Re: Elder Street Lofts (the Development), Houston Housing Tax Credit Development No. 03011

Dear Ms. Jones:

The Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs is in receipt of your letter dated April 4, 2007. Your letter discussed several changes that were made in building the development in comparison to the original proposal described in the application. The changes and associated issues are discussed individually below.

One change discussed was that laundry hook-ups in each unit were not provided as proposed. A community laundry room was constructed to satisfy a selection made in Threshold to provide either a community laundry room or hook-ups in each unit. However, laundry "hook-ups" were specifically represented in the scoring section of the application and two points were awarded for that representation. Because no points were offered for the community laundry room that was built, the application would have scored two points less, in retrospect. To compensate, you installed a computer line/phone jack in all bedrooms (worth 2 points) and mini-blinds or window coverings for all windows (worth 2 points). The points associated with the compensating features are adequate to offset the points for the hook-ups that were not installed. Although your counsel's letter discusses twenty-five year architectural shingle roofing as a compensating feature, a significant part of the roof was not covered with these shingles and points would not have been awarded for this item.

Garbage disposals were also proposed but not installed in the development. This feature was represented in the Specifications and Amenities exhibit of the application but was not a Threshold item. Your counsel's letter requests that the microwave ovens in each unit, sound isolation in each bedroom and green space on the built-up section of the roof that were all included in the development in excess of the amenities originally proposed, be accepted as substitutes for the disposers that were proposed but not installed.

#### Printed on recycled paper

Your request is granted. This letter will be forwarded to our Portfolio Management and Compliance Division and to the Real Estate Analysis Division. Please include this letter with the submission of your cost certification.

In conjunction with this approval, a penalty will be applied to any affiliate of the applicant of the subject development as specified in \$49.9(c)(2). Pursuant to Title 10 \$1.8 of the Texas Administrative Code, an appeal to waive this assessment of the penalty may be presented to the Board. If you intend to file an appeal, please complete the enclosed form and return it to the Department by facsimile at (512) 475-0764. This form and your appeal must be received by the Department no later than 12:00pm on June 6, 2007, for your appeal to be included on the June 14, 2007 Board meeting.

Thank you for your letter.

Sincerely, Michael Gerber

Executive Director

MFP/bs

Cc: Patricia Murphy, Manager of Compliance Raquel Morales, Senior Cost Certification Specialist

# 03011

### **Amendment Request**



ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

April 4, 2007

Erin D. Jones (612) 604-6730 ejones@winthrop.com

### VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL & FEDERAL EXPRESS

Mr. Ben Sheppard Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs 221 East 11th Street Austin, Texas 78701

Re: Elder Street Lofts (f/k/a Jefferson Davis Artist Lofts) (the "Development") TDHCA No.: 03011

Dear Mr. Sheppard:

We represent Jefferson Davis Artist Lofts Limited Partnership (the "Owner") with respect to the above-referenced Development. This letter is being submitted to request approval of certain proposed amendments to the Development's Uniform Housing Programs Application (the "Application") with respect to unit amenities and quality features to be provided at the Development. A check in the amount of \$2,500 has been provided to the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (the "Department") with respect to this request for amendment.

There are several places throughout the Application referencing the amenities to be available at the Development. Construction of the Development has been completed and there appear to be inconsistencies in the reporting of the Development amenities and the amenities that have been incorporated into the completed Development. Accordingly, the Owner is proposing to amend its Application to properly reflect the in-unit amenities and quality features offered by the completed Development.

### Laundry Amenities.

Exhibit 3, Activity Overview (the "Activity Overview"), specified that there would be a community laundry room on-site at the Development, but did not specify that laundry equipment or connections would be provided in the Development's units. Similarly, in the Development Certification Form - Tab 3A ("Tab 3A"), the Owner committed to provide a "community laundry room **and/or** laundry hook-ups in Units" (emphasis added), and the provision of only a community laundry room would satisfy this commitment. However, in the Provision of Unit Amenities – Tab 4C ("Tab 4C"), the Owner specified that laundry connections would be provided "in every Unit at no extra charge to the tenant." Consistent with the amenities listed at Tab 4C of the Application, in Section 4(C) of the Self-Scoring Form - Tab 1G (the "Self-Scoring Form") it appears that the Owner claimed points for in-unit laundry connections. The amenities committed to in Tab 4C, covered entries, laundry connections, and greater than 75% masonry on

the exterior of the Development, would correspond with the 10 points claimed by the Owner in Section 4(C) of the Self-Scoring Form.

While the Application did not consistently specify that laundry connections would be provided in each unit in the Development, it does appear that the Development's plans and specifications originally contemplated providing laundry connections in each of the units. The Development's plans also contemplated a community laundry room, as specified in the Application. The completed Development does include a community laundry room facility containing four (4) coin-operated washing machines and four (4) coin-operated dryers (the "Community Laundry Room"). The provision of this amenity is consistent with the Activity Overview and Tab 3A. However, the provision of a Community Laundry Room as a Development amenity, without also providing in-unit laundry connections, does not appear to correspond with the points claimed on the Self-Scoring Form.

The Owner acknowledges that a request for amendment to the Application should have been submitted prior to making a final determination to eliminate the in-unit laundry connections. Jeff Davis, LLC is the general partner of the Owner (the "General Partner"). A single-member limited liability company of which Artspace Projects, Inc., a Minnesota nonprofit corporation ("Artspace"), is the sole member, is a 51% member of the General Partner. As the 51% member of the General Partner, Artspace had primary responsibility for oversight of the design and planned rehabilitation of the Development. Shortly after the construction loan closing, Artspace experienced a staffing change. The individual who had been involved in the Application process and was familiar with the Self-Scoring Form left Artspace. Oversight of the design and rehabilitation of the Development was assumed by another individual at Artspace (the "New Project Coordinator"). The New Project Coordinator was not familiar with the procedures of the Department or the specific commitment in the Application to provide in-unit laundry connections. The New Project Coordinator, however, had been with Artspace for many years and was very familiar with Artspace's missions and the overall design of each of its affordable housing developments throughout the United States. Based on this familiarity, the New Project Coordinator made a determination to eliminate the in-unit laundry connections.

Artspace's stated missions include the fostering of low-income housing and the promotion of the arts. Artspace achieves these stated missions by creating and fostering a sense of community and association in each of its affordable housing developments. The inclusion of community space in its affordable housing developments is essential to creating this sense of community and association. The Community Laundry Room is a clean and spacious room that not only provides the Development's residents with a clean and safe environment in which to do laundry, but it also doubles as a community meeting room, both formally and informally, for the residents of the Development. Formally, the residents of the Development conduct planned meetings in the Community Laundry Room. Informally, the Community Laundry Room provides the residents with the opportunity to meet and socialize when it is used for its laundry functions.

The opportunity for informal and unplanned socialization offered by the Community Laundry Room may seem insignificant, but it is vital to achieving the intended sense of community and association. For this reason, Artspace has never provided in-unit laundry connections in its

developments. In reviewing the plans and specifications after the Construction Loan Closing, the New Project Coordinator immediately noticed the inclusion of in-unit laundry connections as being inconsistent with the intent in all of Artspace's developments to foster a sense of community. No conversations occurred in connection with the staffing change that would have alerted the New Project Coordinator to the commitment in the Self-Scoring Form or any other reason for including the in-unit connections. It was because of an unfamiliarity with the Department's processes that an amendment to the Application was not requested once this design inconsistency was discovered.

In addition to fostering a sense of community and association, the Community Laundry Room, rather than in-unit laundry connections, is more consistent with the overall design of the Development units. The Development contains loft-style units with open floor plans. The amount of space that would be consumed by in-unit laundry equipment to be hooked into provided laundry connections would not be consistent with the overall size, configuration, and design of the loft-style units in the Development.

Furthermore, based on its experience with other multifamily affordable housing developments, the Owner determined that the Community Laundry Room would provide more than sufficient on-site access to laundry facilities for the Development Residents. The property manager for the Development has confirmed that the Community Laundry Room has more than met the needs of the residents.

While the Owner did eliminate the in-unit laundry connections as an amenity, additional amenities and quality features were added to the Development during the rehabilitation process that were not committed to in Tab 4C. These additional amenities and quality features were more consistent with the intended mission and style of the Development and of more direct benefit to the Development and a greater number of its residents. As a result of these additional amenities and quality features, the Development remains qualified for the 10 points claimed in Section 4(C) of the Self-Scoring Form. Specifically, the Development contains the following unit amenities and quality features:

Unit Amenities and Quality Features	
Covered entries (previously committed to)	
Computer line/phone jack available in all bedrooms (not previously committed to)	
Mini blinds or window coverings for all windows (not previously committed to)	
Twenty-five year architectural shingle roofing <sup>1</sup> (not previously committed to)	
Greater than 75% masonry on exterior (previously committed to)	
TOTAL	14

Therefore, the Development includes enough unit amenities and quality features, including those not previously committed to, in order to qualify for 14 points (capped at a maximum of 10 points per the Self-Scoring Form), and the points claimed on the Self-Scoring Form in the Application remain unchanged.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The 25-year architectural shingle roofing has been incorporated into the Development on the pitched roof only. Please see additional discussions below regarding the roof materials.

Furthermore, additional upgrades were added to the Development that otherwise do not impact the Developments scoring for provision of unit amenities and quality features, but which do provide significant benefit to the residents of the Development and the Development overall. These upgrades included:

- Upgraded cabinets in kitchens
- Microwave provided in each unit
- Sound isolation in unit bedrooms providing sound isolation from adjoining unit and hallway noise
- Stems added to the track lighting in units making the track lighting easier to use, manipulate, and direct to the resident's specific needs
- Fourth floor flat roof upgraded to include approximately 840 square feet of "green roof" space<sup>2</sup>

The elimination of the in-unit laundry connections did not result in a adverse change for the residents of the Development. The Owner views the provision of in-unit laundry connections as inconsistent both with (i) the intent to foster a sense of community and association and (ii) the overall design of the loft-style units in the Development. The property manager for the Development has indicated that the Community Laundry Room provides more than sufficient on-site laundry access for the Development's residents. Furthermore, the additional unit amenities added to the Development provide more direct benefits for a greater number of the residents of the Development. The in-unit laundry connections would have been beneficial only to those residents who had their own equipment. In addition, the 25-year architectural shingle roofing on the pitched roof of the Development and the green roof space on the fourth floor flat roof provide a significant benefit to the overall Development by extending the life of the Development's roof, and are quality features that the Owner had not committed to previously.

### Roof Materials.

In the Activity Overview, the Owner committed to built-up rock for the Development's fourth floor flat roof and mission tile for the Development's pitched roof. Once construction began, and the extent of damage to the pitched roof was more fully discovered, the Owner made a determination to use 25-year architectural composition shingle for the pitched roof rather than mission tile. The use of the 25-year architectural composition shingle is of significant benefit to the overall Development by extending the life of the roof and is a quality feature not previously committed to by the Owner. The 25-year architectural composition shingling was approved by the Texas Historical Commission and did not have any impact on the Development's historic rehabilitation credits. Furthermore, as discussed above, the Development's fourth floor flat roof includes approximately 840 square feet of "green roof" space. As with the 25-year architectural composition shingle on the pitched roof, the addition of the green roof benefits the Development by significantly extending the life of the flat roof. Furthermore, the green roof space makes the flat roof, which is used by the residents of the Development, a more visually appealing space.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Please see additional discussions regarding roof.

The Owner acknowledges that a request for amendment to the Application should have been submitted prior to making the final determinations regarding the composition shingle and the green roof space. However, both of these modifications are upgrades of significant benefit to the Development and do not adversely impact the residents of the Development or the Development overall. The failure to submit the request for amendment before the upgrades were incorporated into the Development was due to the New Project Manager's unfamiliarity with the Department's amendment procedures.

### Garbage Disposals and Ceiling Fans.

In the Activity Overview, the Owner committed to provide garbage disposals in the unit kitchens and to provide ceiling fans. These amenities were eliminated from the Development. However, as discussed above, many other in-unit amenities and quality features were added that the Owner had not committed to previously. Again, these additional in-unit amenities and quality features include:

- Computer line/phone jack available in all bedrooms
- Mini blinds or window coverings for all windows
- Upgraded cabinets in kitchens
- Microwave provided in each unit
- Sound isolation in unit bedrooms providing sound isolation from adjoining unit and hallway noise
- Stems added to the track lighting in units making the track lighting easier to use, manipulate, and direct to the resident's specific needs
- Twenty-five year architectural shingle roofing on pitched roof
- Fourth floor flat roof upgraded to include approximately 840 square feet of "green roof" space

Because of all the additional amenities and quality features added to the Development, the elimination of the garbage disposals and ceiling fans did not have an overall adverse impact on the residents of the Development or the Development as a whole. As with the other amenity modifications being requested, the Owner inadvertently failed to seek the Department's approval for the elimination of the garbage disposals and ceiling fans because of the New Project Manager's unfamiliarity with the Department's formal amendment procedures.

Accordingly, the Owner proposes to amend its Application (i) to remove from the Application its commitment to provide in-unit laundry connections, mission tile, garbage disposals, and ceiling fans (as indicated on the Self-Scoring Form, Tab 4C, the Activity Overview, and elsewhere throughout the Application (if applicable)), and (ii) to include in the Application a commitment to provide the following unit amenities and/or quality features: (1) computer line/phone jack in each bedroom, (2) mini blinds or window coverings for all windows, (3) microwaves, (4) sound isolation in unit bedrooms, (5) twenty-five year architectural shingle roofing, and (6) green roof space. These requested amendments do not impact the scoring on the Application and the

residents of the Development and the Development as a whole are significantly benefited by these requested amendments.

If you have any questions or require additional information, or if you contemplate making a determination to deny the requested amendments to the Application, please contact Erin Jones (612-604-6730). If the requested amendments require Board approval, please include this request for consideration at the next Board meeting possible.

Sincerely,

WINTHROP & WEINSTINE, P.A.

un N. Jones

Erin D. Jones

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Will Law Mr. Dean Crowell Ms. Mary Lawler Cynthia L. Bast, Esq. Christine Richardson, Esq.

3141654v6 File No.: 4886.37



ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

April 17, 2007

Erin D. Jones (612) 604-6730 ejones@winthrop.com

### VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Mr. Ben Sheppard Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs 221 East 11th Street Austin, Texas 78701

Re: <u>Supplement to Request for Approval of Amendment to Application</u> Elder Street Lofts (f/k/a Jefferson Davis Artist Lofts) (the "Development") TDHCA No.: 03011

Dear Mr. Sheppard:

This letter is being provided as follow-up on behalf of Jefferson Davis Artist Lofts Limited Partnership (the "Owner") with respect to the request for approval of certain proposed amendments to the Uniform Housing Programs Application (the "Application") of the Development, which request for approval was submitted to the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (the "Department") on Thursday, April 5, 2007 (the "Request"). The Owner hereby amends the Request by providing that ceiling fans will be installed in the living room and each sleeping room of each unit in the Development to satisfy the threshold requirement set forth in Section 49.9(e)(4)(F)(v) of the Department's 2003 Qualified Allocation Plan.

Installing a ceiling fan in the living room and each sleeping room of each unit in the Development will require 85 ceiling fans. Attached to this letter are estimates obtained by the Owner for the cost of purchasing and installing the ceiling fans. The Development's architect will provide a written certification to appropriate Department staff once installation of the ceiling fans has been completed.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Attachments

cc: Mr. Will Law Mr. Dean Crowell Mr. John Gross

3188434v1 File No.: 4886.37

Suite 3500 | 225 South Sixth Street | Minneapolis, MN 55402-4629 | MAIN: (612)604-6400 | FAX: (612)604-6800 | www.winthrop.com | A Professional Association

07302 Casa Alton

### MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION BOARD ACTION REQUEST June 28, 2007

### Action Item

Presentation, Discussion and Possible Action for 2007 Competitive Housing Tax Credit ("HTC") Appeals.

### **Requested Action**

Approve, Deny or Approve with Amendments a determination on the appeal.

### **Background and Recommendations**

### <u>Casa Alton - 07302</u>

This Applicant is appealing the eligibility of the scoring determination for points awarded pursuant to \$49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules ("QAP"), Housing Needs Characteristics.

The points awarded under §49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 QAP were reduced because of the following:

Pursuant to §49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 QAP, "each Application may receive a score if correctly requested in the self score form based on objective measures of housing need in the Area where the Development is located." §49.3(11) of the 2007 QAP defines Area as "(A) The geographic area contained within the boundaries of: (i) An incorporated place or (ii) Census Designated Place (CDP) as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census."

The Department publishes a reference manual and a procedures manual each year to be used for the housing tax credit program for that year. All information is updated annually prior to the application program year. The manual includes a series of resource documents and data including information concerning the housing needs around the state. It specifically includes the "Housing Needs Score". The source data used for the housing need calculation is used consistently throughout many agency documents each year, including the Regional Allocation Formula and is applied consistently across agency programs.

The Applicant requested, and was awarded, six points under §49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 QAP based on the location of the Development in the Alton North CDP. In a challenge received by the Department on May 23, 2007, a party unrelated to the Application asserted that the Development is located in Alton, not North Alton, the Area for which the point request was made. Information provided in the challenge affirms that the proposed Development is in fact located in the City of Alton due to a city annexation. This was confirmed by the City's Planning Director and the Applicant. Although the Development site was located in the Alton North CDP according to the 2000 Decennial Census, the site has since been annexed into the City of Alton. The most current location of a proposed Development is used to determine the Area for which points may be awarded under \$49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 QAP. The proposed Development is located in Alton; therefore the Application score for this item was revised and four points (for Alton) were awarded instead of six (for Alton North) for Housing Needs Characteristics.

The Applicant's appeal is based on several assertions: because data from the 2000 Decennial Census is used to establish housing need, using the location of the Development as established using a more recent date is not a valid methodology; the source of Department information regarding many threshold and selection requirements of the 2007 QAP is the 2000 Decennial Census; the Department awarded points to an Application for a proposed Development on the same site based on the Development's location in the Alton North CDP; the QAP does not establish precedence for the two options that may be used to determine Area; the proposed Development is located in the Alton North CDP as established by the 2000 Decennial Census; and the information in the Department's Reference Manual for Alton does not apply to the Development site because the site was included in the Alton North CDP at the time of the 2000 Decennial Census.

The current location of a Development, not its location seven years ago (as of the most recent Decennial Census), is used to evaluate eligibility for points based on demographic information from the most recent Decennial Census. This methodology has been consistently applied to all Applications during the 2007 Application Round.

As to the assertion regarding decisions made in 2006, each year the Department must evaluate the information available in the Application based on Department rule. Even when the exact language of the rule and/or specific Application circumstances do not change, information in the Application may be different from information presented in previous Applications. While the Department's goal is to be as consistent as possible and provide signposts to interested parties, where there is a fundamental disagreement with previous interpretations based on new information presented to the Department, there is room for and an obligation to be sure that rules are adhered to.

The 2007 QAP explicitly states that an Application will be awarded points "based on objective measures of housing need in the Area where the Development is located." The QAP does not indicate that the location of the Development as of the most recent Decennial Census should be used. The proposed Development is located in Alton; therefore four points were awarded based on the Development's location in Alton, rather than six points based on the location within the Alton North CDP.

Relevant documentation related to this appeal is provided behind the Board Action Request.

Applicant:	Alton Housing Development, L.P.
Site Location:	NW Corner Trosper Rd. & Proposed Oxford St.
City / County:	Alton / Hidalgo County
Regional Allocation Category:	Rural
Set-Aside:	USDA
Population Served:	General
Region:	11
Type of Development:	New Construction
Units:	76
Credits Requested:	\$705,994
Staff Recommendation:	The Executive Director denied the original appeal. Staff is recommending that the Board also deny the appeal.

Page 3 of 3

### 07302 Appeal Documentation



1.18

### Rufino Contreras Affordable Housing Corporation, Inc.

908 E. 5th Street, Suite 201, Austin, TX 78702- Tel. (512) 474-5003 Fax- (512) 474-5010 a subsidiary corporation of the National Farm Workers Service Center, Inc.

June 19, 2007

Ms. Audrey Martin Multifamily Finance Division Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs PO Box 13941 Austin TX 78711

Re: Scoring Notice Appeal, HTC Application 07302, Casa Alton

Dear Ms Martin,

Please accept this letter as additional documentation for the appeal to the scoring notice previously sent for the above referenced project. In our previous letter (dated May 25 in response to a challenge to the application 07302), we pointed to several instances in the QAP and Reference Manual that used the 2000 Census as a source of information for determining area, place, and characteristics of those places. We have since discovered one more instance in which the 2000 census is referenced.

The 2007 AHNS Methodology (on the TDHCA website) states that "an adjusted number of households with cost burden is calculated based on the difference between the area's population *in the 2000 Census* and the most recent State Data Center population estimate."

It also states "the number of households assisted using TDHCA funding since the Census was taken (April 1, 2000) is subtracted from the adjusted number..." in order to determine the level of affordable housing need.

The AHNS methodology references the QAP definition of area as "a CDP as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent *Decennial Census*." This QAP definition was also mentioned in our previous letter.

Finally, the AHNS methodology notes that "the definition of 'population' *in state law*...is the population shown by the most recent federal *decennial census*."

Again we argue that the TDHCA, by referencing the 2000 Census and the Decennial Census as a source of information regarding HTC applications, implies that this is also a valid source for determining the place where a site is located. We therefore again request that the application 07302 be awarded 6 points for the 2007 Affordable Housing Needs Score.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean Coburn Project Manager

Attachment: 2007 AHNS Methodology



### ATTACHMENT A 2007 AHNS METHODOLOGY

#### Background

The AHNS scoring criterion is used to evaluate HOME, Housing Tax Credit (HTC), and Housing Trust Fund (HTF) applications. The formula is submitted annually for public comment. The final version is published in the SLIHP.

While not specifically legislated by the state, the AHNS helps address other need based funding allocation requirements by responding to:

- an IRS Section 42 requirement that the selection criteria used to award the HTC funding must include "housing needs characteristics."
- State Auditor's Office (SAO) and Sunset findings that called for the use of objective, need based criteria to award TDHCA's funding.



The AHNS is an extension of the TDHCA

Regional Allocation Formula (RAF) in that it provides a comparative assessment of each area's level of need relative to the other areas within its State Service Region. Through the AHNS, applicants are encouraged to request funding to serve communities that have a high level of need.

The HOME and HTF/HTC programs use slightly modified versions of the AHNS because the programs have different eligible activities, households, and geographical areas. Under §2306.111(c) of the Texas Government Code, at least 95 percent of HOMB funding is set aside for non-participating jurisdictions. Therefore, the HOME AHNS only uses need data for non-participating jurisdictions.

### Methodology

The following steps measure each area's level of affordable housing need.

1) The Census number of households at or below 80% AMFI with cost burden establishes baseline for each area's number of households in need of housing assistance. The type of household considered for this baseline varies by activity.

- Renter data is used for the rental development (RD), tenant based rental assistance (TBRA), and down payment assistance (DPA) scores.
- b) Owner data is used for the owner occupied rehabilitation (OCC) score.

2) For each activity, an adjusted number of households with cost burden is calculated based on the difference between the area's population in the 2000 Census and the most recent State Data Center population estimate.

3) The number of households assisted using TDHCA funding since the Census was taken (April 1, 2000) is subtracted from the adjusted number of households with cost burden. The resulting number shows the area's estimated remaining need.

a) For HTC and HTF scores, RD activity is used;

Q.HIRC/Regional Allocation Formula/2007 RAF/Final AHNS/07 Method AHNS - HOIVE Bd Falloso

- b) For HOME TBRA and RD scores, TBRA<sup>1</sup> and RD activity is used;
- c) For HOME DPA scores, First Time Homebuyer and HOME DPA activity is used; and
- d) For HOME OCC scores, HOME OCC activity is used.
- 4) The estimated remaining need measure is used to quantify the area's level of need for each scoring activity as measured by the ratio of the area's households in need to the area's total households. This ratio shows the concentration of need within an area.

5) A sliding scale that compares each area's level of need to the region's other areas is used to assign points to each area based on its relative concentration of need (maximum of 7 points).

### Rural and Exurban/Urban Need

Section 2306.111(d) of the Government Code requires the RAF to consider rural and urban/exurban areas in its distribution of funds. To assist with this distribution, each area is classified using the RAF's geographic area definitions.

The RAF uses the following definitions to categorize rural and urban/exurban areas.

- 1. Area The geographic area contained within the boundaries of:
  - a. an incorporated place, or
  - a Census Designated Place (CDP) as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decembral Census.
- 2. Rural An Area that is:
  - a. outside the boundaries of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA); or
  - b. within the boundaries of a MSA, if the Area has a population of 20,000<sup>2</sup> or less and does not share a boundary with an Area that has a population greater than 20,000.<sup>3</sup>
  - c. For the HTC AHNS, areas that are eligible for new construction or rehabilitation funding by TX-USDA-RHS are also considered rural.
- 3. Urban/Exurban Any Area that does not satisfy the Rural definition.
- 4. Rental development activities that occur outside an Area shall use the rural or urban/exurban designation of the closest Area.

For the HOME program, a county score is used for activities that will serve more than one Area within a county. If multiple counties or Areas in multiple counties will be served by an application, then the county scores will be averaged. Participating Jurisdictions (PJ) receive a score of zero.

Because of the limited duration of TBRA, a conversion factor was used to equate the value of a voucher to an affordable housing unit. This factor equaled the voucher duration divided by the number of years since the Census. For 2007, this is 2 years/7 years or an approximate reduction in the number of households in need by 29 percent for each TBRA voucher.

The definition of "population" in state law (Sec. 311.005(3), Government Code) is "the population shown by the most recent federal decennial census." Because of this requirement, the decennial census place population must be used to make the area type determination.

<sup>3</sup> Applicants may petition TDHCA to update the "Rural" designation of an incorporated area within a metropolitan statistical area by providing a latter from a local official. Such latter must clearly indicate that the area's incorporated boundary touches the boundary of another incorporated area with a population of over 20,000. To treat applicants equitably, such latter must be provided to TDHCA prior to the commencement of the pre-application submission period for HTC applications, or application submission period for HOME applications.
# Rufino Contreras Affordable Housing Corporation, Inc.

908 E. 5th Street, Suite 201, Austin, TX 78702- Tel. (512) 474-5003 Fax- (512) 474-5010 a subsidiary corporation of the National Farm Workers Service Center, Inc.

May 25, 2007

Ms. Audrey Martin Multifamily Finance Division Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs PO Box 13941 Austin, TX 78711

Re: Challenge to 2007 HTC Application 07302, Casa Alton

Dear Ms Martin,

Please accept this letter as a response to the challenge to the above referenced application. Casa Alton should be considered to be located in Alton North, not Alton, and receive the 6 points requested in the application for Affordable Housing Needs Score.

The challenge argues that the proposed site, on northwest corner of Trosper Road and proposed Oxford Street is in the City of Alton and not in Alton North according to the US Census's 2005 city and town information. We argue that this source of information is not valid in determining the place or area in which a site is located.

There is not a single instance of the TDHCA referring applicants to US Census 2005 data and there are at least four instances in the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules and at least three instances in the Reference Manual which refer to the most recent decennial census (i.e. the 2000 Census) as the source of data:

- §49.3 (11) (A) defines Area as the geographic area contained within the boundaries of...Census Designated Place (CDP) as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census. (Exhibit A)
- §49.6 (g) states that...the Board will not allocate housing tax credits for a...Development located in a census tract that has more than 30% Housing Tax Credit Units per total households in the census tracts as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census. (Exhibit B)
- §49.6 (h) (1) state that staff will only recommend a 30% increase in Eligible Basis if...(2) The Development is located in a Qualified Census Tract that has less than 40% Housing Tax Credit Units per households in the tract as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census. (Exhibit C)
- §49.8 (i) (15) states that applications may qualify to receive 7 points if the Development is not located in a Rural Area and has a population less than 100,000 based on the most current Decennial Census. (Exhibit D)
- The 2007 Reference Manual List of Items on the TDHCA website directs applicants to go to <u>http://qct.huduser.org/index.html</u> in order to find Qualified Census Tracts and Difficult Development Areas. This web page is a Qualified Census Tract Generator that states that the





a subsidiary corporation of the National Farm Workers Service Center, Inc.

2007 QCTs are based on new metropolitan area geography and a new, more detailed tabulation of household income at the census tract level from the 2000 Census. (Exhibit E)

- The Reference Manual also directs applicants to the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics as of 4/12/2007 Board Meeting – Place Level. This document states that a site located outside the boundaries of a place (as designated by the 2000 U.S. Census) will use the Affordable Housing Needs Score of the place whose boundary is closest to the site. (Exhibit F)
- The Reference Manual also directs applicants to the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics as of April 12, 2007 Board Meeting Tract Level. This document lists the 2000 U.S. Census as the tract data source. (Exhibit G)

In addition to the references to the Decennial Census in the QAP and Reference Manual, the TDHCA staff accepted a response to a deficiency notice to application #060047, stating that the same site should be considered in Alton North, not the City of Alton. A copy of the deficiency and response are attached as well.

The TDHCA, by referencing the 2000 Census and the Decennial Census as a source of information regarding HTC applications, not only implies that this is a valid source for determining the Area where a site is located but also states such:

§49.3 (11) (A) The geographic area contained within the boundaries of:

- (i) An incorporated place or
- (ii) Census Designated Place (CDP) as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census.

The QAP does not specify which of these two options, or definitions, takes precedence. Though the site where 07302 is proposed to be developed has been annexed into City of Alton boundaries in the recent past, it is also in the Alton North CDP as established by the 2000 census. In essence both definitions are true. However, given that we are relying upon the Reference Manual (and thus the 2000 Census) for other data, we cannot include our site in Alton without invalidating all of the other data we rely upon for application purposes.

If the TDHCA required applicants use the most recent site location boundaries in determining Area, updated on an annual basis as cities annex land block by block, then all data pertaining to these Areas would need to be updated as well. For instance, changing the geographical boundaries of any Area would necessitate a change in that place's population, HTC units in place, Place Per Capita/TX Per Capita, and possibly the Area Type. These new boundaries would also result in changes regarding the items previously mentioned in the QAP, namely issues such as determining census tracts that have more than 30% Housing Tax Credit Units per household, Eligible Basis, and Exurban points. Since this data is not updated on an annual basis, the TDHCA and the applicants rely on more static data, namely the decennial census, to keep all statistics pertinent.

If we were to designate Alton and not Alton North as our development's Area, the information cited in the Reference Manual for Alton would not apply to our site location. For example, the Reference Manual states that Alton has a population of 4,384. That population statistic does not include the





Rufino Contreras Affordable Housing Corporation, Inc.

908 E. 5th Street, Suite 201, Austin, TX 78702- Tel. (512) 474-5003 Fax- (512) 474-5010 a subsidiary corporation of the National Farm Workers Service Center, Inc.

geographical area where our proposed development would be located, does not include the people who live on land annexed by the City of Alton since 2000. If we were to designate Alton and not Alton North as our Area, ALL data we would draw from the Reference Manual would be irrelevant to the geographical location of our project. Therfore, it is the Alton North data in the Reference Manual that most accurately reflects the population and housing characteristics of our geography.

Based on this information, we request that application 07302 receive 6 points for the 2007 Affordable Housing Needs Score.

Sincerely,

Jean Coburn Project Manager



## EXHIBIT A 2007 Housing Tax Credit Program Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules

(4) **Applicable Fraction**--The fraction used to determine the Qualified Basis of the qualified low-income building, which is the smaller of the Unit fraction or the floor space fraction, all determined as provided in the

Code, \$42(c)(1). (5) Applicable Percentage--The percentage used to determine the amount of the Housing Tax Credit for any Development (New Construction, Reconstruction, and/or Rehabilitation), as defined more fully in the Code, \$42(b).

(A) For purposes of the Application, the Applicable Percentage will be projected at :

(i) 40 basis points over the current applicable percentage for 70 percent present value credits, pursuant to \$42(b) of the Code for the month in which the Application is submitted to the Department, or

(ii) 15 basis points over the current applicable percentage for 30 percent present value credits, pursuant to \$42(b) of the Code for the month in which the Application is submitted to the Department.

(B) For purposes of making a credit recommendation at any other time, the Applicable Percentage will be based in order of priority on:

(i) The percentage indicated in the Agreement and Election Statement, if executed; or

(ii) The actual applicable percentage as determined by the Code, \$42(b), if all or part of the Development has been placed in service and for any buildings not placed in service the percentage will be the actual percentage as determined by Code, \$42(b) for the most current month; or

(iii) The percentage as calculated in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph if the Agreement and Election Statement has not been executed and no buildings have been placed in service.

(6) Applicant--Any Person or Affiliate of a Person who files a Pre-Application or an Application with the Department requesting a Housing Credit Allocation. (\$2306.6702)

(7) Application--An application, in the form prescribed by the Department, filed with the Department by an Applicant, including any exhibits or other supporting material. (§2306.6702)

(8) Application Acceptance Period--That period of time during which Applications for a Housing Credit Allocation from the State Housing Credit Ceiling may be submitted to the Department as more fully described in \$49.9(a) and \$49.21 of this title. For Tax-Exempt Bond Developments this period is the date the Volume 1 and 2 are submitted or the date the reservation is issued by the Texas Bond Review Board, whichever is earlier, and for Rural Rescue Applications this is that period of time stated in the Rural Rescue Policy.

(9) Application Round--The period beginning on the date the Department begins accepting Applications for the State Housing Credit Ceiling and continuing until all available Housing Tax Credits from the State Housing Credit Ceiling (as stipulated by the Department) are allocated, but not extending past the last day of the calendar year. (\$2306.6702)

(10) Application Submission Procedures Manual--The manual produced and amended from time to time by the Department which sets forth procedures, forms, and guidelines for the filing of Pre-Applications and Applications for Housing Tax Credits.

(11) Area--

(A)The geographic area contained within the boundaries of:

(i) An incorporated place or

(ii) Census Designated Place (CDP) as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census.

(B) For Developments located outside the boundaries of an incorporated place or CDP, the Development shall take up the Area characteristics of the incorporated place or CDP whose boundary is nearest to the Development site.

(12) Area Median Gross Income (AMGI)--Area median gross household income, as determined for all purposes under and in accordance with the requirements of the Code, §42.

(13) At-Risk Development--a Development that: (\$2306.6702)

(A) has received the benefit of a subsidy in the form of a below-market interest rate loan, interest rate reduction, rental subsidy, Section 8 housing assistance payment, rental supplement payment, rental assistance payment, or equity incentive under at least one of the following federal laws, as applicable:

(i) Sections 221(d)(3) and (5), National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. \$17151);

(II) Section 236, National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. §1715z-1);

(iii) Section 202, Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. \$1701q);

(iv) Section 101, Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. \$1701s);

(v) the Section 8 Additional Assistance Program for housing Developments with HUD-Insured and HUD-Held Mortgages administered by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(vi) the Section 8 Housing Assistance Program for the Disposition of HUD-Owned Projects administered by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(vii) Sections 514, 515, and 516, Housing Act of 1949 (\$42U.S.C. \$\$1484, 1485, and 1486); or (viii) Section 42, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. \$42), and

2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules Page 3 of 65

#### 2007 Housing Tax Credit Program Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules

Applications are not subject to these Housing Tax Credit limitations, and Tax-Exempt Bond Developments will not count towards the total limit on tax credits per Applicant. The limitation does not apply (\$2306.6711(b));

(1) to an entity which raises or provides equity for one or more Developments, solely with respect to its actions in raising or providing equity for such Developments (including syndication related activities as agent on behalf of investors);

(2) to the provision by an entity of "qualified commercial financing" within the meaning of the Code (without regard to the 80% limitation thereof);

(3) to a Qualified Nonprofit Organization or other not-for-profit entity, to the extent that the participation in a Development by such organization consists only of the provision of loan funds, grants or social services; and

(4) to a Development Consultant with respect to the provision of consulting services, provided the Development Consultant fee received for such services does not exceed 10% of the fee to be paid to the Developer (or 20% for Qualified Nonprofit Developments), or \$150,000, whichever is greater.

#### (e) Limitations on the Size of Developments.

(1) The minimum Development size will be 16 Units if the Development involves Housing Tax Credits. The minimum Development size will be 4 Units if the funding source only involves the Housing Trust Fund or HOME Program.

(2) Rural Developments involving any New Construction (excluding New Construction of non-residential buildings) will be limited to 76 Units. Rural Developments involving only Rehabilitation do not have a size limitation.

(3) Developments involving any New Construction (excluding New Construction of non-residential buildings), that are not Tax-Exempt Bond Developments, will be limited to 252 Total Units, wherein the maximum Department administered Units will be limited to 200 Units. Tax-Exempt Bond Developments will be limited to 252 Total Units. These maximum Unit limitations also apply to those Developments which involve a combination of Rehabilitation, Reconstruction, and New Construction. Developments that consist solely of acquisition/Rehabilitation or Rehabilitation only may exceed the maximum Unit restrictions.

(4) For those Developments which are a second phase or are otherwise adjacent to an existing tax credit Development unless such proposed Development is being constructed to provide replacement of previously existing affordable multifamily units on its site (in a number not to exceed the original units being replaced, unless a market study supports the absorption of additional units) or that were originally located within a one mile radius from the proposed Development, the combined Unit total for the Developments may not exceed the maximum allowable Development size, unless the first phase has been completed and has attained Sustaining Occupancy (as defined in \$1.31 of this title) for at least six months.

(f) Limitations on the Location of Developments. Staff will only recommend, and the Board may only allocate, housing tax credits from the Credit Ceiling to more than one Development from the Credit Ceiling in the same calendar year if the Developments are, or will be, located more than one linear mile apart as determined by the Department. If the Board forward commits credits from the following year's allocation of credits, the Development is considered to be in the calendar year in which the Board votes, not in the year of the Credit Ceiling. This limitation applies only to communities contained within counties with populations exceeding one million (which for calendar year 2007 are Harris, Dallas, Tarrant and Bexar Counties). For purposes of this rule, any two sites not more than one linear mile apart are deemed to be "in a single community." (\$2306.6711) This restriction does not apply to the allocation of housing tax credits to Developments financed through the Tax-Exempt Bond program, including the Tax-Exempt Bond Developments under review and existing Tax-Exempt Bond Developments in the Department's portfolio. (\$2306.67021)

(g) Limitations of Development in Certain Census Tracts. Staff will not recommend and the Board will not allocate housing tax credits for a Competitive Housing Tax Credit or Tax Exempt Bond Development located in a census tract that has more than 30% Housing Tax Credit Units per total households in the census tract as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census unless the Applicant:

(1) In an area whose population is less than 100,000;

(2) Proposes only Reconstruction or Rehabilitation (excluding New Construction of non-residential buildings); or,

(3) Submits to the Department an approval of the Development referencing this rule in the form of a resolution from the governing body of the appropriate municipality or county containing the Development. For purposes of this paragraph, evidence of the local government approval must be received by the Department no later than April 2, 2007 (or for Tax-Exempt Bond Developments no later than 14 days before the Board meeting where the credits will be committed). These ineligible census tracts are outlined in the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics Report.

2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules Page 15 of 65 EXHIBIT C

(h) Limitations on Developments Proposing to Qualify for a 30% increase in Eligible Basis. Staff will only recommend a 30% increase in Eligible Basis:

(1) If the Development proposing to build in a Hurricane Rita Gulf Opportunity Zone (Rita GO Zone), which was designated as a Difficult to Develop Area as determined by HB4440, is able to be placed in service by December 31, 2008 (or date as revised by the Internal Revenue Service) as certified in the Application; or,

(2) The Development is located in a Qualified Census Tract that has less than 40% Housing Tax Credit Units per households in the tract as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census. Developments located in a Qualified Census Tract that has in excess of 40% Housing Tax Credit Units per households in the tract are not eligible to qualify for a 30% increase in Eligible Basis, which would otherwise be available for the Development site pursuant to the Code, \$42(d)(5)(C), unless the Development is proposing only Reconstruction or Rehabilitation (excluding New Construction of non-residential buildings). These ineligible Qualified Census Tract Site Demographic Characteristics Report.

(i) **Rehabilitation Costs.** Developments involving Rehabilitation must establish that the Rehabilitation will substantially improve the condition of the housing and will involve at least \$12,000 per Unit in direct hard costs (including site work, contingency, contractor profit, overhead and general requirements) unless financed with TX-USDA-RHS in which case the minimum is \$6,000.

(j) Unacceptable Sites. Developments will be ineligible if the Development is located on a site that is determined to be unacceptable by the Department.

(k) Appeals and Administrative Deficiencies for Site and Development Restrictions. An Application or Development found to be in violation under subsections (a)  $\cdot$  (h) of this section will be notified in accordance with the Administrative Deficiency process described in \$49.9(d)(4) of this title. They may also utilize the appeals process described in \$49.17(b) of this title.

#### \$49.7. Regional Allocation Formula; Set-Asides; Redistribution of Credits.

(a) Regional Allocation Formula. As required by \$2306.111(d), Texas Government Code, the Department uses a regional distribution formula developed by the Department to distribute credits from the State Housing Credit Celling to all urban/exurban areas and rural areas. The formula is based on the need for housing assistance, and the availability of housing resources in those urban/exurban areas and rural areas, and the Department uses the information contained in the Department's annual state low income housing plan and other appropriate data to develop the formula. This formula establishes separate targeted tax credit amounts for rural areas and urban/exurban areas within each of the Uniform State Service Regions. Each Uniform State Service Region's targeted tax credit amount will be published on the Department's web site. The regional allocation for rural areas is referred to as the Rural Regional Allocation and the regional allocation for urban/exurban areas is referred to as the Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation. Developments qualifying for the Rural Regional Allocation must meet the Rural Development definition. At least 5% of each region's allocation for each calendar year shall be allocated to Developments which are financed through TX-USDA-RHS, that meet the definition of a Rural Development, do not exceed 76 Units if proposing any New Construction (excluding New Construction of nonresidential buildings), and have filed an "Intent to Request 2007 Housing Tax Credits" form by the Pre-Application submission deadline. These Developments will be attributed to the Rural Regional Allocation in each region where they are located. Developments financed through TX-USDA-RHS's 538 Guaranteed Rural Rental Housing Program will be considered under this set-aside. Any Rehabilitation or Reconstruction of an existing 515 development that retains the 515 loan and restrictions, regardless of the source or nature of additional financing, will be considered under this set-aside. Commitments of 2007 Housing Tax Credits issued by the Board in 2006 will be applied to each Set-Aside, Rural Regional Allocation, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation and TX-USDA-RHS Allocation for the 2007 Application Round as appropriate.

(b) Set-Asides. An Applicant may elect to compete in as many of the following Set-Asides for which the proposed Development qualifies: (\$2306.111(d))

(1) At least 10% of the State Housing Credit Ceiling for each calendar year shall be allocated to Qualified Nonprofit Developments which meet the requirements of the Code, \$42(h)(5). Qualified Nonprofit Organizations must have the Controlling interest in the Qualified Nonprofit Development applying for this Set-Aside. If the organization's Application is filed on behalf of a limited partnership, the Qualified Nonprofit Organization must be the controlling managing General Partner. If the organization's Application is filed on behalf of a limited liability company, the Qualified Nonprofit Organization must be the controlling Managing Member. Additionally, a Qualified Nonprofit Development submitting an Application in the nonprofit set-aside must have the nonprofit entity or its nonprofit affiliate or subsidiary be the Developer or a co-Developer as evidenced in the development agreement. (\$2306.6729 and \$2306.6706(b))

2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules Page 16 of 65

## EXHIBIT D

#### 2007 Housing Tax Credit Program Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules

paragraph. Areas qualifying under any one of the subparagraphs (A) - (G) of this paragraph will receive 4 points. An Application may only receive points under one of the subparagraphs (A) - (G) of this paragraph.

(A) A geographical Area which is an Economically Distressed Area; a Colonia; or a Difficult Development Area (DDA) as specifically designated by the Secretary of HUD at the time of Application submission (\$2306.127).

(B) a designated state or federal empowerment/enterprise zone, urban enterprise community, or urban enhanced enterprise community. Such Developments must submit a letter and a map from a city/county official verifying that the proposed Development is located within such a designated zone. Letter should be no older than 6 months from the first day of the Application Acceptance Period. (General Appropriation Act, Article VII, Rider 6; \$2306.127)

(C) the Development is located in a county that has received an award as of November 15, 2006, within the past three years, from the Texas Department of Agriculture's Rural Municipal Finance Program or Real Estate Development and Infrastructure Program. Cities which have received one of these awards are categorized as awards to the county as a whole so Developments located in a different city than the city awarded, but in the same county, will still be eligible for these points.

(D) the Development is located in a census tract which has a median family income (MFI), as published by the United States Bureau of the Census (U.S. Census), that is higher than the median family income for the county in which the census tract is located. This comparison shall be made using the most recent data available as of the date the Application Round opens the year preceding the applicable program year. Developments eligible for these points must submit evidence documenting the median income for both the census tract and the county. These Census Tracts are outlined in the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics Report.

(E) the proposed Development will serve families with children (at least 70% of the Units must have an eligible bedroom mix of two bedrooms or more) and is proposed to be located in an elementary school attendance zone of an elementary school that has an academic rating of "Exemplary" or "Recognized," or comparable rating if the rating system changes. The date for consideration of the attendance zone is that in existence as of the opening date of the Application Round and the academic rating is the most current rating determined by the Texas Education Agency as of that same date. (\$42(m)(1)(C)(vii))

(F) the proposed Development will expand affordable housing opportunities for low-income families with children outside of poverty areas. This must be demonstrated by showing that the Development will serve families with children (at least 70% of the Units must have an eligible bedroom mix of two bedrooms or more) and that the census tract in which the Development is proposed to be located has no greater than 10% poverty population according to the most recent census data. (\$42(m)(1)(C)(vii)) These Census Tracts are outlined in the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics Report.

(15) Exurban Developments (Development characteristics). (\$2306.6725(a)(4); \$42(m)(1)(C)(i)) Applications may qualify to receive 7 points if the Development is not located in a Rural Area and has a population less than 100,000 based on the most current Decennial Census

(16) Demonstration of Community Support other than Quantifiable Community Participation: if an Applicant requests these points on the self scoring form and correctly certifies to the Department that there are no neighborhood organizations that meet the Department's definition of Neighborhood Organization pursuant to \$49.9(i)(2)(A)(iv) of this title and 12 points were awarded under paragraph (2) of this subsection, then that Applicant may receive two points for each letter of support submitted from a community or civic organization that serves the community in which the site is located. Letters of support must identify the specific Development and must state support of the specific Development at the proposed location. The community or civic organization must provide some documentation of its existence in the community to include, but not be limited to, listing of services and/or members, brochures, annual reports, etc. Letters of support from organizations that are not active in the area that includes the location of the Development will not be counted. For purposes of this item, community and civic organizations do not include neighborhood organizations, governmental entities, taxing entities or educational activities. Letters of support received after March 1, 2007. will not be accepted for this item. Two points will be awarded for each letter of support submitted in the Application, not to exceed 7 points. Should an Applicant elect this option and the Application receives letters in opposition by March 1, 2007, then two points will be subtracted from the score for each letter in opposition, provided that the letter is from an organization serving the community. At no time will the Application, however, receive a score lower than zero for this item.

(17) Developments in Census Tracts with No Other Existing Developments Supported by Tax Credits: The Application may receive 7 points if the proposed Development is located in a census tract in which there are no other existing developments supported by housing tax credits. Applicant must provide evidence of the census

> 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules Page 43 of 65

------

EXHIBIT E

## **Qualified Census Tract Table Generator**

This page allows you to generate Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Qualified Census Tract (QCT) tables for individual counties, individual metropolitan areas, nonmetropolitan parts of individual States, all counties in a single State, the complete table for all metropolitan areas, and the complete table for all nonmetropolitan parts of States. Simply click the appropriate button below.

Geocoded lists of all Qualified Census Tracts are available in WinZip-archived dBase files. | 2006 | 2007 |

## Notes on 2007 QCTs

The 2007 QCTs are based on new metropolitan area geography and a new, more detailed tabulation of household income at the census tract level from the 2000 Census. See the latest <u>Designation</u> <u>Notice</u> for information on the application of new metropolitan area geography. An explanation of the new, more detailed tabulation of household income at the census tract level from the 2000 Census used to designate the 2007 QCTs, and a downloadable data file, are available <u>here</u>.

Excel spreadheets containing the <u>data</u> used to designate the 2007 QCTs are available <u>here</u>. The designation <u>algorithm</u> can be read <u>here</u>.

Select Individual County/Metro Aree/Mannetro State Table

Select Year:

C 2006

© 2007 Generate Complete Metro Table

The Complete Metro Table is available as an Adobe Acrobat (\*.PDF) file formatted for optimal printing. | 2006 | 2007 |

Select Year:

C 2006

© 2007 Cenerate Complete Nonmelie able

The Complete Nonmetro Table is available as an Adobe Acrobat (\*.PDF) file formatted for optimal printing. 2006 2007

Difficult Development Area Tables Select Year:

C 2006 (updated to include changes related to the Gulf Opportunity Zone Act of 2005)

**@** 2007

Generate DDA Tables

The Difficult Development Area tables are available as Adobe Acrobat (\*.PDF) files formatted for optimal printing. | <u>Metro DDAs 2006</u> | <u>Nonmetro DDAs 2006</u> | | <u>Metro DDAs 2007</u> | <u>Nonmetro DDAs 2007</u>

To determine the census tract number for a particular address, visit the <u>HUD User GIS Service --</u> Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Qualified Census Tract (QCT) Locator, or for Guam and Northern Marianas Island locations, the <u>Small Business Administration (SBA) HUB Zone Locator</u>.

http://qct.huduser.org/index.html

5/25/2007

# EXHIBIT F



## 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics as of 04/12/2007 Board Meeting

#### Place Level - Sorted by Place

Instructions:

A site located outside the boundaries of a place (as designated by the 2000 U.S. Census) will use the Affordable Housing Need Score of the place whose boundary is closest to the site.

If information for a specific place is not included in the table, then contact TDHCA's Division of Policy and Public Affairs at (512) 475-3976. All other quastions relating to scoring an application should be submitted in writing to Jason Burr via email at jason.burr@tdhca.state.tx.us.

#### Notes:

(1) These area designations may be updated when TX-USDA-RHS releases the 2007 areas eligible for funding or applicants may petition TDHCA to update the "Rural" designation of a place within a metropolitan statistical area by providing a letter from a local official. Such letter must clearly indicate that the place has an incorporated area boundary that touches the boundary of another place with a population of over 20,000. Such petitions should be submitted to the TDHCA Division of Policy and Public Affairs via email at info@tthca.state.tx.us or fax at (512) 475-3746. To treat all applicants equitably, such letter must be provided to TDHCA prior to the commencement of the pre-application submission period for HTC applications. The results of such petitions will be posted on the HTC application updates portion of the website at http://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/lihtc.htm and any changes to the area designations will be e-mailed to the applicant contact e-mail addresses as listed in the application.

(2) QAP 49.9(i)(11), Affordable Housing Needs Score - The number represented for the place is the number of points that may be requested for a Competitive Housing Tax Credit Application for the 2007 Application Round.

(3) QAP 49.9(1)(15), Exurban Points - The "Yes" or "No" in this column for each place indicates whether a Competitive Housing Tax Credit Application in the place is eligible for Exurban points.

(4) QAP 49.5(a)(7), 2X Per Capita - A "Yes" in this column for a place indicates that the place violates the 2X per capita limitation; a "No" indicates that the place does not violate the 2X per capita limitation. HTC Unit Data is based on Board approvals through 12/14/2006. Population data is based on Texas State Data Center 06 Population Estimate. A site located outside the boundaries of an incorporated place will use the County HTC per capita. The HTC per capita status of the Census Designated Places (CDP) shown in the table below is based on the county per capita.

Region		County	Area Type-Rural or Urban/ Exurban (1)	2000 Census Population	tor Affertdable Housing Need Score (2)	Eligible for Exurban Points (3)	HTC Units in Place	Place Per Capital TX Per Capita	Pi Per Cap >2x TX Per Cap (4)	CDP	Status Changed from Previous Analysi
	Abbott	HII	Rural	300		No	0		No		
	Abernathy	Hale	Rural	2839	5	INO	24	1.17			
	Abilene	Taylor	Urb./Exurb.	115930		No	823	0.97	- 14		
11	Abram-Perezville	Hidalgo	Rural	5444		No	0		No	Yes	
	Ackerly	Dawson	Rural	245		No	0		No	<u> </u>	
3	Addison	Dallas	Urb./Exurb.	14166		Yes	0		No		
1	Adrian	Oldham	Rural	169		No	0		No		
	Agua Dulce (El Paso		Rural	738		No	0		No	Yes	
	Agua Duice (Nueces		Rural	737		No	Ó		No		
	Airport Road Addition		Rural	132		No	0	0		Yeş	
	Alamo	Hidalgo	Urb./Exurb.	14760	4	Yes	290	2.25			
	Alamo Heights	Bexar	Urb./Exurb.	7319		Yes	0		No		
	Alba	Wood	Rural	430		No	0		No		
2	Albany	Shackelfor	Rural	1921		No	40	2.98			
	Aldine	Harris	Urb./Exurb.	13979			120	1.13		Yes	
	Aledo	Parker	Rural	1726		No	0		No		
	Alfred-South La Palo		Rural	451		No	Ö		No	Yes	
10	Alice	Jim Wells	Rural	19010		Yes	196	1.36	·		
10	Alice Acres	Jim Wells	Rural	491	4	No	0	0	No	Yes	

Page 1 of 33 5/25/2007

<u>ي</u>

# EXHIBIT E



## 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics as of April 12, 2007 Board Meeting Tract Level - Sorted by County then Tract

Tract Data Source: U.S. Census 2000

The complete tract identifier used by the Census Bureau is below provided (i.e. 48001950800). The first five digits are the state and county code. The remaining six digits are the tract code. Often in general use, only the tract code is shown with a decimal prior to the final two digits. For example, the above referenced tract would be shown as 9506.00.

Applicants may petition TDHCA to update the unit concentration data if they believe that the number of HTC units in the tract is in error. Such petition must be provided to the TDHCA Division of Policy and Public Affairs via email at info@tdhca.state.tx.us or fax at (512) 475-3746 prior to the commencement of the pre-application submission period for HTC applications. The results of such petitions will be posted on the HTC application updates portion of the website at http://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/lihtc.htm and any changes to the area designations will be e-mailed to the applicant contact e-mail adderesses as listed in the application.

#### Notes:

(1) QAP §49.9(i)(14)(D), Tract MFI > County MFI Points - If "Yes", the Application is eligible for points pursuant to this section.

(2) QAP §49.9(i)(14)(F), Developments Outside of Poverty Areas - If "Yes", the Application is eligible for points pursuant to this section.

(3) QAP §49.9(I)(17), Developments Located in Cencus Tracts with No Other HTC Developments - If "Yes", the Application is eligible for points pursuant to this section.

(4) QAP ineligibility item 49.6(g): If "Yes", New Construction Applications are ineligible for Housing Tax Credits unless the Applicant submits to the Department an approval of the Development referencing this rule in the form of a resolution from the governing body of the appropriate municipality or county containing the Development by the required deadlines outlined in the QAP.

(5) For QAP ineligibility item 49.6(h), if "Yes", not eligible for the 130% Eligibile Basis Increase.

Traci ID	County	2000 Tract Median Family Income	2006 County Median Family Income	Eligible for §49.9(f)(14)(D) Track MFI > County MFI Points (1)	2000 Tract Population	2000 Tract Poverty Population	Eligible for Poverty < 10% Points? (2)	Eligible for §49.9(i)(17)? (3)		meligible Tract? (4)	lheligible For 130% Basis Boost? (5)
48001950100	Anderson	38571	37513	Yes	4449	626	No	No	no	no	
48001950200	Anderson	40391	37513	Yes	3371	509	No	Yes	no	no	
48001950300	Anderson	40278	37513	Yes	738	117	No	Yes	no	no	
48001950400	Anderson	57788	37513	Yes	14381	3	Yes	Yes	no	no	
48001950500	Anderson	31223	37513	No	3954	981	No	No	no	no	
48001950600	Anderson	37769	37513	Yes	6363	1127	No	Yes	no	no	
48001950700	Anderson	26736	37513	No	2353	677	No	No	no	no	
48001950800	Anderson	37319	37513	No	4955	. 815	No	No	no	no	
48001950900	Anderson	40071	37513	Yes	8744	995	No	No	no	no	
48001951000	Anderson	38264	37513	Yes	5801	804	No	No	no	no	
48003950100	Andrews	56406	37017	Yes	1525	151	Yes	Yes	no	no	
48003950200	Andrews	39816	37017	Yes	5607	822	No	No	no	no	
48003950300	Andrews	29211	37017	No	3519	753	No	Yes	no	no	

Page 1 of 234 4/26/2007

# 07302 Executive Director Appeal Response



## **TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS**

www.tdhca.state.tx.us

Rick Perry Governor

Michael Gerber Executive Director

June 18, 2007

Ms. Jean Coburn Alton Housing Development, L.P. 908 E. 5th Street, # 201 Austin, TX 78702 Telephone: (512) 474-5003 Facsimile: (512) 474-5010

### Re: Appeal Received for Casa Alton – 07302

Dear Ms. Coburn:

#### **Appeal Review**

I have carefully reviewed the Application you submitted, as well as the appeal received by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (the "Department") on June 11, 2007 regarding points awarded under §49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules ("QAP"), Housing Needs Characteristics.

Pursuant to \$49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 QAP, "each Application may receive a score if correctly requested in the self score form based on objective measures of housing need in the Area where the Development is located." \$49.3(11) of the 2007 QAP defines Area as "(A) The geographic area contained within the boundaries of: (i) An incorporated place or (ii) Census Designated Place (CDP) as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census." The current location of a proposed Development is used to determine the Area for which points may be awarded under \$49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 QAP. The proposed Development is located in Alton; therefore the Application received four points for Housing Needs Characteristics.

You appealed the eligibility of the letter by asserting several points: because data from the 2000 Decennial Census is used to establish housing need, using the location of the Development as established using a more recent date is not a valid methodology; the source of Department information regarding many threshold and selection requirements of the 2007 QAP is the 2000 Decennial Census; the Department awarded points to an Application for a proposed Development on the same site based on the Development's location in the Alton North CDP; the QAP does not establish precedence for the two options that may be used to determine Area; the proposed Development is located in the Alton North CDP as established by the 2000 Decennial

BOARD MEMBERS Elizabeth Anderson, *Chair* Shadrick Bogany C. Kent Conine Sonny Flores Gloria Ray Norberto Salinas Ms. Coburn June 18, 2007 Page 2 of 2

Census; and the information in the Department's Reference Manual for Alton does not apply to the Development site because the site was included in the Alton North CDP at the time of the 2000 Decennial Census.

The proposed Development Site is currently located within the City of Alton, as confirmed by the City's Planning Director and the Applicant. The current location of a Development, not its location as of the most recent Decennial Census, is used to evaluate eligibility for points based on demographic information from the most recent Decennial Census. This methodology has been consistently applied to all applications during the 2007 Application Round.

As to your point regarding decisions made in 2006, each year the Department must evaluate the information available in the Application based on Department rule. Even when the exact language of the rule and/or specific Application circumstances do not change, information in the Application may be different from information presented in previous Applications. While the Department's goal is to be as consistent as possible and provide signposts to interested parties, where there is a fundamental disagreement with previous interpretations based on new information presented to the Department, there is room for and an obligation to be sure that rules are adhered to.

The 2007 QAP explicitly states that an Application will be awarded points "based on objective measures of housing need in the Area where the Development is located." The QAP does not indicate that the location of the Development as of the most recent Decennial Census should be used. The proposed Development is located in Alton; therefore four points were awarded based on the Development's location in Alton, rather than six points based on the location within the Alton North CDP.

### **Appeal Determination**

Your appeal is denied.

Pursuant to §49.17(b)(4) of the 2007 QAP, an appeal has been filed with the Board and will be considered by the Board at the June 28, 2007 Board meeting. Board appeal documentation must still be submitted by 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 19, 2007 to be placed with the June 28, 2007 Board materials. If no documentation is submitted, the appeal documentation to the Executive Director will be utilized.

If you have questions or comments, please call (512) 475-3340.

Sincerely,

Michael Gerber Executive Director

# 07302 Challenge

May 23, 2007.

Ms. Audrey Martin Multifamily Finance Production Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs PO Box 13941 Austin, TX 78711

#### RE: Challenge to 2007 HTC Application 07302, Casa Alton

Dear Ms. Martin:

Please accept this letter as a formal challenge to application 07302, Casa Alton. In this application, it appears that the applicant has elected 6 points under Section 49.9(i)(11) for the 2007 Affordable Housing Needs Score. According to our research, the Casa Alton development site is located within the City of Alton, and should have received 4 points for this item instead of 6.

According to the place-level data from the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographics Characteristics as of April 12, 2007 Board Meeting, 6 points may be elected for developments in Alton North (See Attachment 1). As also highlighted here, developments in Alton should receive 4 points.

In Volume 4, Tab 13, of application 07302, it confirms that the applicant considers the development site to be in Alton North (See Attachment 2). As such, the applicant elected 6 points for "Housing Needs Characteristics" in Volume 4, Tab 1 (Attachment 3).

However, according to our research, this development site is currently located within the city limits of the City of Alton.

The map from Volume 2, Tab 3, shows that the site is located on the west side of Trosper Rd. and approximately west of Diamond Head Avenue (Attachment 4). I have also included a flood zone map with the site location outlined, as found in Volume 3, Tab 2, of application 07302 (Attachment 5).

In 2000, this location was outside of the City of Alton and within the Alton North CDP. A map from the US Census website depicting the 2000 places and census tracts is attached, with the 07302 site marked in blue (Attachment 6).

However, according to the US Census's 2005 city and town information, the site is located within the City of Alton. A map from the US Census website depicting the 2005 cities and towns is attached, with the 07302 site marked in blue (Attachment 7).

We have also included a letter from the David Deleon, Planning Director with the City of Alton, that confirms that the 07302 development site is indeed located within the city limits of the City of Alton (Attachment 8). The letter includes a map with the land tract of the site outlined in orange with the proposed 07302 site plan outlined in yellow. For clarification, I have also printed out the first page of the site purchase contract contained in Volume 3, Tab 2, of application 07302 confirming that the site is located in tract 42-4, the same tract that Mr. Deleon references in his letter. I have also included the site plan from Volume 2, Tab 4, of application 07302 confirming the outline of the development site with the map from the letter. Furthermore, I have included the

zoning letter from Mr. Deleon with the City of Alton that was included in Volume 3, Tab 2, of application 07302 that certifies that the development site is zoned per the City of Alton's Comprehensive Zoning Plan.

According to guidance received from the Department, the current location of the development site should be used for both the Affordable Housing Needs Score and the 2x per Capita items. Email documentation of this guidance is included as Attachment 9. It specifically states that "Although 2000 census data is used, the current location of the development should be used for both items."

Alton North is a Census Designated Place, which by definition is an unincorporated area. Because the 07302 site is now located in an incorporated area known as Alton, it cannot be considered as being within a CDP.

Based on this information, application 07302 should have elected and received 4 points under Section 49.9(i)(11) for the 2007 Affordable Housing Needs Score because the proposed development site is currently located within the City of Alton. This should be a deduction of 2 points, as they should not have elected 6 points because the site is not located in the Alton North CDP.

We respectfully request that TDHCA review this matter and reconsider the AHNS points awarded to application 07302.

Please contact me at (512) 789-1295 if you have any questions.

Regards,

(Alyssa Carpenter Ph: (512) 789-1295 Fax: (512) 233-2269 Email: ajcarpen@gmail.com

Attachments:

- 1. Page from 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographics Characteristics as of April 12, 2007 Board Meeting with Alton North and Alton highlighted.
- 2. Page from Volume 4, Tab 13, of application 07302 with Alton North circled.
- Page from Volume 4, Tab 1, of application 07302 with Housing Needs Characteristics score highlighted.
- 4. Page from Volume 2, Tab 3, of application 07302 with map of area and site designated as a star.
- 5. Page from Volume 3, Tab 2, of application 07302 with site outlined.
- Map from the US Census website depicting the 2000 places and census tracts with the 07302 site marked in blue.
- Map from the US Census website depicting the 2005 cities and towns with the 07302 site marked in blue.
- Letter from City of Alton confirming 07302 development site is located within the city limits of the City of Alton, First page of the property contract for development site from Volume 3, Tab 2, of application 07302. Site plan from Volume 2, Tab 4, of application 07302. Zoning letter from Volume 3, Tab 2, of application 07302.
- April 23, 2007, email from Audrey Martin clarifying that a development should use its current location for AHNS and 2x per Capita items.

ATTACHMENT 1

δ w	<b>4</b>	ves Type-Pural or Utbart Exurban (1)	2000 Carsus Population	Affordable Honsing Need Score (2)	Bigdee for Eruction Points (3)	HTC Units in Place	0 60 Place Per Capital TX Per Capita	er Capin 7X Per Cap (4)		
	County	Area	200	Allo		- Children	200	4 6	ĉ	1
3 Allen	Collin	U(b./Exurb.	43554	6	Yes	94	0.19	No	<b></b>	1
3 Alma	Ellis	Rural	302	7	No	Ö	0	Nø		<u></u>
13 Alpine	Brewster	Rural	5786	7	No	92	2.04	Yes		[
4 Alto	Cherokee	Rural	1190	5	No	32	3.43	Yes		
11 Alto Bonito	Starr	Rural	669	4	No	0	Q	No	Yes	
11 Allone		Ruralina associate	A384	See and	No	106	1.66	No	1	
Alion North &	Hidalgoom	Rural	5051	6	No	Q	Ō	No	Yes	
3 Alvarado	Johnson	Rural	3288		No	24	0.84			
6 Alvin	Brazoria	Urb./Exurb.	21413	6	Yes	246	1.46	No	a an traig	
3 Alvord	Wise	Rural	1007		No	Ó	0	No	- interest	
1 Amarillo	Polter	Urb./Exurb.	173627	6	No	1434	1.05	No	T.	
8 Ames:	Liberty	Rural	1079	5	No	0	Ō	No		<u> </u>
1 Amherst	Lamb	Rural	791	5	No	9	1,51	No		
6 Anahuac	Chambers	Rural	2210		No	0	0	No	T	
8 Anderson	Grimes	Rural	257	4	No	0	0	No		1
7 Anderson Mill	Williamson	Urb,/Exurb,	8953		Yes		Õ	No	Yes	
12 Andrews	Andrews	Rural	9652	6	No	24	0.36	No		
6 Angleton	Brazoria	Runal	18130		No	248	1.78	No	A 44 4 4 4	
3 Angus	Navarro	Rural	334	- 5	No	0	0	No		1
3 Anna	Collin	Rural	1225	7	No	Q	Ö	No		1.1.1.1.1
3 Annetta	Parker	Rural	1108	7	No			No		
3 Annetta North	Parker	Rural	467	7	No	0	Ó	No	1	
3 Annetta South	Parker	Rural	565	7	No	000000000000000000000000000000000000000		No		
4 Annona	Red River	Rural	282	7	No	Ō		No	1	
2 Anson	Jones	Rural	2556	4	No	0		No		
13 Anthony	El Paso	Urb./Exurb.	3850	4	Yes	60	1,99	No		Yes
1 Anton	Hockley	Rural	1200	-4	No	0	Õ	No		19-10-1
5 Appleby	Nacogdoch	Rural	444	6	No	0	0	No		
8 Aquilla	Hill	Rural	136		No	0	Ô	No	6 8	
10 Aransas Pass	San Patrici	Rural	8138	5	No	100	1,67	No		
2 Archer City	Archer	Rural	1848	5	No	0	0	No		
6 Arcola	Fort Bend		1048		No	0	0	No	1	
3 Argyle	Denton	Urb./Exurb.	2365	5	Yes	Ö	Ō	No	1.00	
3 Arlington	Tarrant	Urb./Exurb.	332969		No	2969	1,11	No	1	
4 Arp	Smith	Rural	901		No	Û	0	No	1	
11 Arroyo Alto	Cameron	Rural	320		No	O		No	Yes	
11 Arroyo Colorado Est		Rural	755		No	0	0	No	Yes	
11 Arroyo Gardens-La		Rural	732		No	0	Q	No	Yes	
11 Asherton		Rural	1342	7	No	Ö	Ø	No		
2 Aspermont	Stonewall	Rural	1021		No	0		No	]	
6 Atascocita	Harris	Urb./Exurb.	35757	6	Yes	0	0	No	Yes	
4 Athens	Henderson		11297	5	No	156	1,71		1-1 1-1 1-1	1775-777 1
4 Atlanta	Cass	Rural	5745	5	No No	0		No		
3 Aubrey	Denton	Rural	1500	7	No	0	Ó	Nö		
3 Aurora	Wise	Rural	853		No	Ö	δ	No		
7 Austin	Travis	Urb./Exurb.	656562		No	8316				
10 Austwell	Refugio	Rural	192	7	No	0	Ő	No		ŧ

and the second

Page 2 of 33 4/30/2007

	ATTACHM	ËM	Ï
--	---------	----	---

••

...

.

•

D     Also Agrea     Jm Wolis     Fural     491     4     No     0     0     No     1       3     Alama     Crdlin     Lirk/Ekurk.     43854     0     Yas     94     0.168     No     1     Apline     Birwester     Rurel     9766     7     No     92     2.0463     Yes       13     Apline     Birwester     Rurel     11666     16     No     92     2.0474     Yes       14     Ats Gonito     Start     Rurel     6669     4     No     102     1.681     No       14     Ats Gonito     Hidalgo     Rurel     6661     9     No     102     1.681     No       3     Atvind     Brazoda     Lirb/Exurb.     2244     100     0     No     10     0.0     No     10     1041     1007     7     No     0     0     No     14.34     1006     No     10     1041     1024     10664     No     1.531     <	аT	A Base	Jim Weils	Rural	19010	5	and the second	Unit-	1.378	No	
Aber     Colin     Ufb/Exuth.     43864     6     Yes     64     0.198     No       3     Alma     Ellis     Rurai     302     7     No     0     0     No       3     Alpina     Brendeer     Rurai     5788     7     No     0     0     No       4     Alpina     Bonito     Starr     Rurai     1180     5     No     3.377     Yes       11     Also     Charolage     Rurai     6661     1     No     1.68     No       11     Also     Domas     No     1.68     No     1.68     No     1.68     No     1.68     No     1.68     No     1.68     No     1.64     No     1.68     No     No     1.68     No     <	_								_		Ye
Arma     Ellia     Rurei     Doz     7     No     0     0     0       3 Apira     Breweter     Aural     6768     7     No     92     2.065     Yes       1 Abo     Chervice     Rural     160     5     No     92     3.474     Yes       1 Abo     Starr     Rural     669     4     No     00     No     1       1 Abo     Starr     Rural     689     4     No     00     No     1       1 Abon     Markingo     Rural     689     4     No     00     No     1	-								0.188		
Altino     Brevettr     Parat     5786     7     No     62     2.065     Yee       Alto     Cherokee     Rural     1190     5     No     32     3.474     Yee       1 Abs conics     Starr     Rural     1986     4     No     102     1.00     No     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     11     10	-			and the second se		A REAL PROPERTY.	the second s			<u> </u>	
Abo     Cherokee     Rural     1180     5     No     32     3.477     Yea       1 Abs Sonito     Starr     Rural     669     4     No     0     No     No       1 Abs Sonito     Starr     Rural     669     4     No     0     No     No       1 Abs Nurth     Hidalgo     Rural     6051     5     No     24     0.845     No       2 Abvind     Johnson     Rural     3238     6     No     24     0.945     No       3 Ahvind     Brazoria     Uib Arbanch     177827     8     No     1434     1.625     No     344     No     0     No     No     1.621     No     0     0     No     No     0	-			The second s		the second s		_	-		
Abe Bonizo     Starr     Rural     686     4     No.     0     No.     1       11     Aben Morth     Hidalgo     Rural     4384     4     No.     102     1.081     No.     1       Aben Morth     Hidalgo     Rural     6651     5     No.     24     0.845     No.       Aben Morth     Brazota     Urb/Exuth.     21413     6     No.     24     0.845     No.       Alvord     Wise Rural     1007     7     No.     0     0     No.       Ameritio     Potter     Urb/Exuth.     173827     8     No.     1.434     1.066     No.       Ameritio     Potter     Urb/Exuth.     173827     8     No.     1.434     1.066     No.       Ameritio     Potter     Urb/Exuth.     173827     8     No.     1.00     No.       Ameritio     Rural     257     4     No.     0     No.     No.       Anderono     Grimmas     Rural <td>- e</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td>· · · · · · · · ·</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	- e					_	· · · · · · · · ·				
Alson     Hidalgo     Rural     4384     4     No     102     1.881     No       Alson     Hidalgo     Rural     6051     5     No     0     0     No       Alvin     Brazota     Urb./Exu/h.     21413     8     Yes     304     1.621     No       Alvin     Brazota     Urb./Exu/h.     21413     8     Yes     304     1.621     No       Avorid     Wise     Rural     1007     7     No     0     No       Armertiz     Potter     Urb./Exu/h.     174827     6     No     0     No       Armeruz     Liberty     Rural     751     5     No     9     1.531     No       Anderson     Carines     Rural     257     4     No     0     0     No       Anderson     Artineson     Rural     257     4     No     0     No       Anderson     Garme     Anataso     No     0     No     No	-			and the second se							Ye
T     Abon Nurth     Hidalgo     Rural     BOS1     S     No     Q     No											F
Avanue     Autrin     S288     S     No     24     0.845     No       Alvin     Brazofa     Urb/Exurb.     21413     6     Yee     304     1.821     No       Alvord     Wise     Rural     1007     7     No     0     0     No       Armanto     Potar     Urb/Exurb.     1079     6     No     0     0     No       Armanto     Chamberta     Rural     1079     6     No     0     0     No       Andreson     Chamberta     Rural     287     4     No     0     0     No       Andreson     Grimes     Rural     287     4     No     0     0     No       Andreson     Grimes     Rural     287     4     No     0     0     No       Andreson     Ardreson     Rural     287     4     No     0     0     No       Ansets     Bargofa     Rural     11225     No     0     <				and the second	the second s						Ye
Aivin     Brazoda     Urb./Exurb.     21413     S     Yes     304     1.621     No       Amartibo     Wise     Rural     1007     7     No     0     No       Amartibo     Potter     Urb./Exurb.     173627     6     No     0     No       Amare     Liborty     Rural     1079     5     No     0     0     No       Anherat     Lamb     Rural     2210     8     No     0     0     No       Anderson     Grimes     Rural     2267     4     No     0     No       Anderson     Grimes     Rural     2267     No     0     0     No       Anderson     Grimes     Rural     9952     No     24     0.355     No       Angleton     Brazonta     Rural     11334     6     No     0     0     No       Ananeta     Parker     Rural     1108     No     0     0     No       Ananeta	<u>i a s</u>	the second s							-	_	Ē
Aivord     Wise     Pural     1007     7     No.     0     No.       Amarilo     Potter     Urbu/Exorb.     173827     8     No.     1434     1.065     No.       Armee     Liberty     Rural     1079     5     No.     0     0     No.       Ammersi     Lamb     Rural     781     5     No.     0     0     No.       Andreson     Grimes     Rural     287     4     No.     0     0     No.       Anderson Mill     Williamson     No./Exorb.     6983     6     Yes     0     0     No.       12     Andreson Mill     Milliamson     No./Exorb.     6852     No.     24     0.365     No.       13     Angua     Navarno     Rural     1122     7     No.     0     0     No.       14     Angua     Navarno     Rural     1122     7     No.     0     0     No.       14     Andress     Rural </td <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td>	-						_		_		
Arranilo     Potter     Urbulexurb.     173827     8     No     1434     1.085     No       Armes     Liberty     Rural     1079     5     No     0     0     No       Amherst     Lamb     Rural     791     5     No     0     1.631     No       Anshuao     Chambera     Rural     2210     6     No     0     No       Andrexon     Grimes     Rural     2277     4     No     0     0     No       Andrexon     Andrexon     Rural     2877     4     No     0     0     No       2 Andrexon     Andrexon     Mural     19952     6     No     24.0.3555     No       3 Ana     Collin     Rural     1128     7     No     0     0     No       3 Annetia     Parker     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       3 Annetia     Selfon     Parker     Rural     1287     No	-								_		ł
Arrage     Liberty     Rural     1079     5     No     0     0     No       Amberst     Lamb     Rural     791     5     No     9     1.631     No       Anahuac     Chambers     Rural     2210     6     No     0     No       Anderson     Grimes     Rural     287     4     No     0     0     No       I Anderson     Grimes     Rural     287     4     No     0     0     No       I Anderson     Mill     Williamson     Urb/Eburb.     6983     6     Yes     0     0     No       I Anderson     Brazoria     Rural     18130     6     No     244     0.385     No       Anglaton     Baradis Noth     Parker     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       Anneta     Parker     Rural     2856     7     No     0     0     No       Annota     Red River     Rural	-	and the second se				·				Contraction of the local division of the loc	
Amharsi     Lamb     Rural     781     5     No     9     1.631     No       Anderson     Chambers     Rural     2210     6     No     0     0     No       Anderson     Grimes     Rural     257     4     No     0     0     No       Anderson     MU     Willsmason     Urb/Exurb.     8982     6     No     24     0.356     No       2     Anderson     Brazota     Rural     18130     6     No     244     0.356     No       3     Angus     Navarno     Rural     1334     6     No     0     0     No       4     Anna     Colin     Rural     122     7     No     0     0     No       3     Annetta     Parker     Rural     1226     7     No     0     0     No       4     Annetta     Sector     No     0     0     No     No       4     Annetta							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				ł
Anahuao     Chambers     Puzal     2210     6     No     0     No       Anderson     Grimes     Rural     267     4     No     0     0     No       Anderson     Grimes     Rural     267     4     No     0     0     No       Anderson     Mill     Willameon     Urb/Exurb.     8983     6     Yes     0     0     No       2     Andrews     Andrews     Rural     9882     6     No     24     0.355     No       2     Andrews     Andrews     Rural     1325     7     No     0     0     No       3     Anneta     Colin     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       4     Anneta     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       3     Antorta     Parker     Rural     2856     4     No     0     No       3     Antorta     Parker	-	and the second		and the second sec			the second se			_	1
Anderson     Grimes     Rural     257     4     No     0     No       Anderson Mill     Williamson     Urb/Exurb.     6983     6     Yes     0     0     No       2 Andrews     Andrews     Rural     9682     6     No     24     0.356     No       2 Andrews     Rural     18130     6     No     24     0.356     No       Angus     Navarro     Rural     1334     5     No     0     0     No       3 Anna     Collin     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       4 Annetta     Parker     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       4 Annetta South     Parker     Rural     285     7     No     0     0     No       4 Annona     Red River     Rural     2850     4     No     0     0     No       4 Antorn     Hecdory     Rural     1385     No     0 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td></t<>											1
Anderson Mill     Williamson     Urb/Esurb.     8953     8     Yes     0     0     No       12 Androws     Andrews     Rural     9852     6     No     24     0.355     No       3 Angus     Navarro     Brezorla     Rural     18130     6     No     0     0     No       3 Angus     Navarro     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       3 Anneta     Coffin     Rural     11225     7     No     0     0     No       3 Anneta North     Parker     Rural     1100     7     No     0     0     No       4 Anneta South     Parker     Rural     2855     7     No     0     0     No       13 Anthony     El Paso     Urb/Exurb.     3850     4     Yes     60     No     0     No       14 Anton     Hockley     Rural     136     No     0     0     No       15 Anguson     Hockley     <	-						and the second second				1
2     Andrews     Rural     0852     6     No     24     0.356     No       3     Angleton     Brazoria     Rural     18130     6     No     248     1.798     No       3     Angua     Navarro     Rural     334     5     No     0     0     No       3     Anna     Coltin     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       3     Annetta     Parker     Rural     1106     7     No     0     0     No       3     Annetta South     Parker     Rural     2822     7     No     0     0     No       4     Annona     Red River     Rural     2822     7     No     0     0     No       13     Anthon     Hoddey     Rural     2826     4     No     0     0     No       14     Anton     Hoddey     Rural     2866     4     No     0     No		the second s						and the second s		the second second	-
Angleton     Brazona     Rural     18130     8     No     248     1.788     No       Angua     Navarno     Rural     334     6     No     0     0     No       Angua     Navarno     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       Annetta     Parker     Rural     1108     7     No     0     0     No       Annetta     Parker     Rural     467     7     No     0     0     No       Annetta North     Parker     Rural     282     7     No     0     0     No       Annon     Jones     Rural     2856     4     No     0     0     No       Anton     Jones     Rural     2850     4     No     0     0     No       Anton     Hockey     Rural     1200     4     No     0     0     No       Anton     Hockey     Rural     1385     No     0	1	Anderson Mill		பர்படுகள்			the second second				Ye
Argus     Navarro     Rural     334     5     No     0     No       3     Anna     Collin     Rural     1225     7     No     0     0     No       3     Anneta     Parker     Rural     1108     7     No     0     0     No       3     Anneta North     Parker     Rural     555     7     No     0     0     No       4     Anneta Scuth     Parker     Rural     2855     4     No     0     0     No       13     Antona     Red River     Rural     2850     4     No     0     0     No       13     Anton     Hockey     Rural     2850     4     Yes     80     2.016     Yes       4     Anton     Hacogooches     Rural     13850     4     Yes     80     0     No     0     No       14     Anton     Hacogooches     Rural     13850     No     100     1.585	2	Andrews		Rurai		the second s	and the second second			the second s	Į.
Anna     Cottin     Rurat     1225     7     No     0     No       Annetta     Perker     Rurat     1106     7     No     0     No       Annetta     Parker     Rurat     447     7     No     0     0     No       Annetta     South     Parker     Rurat     656     7     No     0     0     No       Annetta     South     Parker     Rurat     2858     4     No     0     0     No       Annon     Jones     Rurat     2859     4     No     0     0     No       3     Anton     Hockley     Rurat     13850     4     Yes     60     2.016     Yes       4     Apleby     Nacogodothes     Rurat     139     7     No     0     N		Anglaton	Brazorla	Rural	18130	6	No	248	1.798	No	l
Annetta     Parkar     Rurat     1108     7     No     0     No       Annetta     North     Parker     Rurat     467     7     No     0     0     No       Annetta     South     Parker     Rurat     555     7     No     0     0     No       Annona     Red River     Rurat     282     7     No     0     0     No       Antona     Jones     Rurat     2566     4     No     0     0     No       Anton     Jones     Rurat     1280     4     No     0     0     No       Anton     Hockey     Rurat     1380     4     No     0     0     No       Anton     Hockey     Rurat     1385     No     0     0     No     0     No       Antoin     Hockey     Rurat     1386     No     0     0     No     0     No       Archer City     Archer     Rurat     1	3	Angus	Navano	Rural	334	δ	No	0	0	No	I
Annetia North     Parker     Rural     467     7     No     0     b     No       3     Annatta South     Parker     Rural     555     7     No     0     0     No       4     Annona     Red River     Rural     282     7     No     0     0     No       2     Anson     Jones     Rural     2856     4     No     0     0     No       13     Anthony     El Paso     Urb /Exurb.     3850     4     Yes     60     2.016     Yes       14     Anton     Hockley     Rurai     1200     4     No     0     0     No       5     Appleby     Nacogoohes     Rurai     1200     4     No     0     0     No       6     Appleby     Nacogoohes     Rurai     138     6     No     100     1.685     No       10     Archer Chy     Archer     Rurai     1348     6     No     100     <	3	Алла	Collin	Rutal	1225	7	No	Ò	0	No	]
Annetta South     Parker     Rural     555     7     No     0     0     No       Annona     Red River     Rural     282     7     No     0     0     No       Annona     Jones     Rural     282     7     No     0     0     No       Anton     Jones     Rural     2856     4     No     0     0     No       3 Anthony     El Peso     Urb/Exurb.     3850     4     Yes     60     2.016     Yes       Anton     Hockdey     Rural     138     7     No     0     0     No       Applaby     Nacogdoches     Rural     138     7     No     0     0     No       0 Aransea Poss     San Patricio     Rural     1344     6     No     100     1.685     No       1 Archer Chy     Archer     Rural     1344     5     No     0     No     1     No     100     No     1     No     0	3	Annetta	Parker	Rural	1108	7	Na	0	0	No	
Annona     Red River     Rural     282     7     No     0     0     No       2     Anson     Jonas     Rural     2556     4     No     0     0     No       3     Anthony     El Paso     Urb/Exurb.     3850     4     Yes     60     2.016     Yes       Anton     Hockley     Rurai     1200     4     No     0     0     No       3     Apploby     Nacogdoches     Rurai     1385     4     No     0     0     No       3     Aquilia     Hill     Rurai     138     7     No     0     0     No       4     Archer Chy     Archer     Rurai     1048     8     No     0     0     No       4     Archer Chy     Archer     Rurai     1048     8     No     0     No     1     No       4     Arp     Denton     Urb/Exurb.     332669     8     No     20     No	5	Annetta North	Parker	Rural	467	7	No	0	0	No	)
2     Anson     Jones     Rural     2556     4     No     0     No       13     Anthony     El Pago     Urb / Exurb,     3850     4     Yes     60     2.016     Yes       14     Anton     Hockley     Rural     1200     4     No     0     0     No       5     Appleby     Nacogdoches     Rural     136     7     No     0     0     No       6     Aquilla     Hill     Rural     136     7     No     0     0     No       10     Aranaes Posa     Ban Patricto     Rural     1384     6     No     100     1.585     No       2     Archer City     Archer     Rural     1048     6     No     0     No       3     Artington     Tarrant     Urb / Exurb.     332669     6     No     2969     1.12     No       4     Arp     Smith     Rural     320     4     No     0     0	3	Annetta South	Parker	Rural	555	7	No	0	0	No	1
2     Anson     Jones     Rural     2856     4     No     0     No       13     Anstrony     El Pago     Urb/Exurb.     3850     4     Yes     60     2.016     Yes       14     Anton     Hockley     Rurai     1200     4     No     0     0     No       5     Appleby     Nacogdoches     Rurai     130     7     No     0     0     No       6     Appleby     Nacogdoches     Rurai     136     7     No     0     0     No       10     Aramase Posa     San Patricio     Rurai     1388     6     No     100     1638     No       2     Archer City     Archer     Rurai     1048     6     No     0     No       3     Argyle     Denton     Urb/Exurb.     332669     6     No     2969     1.12     No       4     Arp     Smith     Rurai     320     4     No     0     No	1	Annona	Red River	Rural	282	7	No	0	ō	No	1
13   Anthony   El Paso   Urb./Exurb.   3850   4   Yes   60   2.016   Yes     1   Anton   Hockley   Rural   1200   4   No   0   0   No     5   Appleby   Hacogdoches   Rural   136   7   No   0   0   No     6   Aquilla   Hill   Rural   136   7   No   0   0   No     10   Aranses Poss   San Patricto   Rural   8138   6   No   100   1.685   No     12   Archer City   Archer   Rural   1848   5   No   0   No     3   Archer City   Archer   Rural   1048   8   No   0   0   No     3   Archer City   Denton   Urb./Exurb.   332669   6   No   2669   1.12   No     4   Arp   Smith   Rural   785   7   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Colorado Estates   Gameron   Rural	2	Anson	Jones	Rural	2556	4		the second second	0	No	1
I     Anton     Hockley     Rurel     1200     4     No     0     0     No       5     Appleby     Nacogdoches     Rural     444     6     No     0     0     No       3     Aquilla     Hill     Rural     136     7     No     0     0     No       10     Aransee Pase     San Patrico     Rural     8138     6     No     100     1.585     No       10     Aransee Pase     San Patrico     Rural     1848     5     No     0     No       2     Archer City     Archer     Rural     1048     6     No     0     0     No       3     Arington     Tarrant     Urb/Exurb.     332669     6     No     2869     1.12     No       1     Aropo Aito     Cameron     Rural     320     4     No     0     0     No       11     Aropo Colorado Estates     Cameron     Rural     732     4     No	-	and the second state of th	El Paso	Urb/Exurb.	3850	4			2.016	_	1
5     Appleby     Nacogdoches     Rural     444     8     No     0     0     No       8     Aquilia     Hill     Rural     136     7     No     0     0     No       10     Aranses Peas     San Patricio     Rural     8138     5     No     100     1.585     No       2     Archer City     Archer     Rural     1848     5     No     0     0     No       3     Archer City     Archer     Rural     1048     8     No     0     0     No       3     Argyle     Denton     Utb/Exurb.     332969     6     No     2969     1.12     No       4     Arp     Smith     Rural     901     4     No     0     0     No       1     Aroyo Colorado Estates     Cameron     Rural     732     4     No     0     0     No       1     Aroyo Colorado Estates     Cameron     Rural     732     No	-+		**************************************		1200					_	1
Aquilia     Hill     Rural     136     7     No     0     0     No       10     Aramas Pass     San Patricto     Rural     8138     6     No     100     1.585     No       10     Archer City     Archer     Rural     1848     5     No     0     0     No       3     Arcola     Fort Bend     Rural     1048     8     No     0     0     No       3     Argyle     Denton     Urb/Exurb.     332969     6     No     2969     1.12     No       4     Arp     Smith     Rural     901     4     No     0     0     No       11     Aroyo Colorado Estates     Cameron     Rural     320     4     No     0     0     No       11     Aroyo Colorado Estates     Cameron     Rural     732     4     No     0     0     No       11     Aroyo Gardans-La Tins     Cameron     Rural     1342     7     No<									<u></u>		1
10   Aransee Poss   San Patricto   Rural   8138   6   No   100   1.585   No     2   Archer City   Archer   Rural   1848   5   No   0   0   No     3   Arcola   Fort Bend   Rural   1048   6   No   0   0   No     3   Angyle   Denton   Urb/Exurb.   2385   5   Yas   0   0   No     3   Angyle   Denton   Urb/Exurb.   332069   6   No   2969   1.12   No     4   Arp   Smith   Rural   320   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Alto   Cameron   Rural   320   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Colorado Estates   Cameron   Rural   785   7   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Gardens-La Tins   Cameron   Rural   1342   7   No   0   0   No     12   Arroyo Gardens-La Tins   Came		and the second se									1
Z     Archer City     Archer     Rural     1848     5     No     0     0     No       3     Arcola     Fort Bend     Rural     1048     8     No     0     0     No       3     Argyle     Denton     Urb/Exurb.     2385     5     Yes     0     0     No       4     Arp     Smith     Rural     901     4     No     0     0     No       1     Aroyo Alto     Cameron     Rural     320     4     No     0     0     No       11     Aroyo Colorado Estates     Cameron     Rural     755     7     No     0     0     No       11     Aroyo Colorado Estates     Cameron     Rural     732     4     No     0     0     No       11     Aroyo Gardens-La Tins     Cameron     Rural     1342     7     No     0     0     No       11     Aroyo Gardens-La Tins     Cameron     Rural     1342     7	_						10		ř		f
B     Arcola     Fort Bend     Rural     1048     6     No     0     0     No       3     Angyle     Denton     U/b/Exurb.     2385     5     Yas     0     0     No       3     Artington     Tarrant     U/b/Exurb.     332969     6     No     2969     1.12     No       4     Arp     Smith     Rural     901     4     No     0     0     No       1     Arroyo Alto     Cameron     Rural     320     4     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Colorado Estatas     Cameron     Rural     755     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Gardans-La Tina     Cameron     Rural     732     4     No     0     0     No       11     Anoyo Gardans-La Tina     Cameron     Rural     732     4     No     0     0     No     1       2     Aspormont     Stonewall     Rural     1342     7 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>and the second se</td> <td></td> <td>the second s</td> <td>and the second se</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ł</td>				and the second se		the second s	and the second se				ł
Argyle     Dentorn     Urb/Exurb.     2385     5     Yes     0     0     No       3     Artington     Tarrant     Urb/Exurb.     332969     6     No     2969     1.12     No       4     Arp     Smith     Rural     901     4     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Alto     Cameron     Rural     320     4     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Colarado Estatas Gameron     Rural     320     4     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Colarado Estatas Gameron     Rural     755     7     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Gardans-La Tins     Cameron     Rural     732     4     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Gardans-La Tins     Cameron     Rural     1342     7     No     0     0     No       12     Aspermont     Stonewait     Rural     1021     5     No <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>_</td><td></td><td>1</td></t<>									_		1
3   Artington   Tarrant   Urb / Exurb.   332969   6   No   2969   1.12   No     4   Arp   Smith   Rural   901   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Alto   Cameron   Rural   320   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Colorado Estates   Cameron   Rural   785   7   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Colorado Estates   Cameron   Rural   732   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Gardens-La Tins   Cameron   Rural   732   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Gardens-La Tins   Cameron   Rural   1342   7   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Gardens-La Tins   Cameron   Rural   1342   7   No   0   0   No     11   Aspermont   Stonewall   Rural   1021   5   No   0   No   16   No   0   No	-						····	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
4     Arp     Smith     Rural     901     4     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Alto     Cameron     Rural     320     4     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Colorado Estates     Gameron     Rural     785     7     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Colorado Estates     Gameron     Rural     732     4     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Gardens-La Tins     Cameron     Rural     732     4     No     0     0     No       11     Arroyo Gardens-La Tins     Cameron     Rural     1342     7     No     0     0     No       11     Aspornoni     Stonewall     Rural     1342     7     No     0     0     No       2     Aspornoni     Stonewall     Rural     1021     5     No     0     No       3     Atascocita     Harris     Urb/Exurb     35767     6	-								<u>i</u>		4
11   Arroyo Alto   Carmeron   Rural   320   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Colorado Estates Carmeron   Rural   785   7   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Gardene-La Tina   Carmeron   Rural   732   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Gardene-La Tina   Carmeron   Rural   732   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Gardene-La Tina   Carmeron   Rural   1342   7   No   0   0   No     11   Aspermont   Stonewall   Rural   1021   5   No   0   0   No     2   Aspermont   Stonewall   Rural   1021   5   No   0   0   No     3   Atascocita   Harris   Urb/Exurb.   35767   6   Yes   0   0   No     4   Athens   Henderson   Rural   5745   5   No   156   1.732   No     3   Autra   Gass </td <td>-</td> <td>The second s</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td>	-	The second s									1
11   Arroyo Colorado Estatas Carmeron   Rural   785   7   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Gardana-La Tina   Carmeron   Rural   732   4   No   0   0   No     11   Arroyo Gardana-La Tina   Carmeron   Rural   732   4   No   0   0   No     11   Ashertan   Dimmit   Rural   1342   7   No   0   0   No     2   Aspermont   Stonewall   Rural   1021   5   No   0   0   No     2   Aspermont   Stonewall   Rural   1021   5   No   0   0   No     3   Atascocita   Harris   Urb/Exurb.   35767   6   Yes   0   0   No     4   Atlanta   Henderson   Rural   11297   5   No   156   1.732   No     4   Allanta   Gaas   Rural   5745   5   No   0   No   No     3   Autora   Wise   Rural </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>and the second second</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b> </b></td>				and the second							<b> </b>
11   Arroyo Gardane-La Tina   Carmeron   Rural   732   4   No   0   0   No     11   Ashertan   Dimmit   Rural   1342   7   No   0   0   No     11   Ashertan   Dimmit   Rural   1342   7   No   0   0   No     2   Aspermont   Stonewall   Rural   1021   5   No   0   0   No     3   Atascocita   Harris   Urb/Exurb.   35767   6   Yes   0   0   No     4   Athens   Henderson   Rural   11297   5   No   156   1.732   No     4   Atlanta   Gaass   Rural   5745   5   No   0   0   No     3   Autrey   Denton   Rural   1500   7   No   0   0   No     3   Autrey   Denton   Rural   853   7   No   0   0   No     3   Autrey   Denton   Rural   856562	_		and the second se		and the second se		the second second				Ye
11   Äsherton   Dimmit   Rural   1342   7   No   0   0   No     2   Asperment   Stonewall   Rural   1021   5   No   0   0   No     3   Atssocita   Harris   Urb/Exarb.   35767   6   Yes   0   0   No     4   Athens   Henderson   Rural   11297   5   No   156   1.732   No     4   Athens   Henderson   Rural   5745   5   No   0   0   No     4   Allanta   Cass   Rural   5745   5   No   0   0   No     3   Aubrey   Denton   Rural   1500   7   No   0   0   No     3   Aurora   Wise   Rural   853   7   No   0   0   No     3   Austra   Urb/Exurb.   656562   6   No   8064   1.577   No     10   Austra   Refugio   Rural   192   7   No<											Ye
2     Aspermoni     Stonewall     Rutal     1021     5     No     0     0     No       3     Atascocita     Harris     Urb/Exurb.     35767     6     Yes     0     0     No       4     Atascocita     Henderson     Rutal     11297     5     No     156     1.732     No       4     Atines     Henderson     Rutal     11297     5     No     156     1.732     No       4     Atlanta     Class     Rural     5745     5     No     0     0     No       3     Autray     Denton     Rural     1500     7     No     0     0     No       3     Aurora     Witee     Rural     853     7     No     0     0     No       3     Aurora     Witee     Rural     853     7     No     0     0     No       4     Avatra     Urb/Exurb.     \$56562     6     No     0     0		the second se	a the second	and the second secon		and an other states of		a second second second	-		Ye
5     Atascocita     Harris     Urb/Exurb.     35767     6     Yes     0     0     No       4     Athens     Henderson     Rural     11297     5     No     156     1.732     No       4     Athens     Henderson     Rural     5745     5     No     0     0     No       4     Atlanta     Cass     Rural     5745     5     No     0     0     No       3     Autora     Denton     Rural     1500     7     No     0     0     No       3     Aurora     Wise     Rural     853     7     No     0     0     No       4     Austin     Travis     Urb./Exurb.     656562     6     No     8064     1.577     No       10     Austeril     Refugio     Rural     192     7     No     0     0     No       4     Avery     Red River     Rural     482     6     No     0			and the second design of the s						and the second data	_	1
4     Athens     Henderson     Rural     11297     5     No     156     1.732     No       4     Atlanta     Gass     Rural     5745     5     No     0     0     No       3     Aubrey     Denton     Rural     1500     7     No     0     0     No       3     Autora     Wise     Rural     853     7     No     0     0     No       3     Aurora     Wise     Rural     853     7     No     0     0     No       7     Austin     Trevia     Urb./Exurb.     658562     6     No     8064     1.577     No       10     Austwell     Refugio     Rural     192     7     No     0     0     No       4     Avery     Red River     Rural     482     6     No     0     0     No       4     Avinger     Cass     Rural     484     7     No     0     0									in the second		Ļ
4     Atlanta     Caass     Rural     5745     5     No     0     0     No       3     Aubrey     Denton     Rural     1500     7     No     0     0     No       3     Aubrey     Denton     Rural     1500     7     No     0     0     No       3     Aurora     Wise     Rural     853     7     No     0     0     No       7     Austin     Travia     Urb./Exurb.     656562     6     No     8064     1.577     No       10     Austweil     Refugio     Rural     192     7     No     0     0     No       4     Avery     Red River     Rural     482     6     No     0     0     No       4     Avinger     Caas     Rural     484     7     No     0     0     No       3     Azia     Tarrant     Urb./Exurb.     9800     5     Yes     140     1.691 </td <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>······································</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Ye</td>	-			······································							Ye
3     Autray     Denton     Rural     1500     7     No     0     0     No       3     Aurora     Wise     Rural     853     7     No     0     0     No       3     Aurora     Wise     Rural     853     7     No     0     0     No       7     Austin     Travia     Urb./Exurb.     656562     6     No     8064     1.577     No       10     Austweil     Refugio     Rural     192     7     No     0     0     No       4     Avery     Red River     Rural     482     6     No     0     0     No       4     Avinger     Caas     Rural     484     7     No     0     0     No       3     Azia     Tarrant     Urb./Exurb.     9800     5     Yes     140     1.891     No	-						la serie de la companya d				ł
3     Aurora     Wise     Rural     853     7     No     0     0     No       7     Austin     Travia     Urb/Exurb.     656562     6     No     8064     1.577     No       10     Austwell     Refugio     Rural     192     7     No     0     0     No       4     Avery     Red River     Rural     482     6     No     0     0     No       4     Avinger     Casas     Rural     484     7     No     0     0     No       3     Azia     Tarrant     Urb/Exurb.     9800     5     Yes     140     1.891     No		The second s		the second s				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		No	1
Austin     Travia     Urb./Exurb.     656562     6     No     8064     1.577     No       IO Austwell     Refugio     Rural     192     7     No     0     0     No       I Avery     Red Rivar     Rural     482     6     No     0     0     No       I Avery     Red Rivar     Rural     482     6     No     0     0     No       I Avery     Red Rivar     Rural     484     7     No     0     0     No       A Avinger     Casas     Rural     484     7     No     0     0     No       Azia     Tarrant     Urb./Exurb.     9800     5     Yes     140     1.691     No	-				and the second se		and the second second	_	_		1
IO Austwell Refugio Rural 192 7 No 0 0 No   I Avery Red River Rural 482 6 No 0 0 No   I Avery Red River Rural 482 6 No 0 0 No   I Avinger Cass Rural 484 7 No 0 0 No   3 Azia Tarrant Urb./Exurb. 9800 5 Yes 140 1.891 No	}	Aurora	Wise			7		-	-	No	J
4     Avery     Red River     Rural     482     6     No     0     0     No       4     Avinger     Ceas     Rural     484     7     No     0     0     No       3     Azia     Terrant     Urb./Exurb.     9800     5     Yes     140     1.891     No	1	Austin	Travia	Urb./Exurb.	656562	6	No	8064	1.577	No	]
4     Avinger     Cess     Rural     464     7     No     0     0     No       3     Azis     Terrant     Urb./Exurb.     9800     5     Yes     140     1.891     No	10	Austwell	Refugio	Rural	192	7	No	0	0	No	
3 Azia Terrant Urb./Exurb. 9800 5 Yes 140 1.891 No	•	Avery	Red River	Rural	462	6	No	0	0	No	]
	•	Avinger	Cass	Rural	484	7	No	0	0	No	
3 (Sacilif (Galveston Urb./Exurb. 18962 17 Ves 10 10 No	3	Azia	Tarrant	Urb./Exurb.	9800	5	Yes	140	1.891	No	]
The second	i T	Bacliff	Galveston	Urb./Exurb.	6962	7	Yes	0	0	No	Ye

•••

... ....

••••••

•• ••••••

•••

.....

. . . . . . ..

Page 2 of 29 3/1/2007 23 m.

. . . . .

- 27.7

بالمحاجب وموجوع والمقوق والمجروب والمحاج والموجوع والمحاج المراجع

Instructions: Complete the following form and indicate all points requested for this Application. All evidence as required by §49.9(i) must be submitted as outlined in the Application Submission Procedures Manual.

§49.9(l)	ASP Tab		Points ueste
(I).	2	Financial Feasibility of the Development (28 points)	28
(2)		Quantifiable Community Participation (Points Not Requested in Self Score)	N/A
(3)	3	The Income Levels of Tenants of the Davelopment (22 Point Maximum)	22
(4)	4	The Size of the Units (Development Characteristics) (20 Points Maximum for Part A and B combined)	20
(5)	5	The Communent of Development Funding by Local Political Subdivisions (18 Politis Maximum)	18
(6)		The Level of Community Support from State Elected Officials (Points Not Requested in Self Score)	N/A
(7)	6	The Rent Levels of the Units (12 Points Maximum)	12
(8)	7	The Cost of the Development by Square Foot (Development Characteristics) (10 Points)	10
(9)	8	The Services to be Provided to Tenants of the Development (8 Points Maximum for Part A and B Combined)	8
(10)	N/A	Rehabilitation or Reconstruction (7 Points)	Q
COD.	IN/A	Hönaing Needs Characterialus (7) Pointa Maximum) to an	<u>6</u>
(12)	9	Development Includes the Use of Existing Housing as part of a Community Revitalization Plan (Development Characteristics) (7 Points)	2
(13)	10	Pro-Application Participation Incentive Points (6 Points)	6
(14)	[11]	Development Location (4 Points)	4
(15)	N/A	Exurban Developments (Development characteristics) (7 Points)	Q
(16)	12	Demonstration of Community Support other than Quantifiable Community Participation (To be awarded points, points must be requested by checking the box, but points are not added into Total Self Score)	
(17)	13	Developments in Census Tracts with No Other Existing Developments Supported by Tax Credits (7 Points)	1
(18)	14	Tenant Populations with Special Housing Needs (4 Points)	4
(19)	15	Length of Affordability Period (4 Points Maximum)	4
(20)	16	Site Characteristics (+4 Points Maximum for Part A and B Combined. Note: may be as low as -5 Points)	4
(21)	17	Davelopment Size (3 Points)	2
(22)	18	Qualified Census Tracts with Rovitalization (1 Point)	
(23)	19	Sponsor Characteristics (2 Points)	Q

#### -2 - 12/13/2006 Version

a sas

Balat n. Salin

ATTACHMENT 4





ANTACHMENT 6



US Carus Act ... Shocks

Boundaries State State State Stream Strea

N Street StreanMaterboty N StreanMaterboty Boundaries State V 05 County V 05 Place N Najor Road Features

Section 20

Plans in

ATTACHMENT 7



US Census 2005 Cites-trus

ATTACHMENT  $\mathcal{H}$ 



May 22, 2007

RE: Trosper Rd. Development

To Whom It May Concern:

The City of Alton confirms based on the attached map, that the proposed development

along N. Trosper Rd. (42-4) is inside of the city's current city boundaries.

If anyone has any further questions regarding this matter, please call me at (956) 581-2733.

Sincerely,

David Deleon

David Deleon' Planning Director City of Alton "City on the Grow"



Proposed Case Alton TDHCA# 97302
Development

#### UNIMPROVED PROPERTY CONTRACT

- 1. PARTIES: CARLOS L. GUERRA: and EUGBNIO BOTELLO(Seller) agrees to sell and convey to <u>NATIONAL FARM WORKERS SERVICE CENTER. INC., a Texas</u> corporation(Buyer) and Buyer agrees to buy from Seller the property described below.
- 2. PROPERTY: A TRACT OF LAND OUT OF THE SOUTH 26.00 ACRES OUT OF LOT 42:45 WEST ADDITION TO SHARYLAND, HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN ATTACHED EXHIBIT 'A", known as , or as described on attached exhibit together with all rights, privileges and appurtenances pertaining thereto, including but not limited to water rights, claims, permits, strips and gores, casements, and cooperative or association memberships (the Property).

#### 3. SALES PRICE:

Α.	Cash portion of Sales Price, payable by Buyer at closing \$22,000.00 Per acre based on survey. Estima	te \$ <u>439,780.00</u>
B,	Sum of all financing described below (excluding any loan funding fee or mortgage insurance premium)	\$ Q
cal.	ಲಿ ಕನ್ನು ಬಿ. ಬಿಡುವಳು ಬಿಡುವಳು ಜೀವಿಕೆ ಕ್ಲೇರ್ ಜಿಲ್ಲೇ ಕೆಯಲ್	an antista antista i

C. Sales Price (Sum of A and B)

\$ 439,780.00

- 4. FINANCING: Not Applicable
- 5. EARNEST MONEY: in five business days of execution of this contract by both parties, Buyer shall deposit \$10,000.00 as non-refundable earnest money of which \$1,000.00 is the option fee described below with <u>FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE CO.</u>, as escrow agent, at <u>515 CONGRESS AVE</u>. Suite 1310, Austin, Texas 78701. All earnest money will be credited to the sales price. If Buyer fails to deposit the earnest money as required by this contract, Buyer will be in default.

#### 6. TITLE POLICY AND SURVEY;

- A. TITLE POLICY: Seller shall furnish to Buyer at Seller's and Buyer's equal expense an owner policy of title insurance (the Title Policy) issued by <u>FIDELITY</u> <u>NATIONAL TITLECO.</u> (the Title Company) in the amount of the Sales Price, dated at or after closing, insuring Buyer against loss under the provisions of the Title Policy, subject to the promulgated exclusions (including existing building and zoning ordinances) and the following exceptions:
  - (1) Restrictive covenants common to the platted subdivision in which the Property is located.
  - (2) The standard printed exception for standby fees, taxes and assessments.
  - (3) Liens created as part of the financing described in Paragraph 4.
  - (4) Utility easements created by the dedication deed or plat of the subdivision in

<u>о</u>

Initialed for identification by Buyer \_\_\_\_\_

A harden and a second





February 16, 2007.

Ms. Monica Poss.

Dear Ms. Poss,

This letter certifies that the Southeast part of the Lot 42-4 West Addition to Sharyland is currently zoned Residential Division 3 as per City of Alton Comprehensive Zoning Plan.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please call me at (956) 581-2733.

Sincerely,

David Dokon

David Deleon Planning and Zoning Director City of Alton Gmail - AHNS and 2x per Capita Questions



alyssa carpenter <ajcarpen@gmall.com>

## **AHNS and 2x per Capita Questions**

Audrey Martin <audrey.martin@tdhca.state.tx.us>

Mon, Apr 23, 2007 at 4:19 PM

To: alyssa carpenter <ajcarpen@gmail.com> Cc: brenda.hull@tdhca.state.tx.us, Robbye Meyer <rmeyer@tdhca.state.tx.us>

Alyssa,

The municipality in which the development is now located should be used for AHNS and 2X per capita. Although 2000 census data is used, the current location of the development should be used for both items. Please let me know if this changes anything for one of your applications.

As for 07153, according to my records a threshold review has not been performed.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

Audrey M. Martin

**Competitive HTC Program Administrator** 

Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs

Ph: (512) 475-3872

Fax: (512) 475-0764

audrey.martin@tdhca.state.tx.us

[Quoted text hidden]

# 07302 Challenge Response

# Rufino Contreras Affordable Housing Corporation, Inc.

908 E. 5th Street, Suite 201, Austin, TX 78702- Tel. (512) 474-5003 Fax- (512) 474-5010 a subsidiary corporation of the National Farm Workers Service Center, Inc.

May 25, 2007

Ms. Audrey Martin Multifamily Finance Division Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs PO Box 13941 Austin, TX 78711

Re: Challenge to 2007 HTC Application 07302, Casa Alton

Dear Ms Martin,

Please accept this letter as a response to the challenge to the above referenced application. Casa Alton should be considered to be located in Alton North, not Alton, and receive the 6 points requested in the application for Affordable Housing Needs Score.

The challenge argues that the proposed site, on northwest corner of Trosper Road and proposed Oxford Street is in the City of Alton and not in Alton North according to the US Census's 2005 city and town information. We argue that this source of information is not valid in determining the place or area in which a site is located.

There is not a single instance of the TDHCA referring applicants to US Census 2005 data and there are at least four instances in the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules and at least three instances in the Reference Manual which refer to the most recent decennial census (i.e. the 2000 Census) as the source of data:

- §49.3 (11) (A) defines Area as the geographic area contained within the boundaries of...Census Designated Place (CDP) as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census. (Exhibit A)
- §49.6 (g) states that...the Board will not allocate housing tax credits for a...Development located in a census tract that has more than 30% Housing Tax Credit Units per total households in the census tracts as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census. (Exhibit B)
- §49.6 (h) (1) state that staff will only recommend a 30% increase in Eligible Basis if...(2) The Development is located in a Qualified Census Tract that has less than 40% Housing Tax Credit Units per households in the tract as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census. (Exhibit C)
- §49.8 (i) (15) states that applications may qualify to receive 7 points if the Development is not located in a Rural Area and has a population less than 100,000 based on the most current Decennial Census. (Exhibit D)
- The 2007 Reference Manual List of Items on the TDHCA website directs applicants to go to <u>http://qct.huduser.org/index.html</u> in order to find Qualified Census Tracts and Difficult Development Areas. This web page is a Qualified Census Tract Generator that states that the





908 E. 5th Street, Suite 201, Austin, TX 78702- Tel. (512) 474-5003 Fax- (512) 474-5010 a subsidiary corporation of the National Farm Workers Service Center, Inc.

2007 QCTs are based on new metropolitan area geography and a new, more detailed tabulation of household income at the census tract level from the 2000 Census. (Exhibit E)

- The Reference Manual also directs applicants to the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics as of 4/12/2007 Board Meeting – Place Level. This document states that a site located outside the boundaries of a place (as designated by the 2000 U.S. Census) will use the Affordable Housing Needs Score of the place whose boundary is closest to the site. (Exhibit F)
- The Reference Manual also directs applicants to the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics as of April 12, 2007 Board Meeting Tract Level. This document lists the 2000 U.S. Census as the tract data source. (Exhibit G)

In addition to the references to the Decennial Census in the QAP and Reference Manual, the TDHCA staff accepted a response to a deficiency notice to application #060047, stating that the same site should be considered in Alton North, not the City of Alton. A copy of the deficiency and response are attached as well.

The TDHCA, by referencing the 2000 Census and the Decennial Census as a source of information regarding HTC applications, not only implies that this is a valid source for determining the Area where a site is located but also states such:

§49.3 (11) (A) The geographic area contained within the boundaries of:

- (i) An incorporated place or
- (ii) Census Designated Place (CDP) as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census.

The QAP does not specify which of these two options, or definitions, takes precedence. Though the site where 07302 is proposed to be developed has been annexed into City of Alton boundaries in the recent past, it is also in the Alton North CDP as established by the 2000 census. In essence both definitions are true. However, given that we are relying upon the Reference Manual (and thus the 2000 Census) for other data, we cannot include our site in Alton without invalidating all of the other data we rely upon for application purposes.

If the TDHCA required applicants use the most recent site location boundaries in determining Area, updated on an annual basis as cities annex land block by block, then all data pertaining to these Areas would need to be updated as well. For instance, changing the geographical boundaries of any Area would necessitate a change in that place's population, HTC units in place, Place Per Capita/TX Per Capita, and possibly the Area Type. These new boundaries would also result in changes regarding the items previously mentioned in the QAP, namely issues such as determining census tracts that have more than 30% Housing Tax Credit Units per household, Eligible Basis, and Exurban points. Since this data is not updated on an annual basis, the TDHCA and the applicants rely on more static data, namely the decennial census, to keep all statistics pertinent.

If we were to designate Alton and not Alton North as our development's Area, the information cited in the Reference Manual for Alton would not apply to our site location. For example, the Reference Manual states that Alton has a population of 4,384. That population statistic does not include the





# Rufino Contreras Affordable Housing Corporation, Inc.

908 E. 5th Street, Suite 201, Austin, TX 78702- Tel. (512) 474-5003 Fax- (512) 474-5010 a subsidiary corporation of the National Farm Workers Service Center, Inc.

geographical area where our proposed development would be located, does not include the people who live on land annexed by the City of Alton since 2000. If we were to designate Alton and not Alton North as our Area, ALL data we would draw from the Reference Manual would be irrelevant to the geographical location of our project. Therfore, it is the Alton North data in the Reference Manual that most accurately reflects the population and housing characteristics of our geography.

Based on this information, we request that application 07302 receive 6 points for the 2007 Affordable Housing Needs Score.

Sincerely,

Jean Coburn Project Manager



### EXHIBIT 2007 Housing Tax Credit Program Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules

(4) Applicable Fraction--The fraction used to determine the Qualified Basis of the qualified low-income building, which is the smaller of the Unit fraction or the floor space fraction, all determined as provided in the Code, §42(c)(1).

(5) Applicable Percentage--The percentage used to determine the amount of the Housing Tax Credit for any Development (New Construction, Reconstruction, and/or Rehabilitation), as defined more fully in the Code, \$42(b).

(A) For purposes of the Application, the Applicable Percentage will be projected at :

(i) 40 basis points over the current applicable percentage for 70 percent present value credits, pursuant to \$42(b) of the Code for the month in which the Application is submitted to the Department, or

(ii) 15 basis points over the current applicable percentage for 30 percent present value credits, pursuant to \$42(b) of the Code for the month in which the Application is submitted to the Department.

(B) For purposes of making a credit recommendation at any other time, the Applicable Percentage will be based in order of priority on:

(i) The percentage indicated in the Agreement and Election Statement, if executed: or

(ii) The actual applicable percentage as determined by the Code, \$42(b), if all or part of the Development has been placed in service and for any buildings not placed in service the percentage will be the actual percentage as determined by Code, \$42(b) for the most current month; or

(iii) The percentage as calculated in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph if the Agreement and Election Statement has not been executed and no buildings have been placed in service.

(6) Applicant-Any Person or Affiliate of a Person who files a Pre-Application or an Application with the Department requesting a Housing Credit Allocation. (\$2306.6702)

(7) Application -- An application, in the form prescribed by the Department, filed with the Department by an Applicant, including any exhibits or other supporting material. (\$2306.6702)

(8) Application Acceptance Period - That period of time during which Applications for a Housing Credit Allocation from the State Housing Credit Ceiling may be submitted to the Department as more fully described in \$49.9(a) and \$49.21 of this title. For Tax-Exempt Bond Developments this period is the date the Volume 1 and 2 are submitted or the date the reservation is issued by the Texas Bond Review Board, whichever is earlier, and for Rural Rescue Applications this is that period of time stated in the Rural Rescue Policy.

(9) Application Round--The period beginning on the date the Department begins accepting Applications for the State Housing Credit Ceiling and continuing until all available Housing Tax Credits from the State Housing Credit Ceiling (as stipulated by the Department) are allocated, but not extending past the last day of the calendar year. (§2306.6702)

(10) Application Submission Procedures Manual--The manual produced and amended from time to time by the Department which sets forth procedures, forms, and guidelines for the filing of Pre-Applications and Applications for Housing Tax Credits.

(11) Area--

(A)The geographic area contained within the boundaries of:

(i) An incorporated place or

(ii) Census Designated Place (CDP) as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent

Decennial Census.

(B) For Developments located outside the boundaries of an incorporated place or CDP, the Development shall take up the Area characteristics of the incorporated place or CDP whose boundary is nearest to the Development site.

(12) Area Median Gross Income (AMGI)--Area median gross household income, as determined for all purposes under and in accordance with the requirements of the Code, §42.

(13) At-Risk Development--a Development that: (\$2306.6702)

(A) has received the benefit of a subsidy in the form of a below-market interest rate loan, interest rate reduction, rental subsidy, Section 8 housing assistance payment, rental supplement payment, rental assistance payment, or equity incentive under at least one of the following federal laws, as applicable:

(i) Sections 221(d)(3) and (5), National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. \$17151);

(ii) Section 236, National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. \$1715z-1);

(iii) Section 202, Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. \$1701q);

(iv) Section 101, Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. \$1701s);

(v) the Section 8 Additional Assistance Program for housing Developments with HUD-Insured and HUD-Held Mortgages administered by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(vi) the Section 8 Housing Assistance Program for the Disposition of HUD-Owned Projects administered by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development;

> (vii) Sections 514, 515, and 516, Housing Act of 1949 (\$42U.S.C. \$\$1484, 1485, and 1486); or (viii) Section 42, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. \$42), and

> > 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules Page 3 of 65

#### 2007 Housing Tax Credit Program Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules

Applications are not subject to these Housing Tax Credit limitations, and Tax-Exempt Bond Developments will not count towards the total limit on tax credits per Applicant. The limitation does not apply (\$2306.6711(b)):

(1) to an entity which raises or provides equity for one or more Developments, solely with respect to its actions in raising or providing equity for such Developments (including syndication related activities as agent on behalf of investors);

(2) to the provision by an entity of "qualified commercial financing" within the meaning of the Code (without regard to the 80% limitation thereof);

(3) to a Qualified Nonprofit Organization or other not-for-profit entity, to the extent that the participation in a Development by such organization consists only of the provision of loan funds, grants or social services; and

(4) to a Development Consultant with respect to the provision of consulting services, provided the Development Consultant fee received for such services does not exceed 10% of the fee to be paid to the Developer (or 20% for Qualified Nonprofit Developments), or \$150,000, whichever is greater.

(e) Limitations on the Size of Developments.

(1) The minimum Development size will be 16 Units if the Development involves Housing Tax Credits. The minimum Development size will be 4 Units if the funding source only involves the Housing Trust Fund or HOME Program.

(2) Rural Developments involving any New Construction (excluding New Construction of non-residential buildings) will be limited to 76 Units. Rural Developments involving only Rehabilitation do not have a size limitation.

(3) Developments involving any New Construction (excluding New Construction of non-residential buildings), that are not Tax-Exempt Bond Developments, will be limited to 252 Total Units, wherein the maximum Department administered Units will be limited to 200 Units. Tax-Exempt Bond Developments will be limited to 252 Total Units. These maximum Unit limitations also apply to those Developments which involve a combination of Rehabilitation, Reconstruction, and New Construction. Developments that consist solely of acquisition/Rehabilitation or Rehabilitation only may exceed the maximum Unit restrictions.

(4) For those Developments which are a second phase or are otherwise adjacent to an existing tax credit Development unless such proposed Development is being constructed to provide replacement of previously existing affordable multifamily units on its site (in a number not to exceed the original units being replaced, unless a market study supports the absorption of additional units) or that were originally located within a one mile radius from the proposed Development, the combined Unit total for the Developments may not exceed the maximum allowable Development size, unless the first phase has been completed and has attained Sustaining Occupancy (as defined in \$1.31 of this title) for at least six months.

(f) Limitations on the Location of Developments. Staff will only recommend, and the Board may only allocate, housing tax credits from the Credit Ceiling to more than one Development from the Credit Ceiling in the same calendar year if the Developments are, or will be, located more than one linear mile apart as determined by the Department. If the Board forward commits credits from the following year's allocation of credits, the Development is considered to be in the calendar year in which the Board votes, not in the year of the Credit Ceiling. This limitation applies only to communities contained within counties with populations exceeding one million (which for calendar year 2007 are Harris, Dallas, Tarrant and Bexar Counties). For purposes of this rule, any two sites not more than one linear mile apart are deemed to be "in a single community." (\$2306.6711) This restriction does not apply to the allocation of housing tax credits to Developments financed through the Tax-Exempt Bond program, including the Tax-Exempt Bond Developments under review and existing Tax-Exempt Bond Developments in the Department's portfolio. (\$2306.67021)

(g) Limitations of Development in Certain Census Tracts. Staff will not recommend and the Board will not allocate housing tax credits for a Competitive Housing Tax Credit or Tax Exempt Bond Development located in a census tract that has more than 30% Housing Tax Credit Units per total households in the census tract as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census unless the Applicant:

(1) In an area whose population is less than 100,000;

(2) Proposes only Reconstruction or Rehabilitation (excluding New Construction of non-residential buildings); or,

(3) Submits to the Department an approval of the Development referencing this rule in the form of a resolution from the governing body of the appropriate municipality or county containing the Development. For purposes of this paragraph, evidence of the local government approval must be received by the Department no later than April 2, 2007 (or for Tax-Exempt Bond Developments no later than 14 days before the Board meeting where the credits will be committed). These ineligible census tracts are outlined in the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics Report.

2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules Page 15 of 65

#### 2007 Housing Tax Credit Program Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules

(h) Limitations on Developments Proposing to Qualify for a 30% increase in Eligible Basis. Staff will only recommend a 30% increase in Eligible Basis:

(1) If the Development proposing to build in a Hurricane Rita Gulf Opportunity Zone (Rita GO Zone), which was designated as a Difficult to Develop Area as determined by HB4440, is able to be placed in service by December 31, 2008 (or date as revised by the Internal Revenue Service) as certified in the Application; or,

(2) The Development is located in a Qualified Census Tract that has less than 40% Housing Tax Credit Units per households in the tract as established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the most recent Decennial Census. Developments located in a Qualified Census Tract that has in excess of 40% Housing Tax Credit Units per households in the tract are not eligible to qualify for a 30% increase in Eligible Basis, which would otherwise be available for the Development site pursuant to the Code, \$42(d)(5)(C), unless the Development is proposing only Reconstruction or Rehabilitation (excluding New Construction of non-residential buildings). These ineligible Qualified Census Tracts are outlined in the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics Report.

(i) **Rehabilitation Costs.** Developments involving Rehabilitation must establish that the Rehabilitation will substantially improve the condition of the housing and will involve at least \$12,000 per Unit in direct hard costs (including site work, contingency, contractor profit, overhead and general requirements) unless financed with TX-USDA-RHS in which case the minimum is \$6,000.

(j) Unacceptable Sites. Developments will be ineligible if the Development is located on a site that is determined to be unacceptable by the Department.

(k) Appeals and Administrative Deficiencies for Site and Development Restrictions. An Application or Development found to be in violation under subsections (a) - (h) of this section will be notified in accordance with the Administrative Deficiency process described in 49.9(d)(4) of this title. They may also utilize the appeals process described in 49.17(b) of this title.

#### \$49.7. Regional Allocation Formula; Set-Asides; Redistribution of Credits.

(a) Regional Allocation Formula. As required by \$2306.111(d), Texas Government Code, the Department uses a regional distribution formula developed by the Department to distribute credits from the State Housing Credit Ceiling to all urban/exurban areas and rural areas. The formula is based on the need for housing assistance, and the availability of housing resources in those urban/exurban areas and rural areas, and the Department uses the information contained in the Department's annual state low income housing plan and other appropriate data to develop the formula. This formula establishes separate targeted tax credit amounts for rural areas and urban/exurban areas within each of the Uniform State Service Regions. Each Uniform State Service Region's targeted tax credit amount will be published on the Department's web site. The regional allocation for rural areas is referred to as the Rural Regional Allocation and the regional allocation for urban/exurban areas is referred to as the Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation. Developments gualifying for the Rural Regional Allocation must meet the Rural Development definition. At least 5% of each region's allocation for each calendar year shall be allocated to Developments which are financed through TX-USDA-RHS, that meet the definition of a Rural Development, do not exceed 76 Units if proposing any New Construction (excluding New Construction of nonresidential buildings), and have filed an "Intent to Request 2007 Housing Tax Credits" form by the Pre-Application submission deadline. These Developments will be attributed to the Rural Regional Allocation in each region where they are located. Developments financed through TX-USDA-RHS's 538 Guaranteed Rural Rental Housing Program will be considered under this set-aside. Any Rehabilitation or Reconstruction of an existing 515 development that retains the 515 loan and restrictions, regardless of the source or nature of additional financing, will be considered under this set-aside. Commitments of 2007 Housing Tax Credits issued by the Board in 2006 will be applied to each Set-Aside, Rural Regional Allocation, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation and TX-USDA-RHS Allocation for the 2007 Application Round as appropriate.

(b) **Set-Asides.** An Applicant may elect to compete in as many of the following Set-Asides for which the proposed Development qualifies: (\$2306.111(d))

(1) At least 10% of the State Housing Credit Ceiling for each calendar year shall be allocated to Qualified Nonprofit Developments which meet the requirements of the Code, \$42(h)(5). Qualified Nonprofit Organizations must have the Controlling interest in the Qualified Nonprofit Development applying for this Set-Aside. If the organization's Application is filed on behalf of a limited partnership, the Qualified Nonprofit Organization must be the controlling managing General Partner. If the organization's Application is filed on behalf of a limited liability company, the Qualified Nonprofit Organization must be the controlling Managing Member. Additionally, a Qualified Nonprofit Development submitting an Application in the nonprofit set-aside must have the nonprofit entity or its nonprofit affiliate or subsidiary be the Developer or a co-Developer as evidenced in the development agreement. (\$2306.6729 and \$2306.6706(b))

2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules Page 16 of 65
## EXHIBIT D

#### 2007 Housing Tax Credit Program Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules

paragraph. Areas qualifying under any one of the subparagraphs (A) - (G) of this paragraph will receive 4 points. An Application may only receive points under one of the subparagraphs (A) - (G) of this paragraph.

(A) A geographical Area which is an Economically Distressed Area; a Colonia; or a Difficult Development Area (DDA) as specifically designated by the Secretary of HUD at the time of Application submission (\$2306.127).

(B) a designated state or federal empowerment/enterprise zone, urban enterprise community, or urban enhanced enterprise community. Such Developments must submit a letter and a map from a city/county official verifying that the proposed Development is located within such a designated zone. Letter should be no older than 6 months from the first day of the Application Acceptance Period. (General Appropriation Act, Article VII. Rider 6: \$2306,127)

(C) the Development is located in a county that has received an award as of November 15, 2006, within the past three years, from the Texas Department of Agriculture's Rural Municipal Finance Program or Real Estate Development and Infrastructure Program. Cities which have received one of these awards are categorized as awards to the county as a whole so Developments located in a different city than the city awarded, but in the same county, will still be eligible for these points.

(D) the Development is located in a census tract which has a median family income (MFI), as published by the United States Bureau of the Census (U.S. Census), that is higher than the median family income for the county in which the census tract is located. This comparison shall be made using the most recent data available as of the date the Application Round opens the year preceding the applicable program year. Developments eligible for these points must submit evidence documenting the median income for both the census tract and the county. These Census Tracts are outlined in the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics Report.

(E) the proposed Development will serve families with children (at least 70% of the Units must have an eligible bedroom mix of two bedrooms or more) and is proposed to be located in an elementary school attendance zone of an elementary school that has an academic rating of "Exemplary" or "Recognized," or comparable rating if the rating system changes. The date for consideration of the attendance zone is that in existence as of the opening date of the Application Round and the academic rating is the most current rating determined by the Texas Education Agency as of that same date. (\$42(m)(1)(C)(vii))

(F) the proposed Development will expand affordable housing opportunities for low-income families with children outside of poverty areas. This must be demonstrated by showing that the Development will serve families with children (at least 70% of the Units must have an eligible bedroom mix of two bedrooms or more) and that the census tract in which the Development is proposed to be located has no greater than 10% poverty population according to the most recent census data. (\$42(m)(1)(C)(vii)) These Census Tracts are outlined in the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics Report.

(15) Exurban Developments (Development characteristics). (\$2306.6725(a)(4); \$42(m)(1)(C)(i)) Applications may qualify to receive 7 points if the Development is not located in a Rural Area and has a population less than 100,000 based on the most current Decennial Census

(16) Demonstration of Community Support other than Quantifiable Community Participation: If an Applicant requests these points on the self scoring form and correctly certifies to the Department that there are no neighborhood organizations that meet the Department's definition of Neighborhood Organization pursuant to \$49.9(i)(2)(A)(iv) of this title and 12 points were awarded under paragraph (2) of this subsection, then that Applicant may receive two points for each letter of support submitted from a community or civic organization that serves the community in which the site is located. Letters of support must identify the specific Development and must state support of the specific Development at the proposed location. The community or civic organization must provide some documentation of its existence in the community to include, but not be limited to, listing of services and/or members, brochures, annual reports, etc. Letters of support from organizations that are not active in the area that includes the location of the Development will not be counted. For purposes of this item, community and civic organizations do not include neighborhood organizations, governmental entities, taxing entities or educational activities. Letters of support received after March 1, 2007, will not be accepted for this item. Two points will be awarded for each letter of support submitted in the Application, not to exceed 7 points. Should an Applicant elect this option and the Application receives letters in opposition by March 1, 2007, then two points will be subtracted from the score for each letter in opposition, provided that the letter is from an organization serving the community. At no time will the Application, however, receive a score lower than zero for this item.

(17) Developments in Census Tracts with No Other Existing Developments Supported by Tax Credits: The Application may receive 7 points if the proposed Development is located in a census tract in which there are no other existing developments supported by housing tax credits. Applicant must provide evidence of the census

> 2007 Qualitied Allocation Plan and Rules Page 43 of 65

EXHIBIT F.

## **Qualified Census Tract Table Generator**

This page allows you to generate Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Qualified Census Tract (QCT) tables for individual counties, individual metropolitan areas, nonmetropolitan parts of individual States, all counties in a single State, the complete table for all metropolitan areas, and the complete table for all nonmetropolitan parts of States. Simply click the appropriate button below.

Geocoded lists of all Qualified Census Tracts are available in WinZip-archived dBase files. | 2006 | 2007 |

#### Notes on 2007 QCTs

The 2007 QCTs are based on new metropolitan area geography and a new, more detailed tabulation of household income at the census tract level from the 2000 Census. See the latest <u>Designation</u> <u>Notice</u> for information on the application of new metropolitan area geography. An explanation of the new, more detailed tabulation of household income at the census tract level from the 2000 Census used to designate the 2007 QCTs, and a downloadable data file, are available <u>here</u>.

Excel spreadheets containing the <u>data</u> used to designate the 2007 QCTs are available <u>here</u>. The designation <u>algorithm</u> can be read <u>here</u>.

Select Individual County/Metro Area/Magnetro State Table

Select Year:

C 2006

© 2007 Generate Complete Metro Table

The Complete Metro Table is available as an Adobe Acrobat (\*.PDF) file formatted for optimal printing. | 2006 | 2007 |

Select Year:

**^** 2006

© 2007 Generate Complete Nonmelle Table

The Complete Nonmetro Table is available as an Adobe Acrobat (\*.PDF) file formatted for optimal printing. | 2006 | 2007 |

Difficult Development Area Tables Select Year:

C 2006 (updated to include changes related to the Gulf Opportunity Zone Act of 2005)

2007

Generate DDA Tables

The Difficult Development Area tables are available as Adobe Acrobat (\*.PDF) files formatted for optimal printing.

| Metro DDAs 2006 | Nonmetro DDAs 2006 | | Metro DDAs 2007 | Nonmetro DDAs 2007

To determine the census tract number for a particular address, visit the <u>HUD User GIS Service --</u> <u>Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Qualified Census Tract (QCT) Locator</u>, or for Guam and Northern Marianas Island locations, the <u>Small Business Administration (SBA) HUB Zone Locator</u>.

http://qct.huduser.org/index.html

# EXHIBIT F



### 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics as of 04/12/2007 Board Meeting

#### Place Level - Sorted by Place

Instructions:

A site located outside the boundaries of a place (as designated by the 2000 U.S. Census) will use the Affordable Housing Need Score of the place whose boundary is closest to the site.

If information for a specific place is not included in the table, then contact TDHCA's Division of Policy and Public Affairs at (512) 475-3976. All other questions relating to scoring an application should be submitted in writing to Jason Burr via emeil at Jason burr@tdhca.state.tx.us.

#### Notes:

(1) These area designations may be updated when TX-USDA-RHS releases the 2007 areas eligible for funding or applicants may petition TDHCA to update the "Rural" designation of a place within a metropolitan statistical area by providing a letter from a local official. Such letter must clearly indicate that the place has an incorporated area boundary that touches the boundary of another place with a population of over 20,000. Such petitions should be submitted to the TDHCA Division of Policy and Public Affairs via small at Info@tdhca.state.tx.us or fax at (512) 475-3746. To treat all applicants equitably, such letter must be provided to TDHCA prior to the commencement of the pre-application submission period for HTC applications. The results of such petitions will be posted on the HTC application updates portion of the website at http://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/lihtc.htm and any changes to the area designations will be e-mailed to the applicant contact e-mail adderesses as listed in the application.

(2) QAP 49.9(i)(11), Affordable Housing Needs Score - The number represented for the place is the number of points that may be requested for a Competitive Housing Tax Credit Application for the 2007 Application Round.

(3) QAP 49.9(i)(15), Exurban Points - The "Yes" or "No" in this column for each place indicates whether a Competitive Housing Tax Credit Application in the place is eligible for Exurban points.

(4) QAP 49.5(a)(7), 2X Per Capita - A "Yes" in this column for a place indicates that the place violates the 2X per capita limitation; a "No" indicates that the place does not violate the 2X per capita limitation. HTC Unit Data is based on Board approvals through 12/14/2006. Population data is based on Texas State Data Center 06 Population Estimate. A site located outside the boundaries of an incorporated place will use the County HTC per capita. The HTC per capita status of the Census Designated Places (CDP) shown in the table below is based on the county per capita.

Region	88 9	E County	Area Type-Rural or Urban/Exurban (1)	2000 Cersus Population	) ( cn. Mifordable Housing Need Score (2)	Eligible for Exurban Points (3)	HTC Units àn Place	Place Per Capita/TX Per Capita	PI Per Cap >2x TX Per Cap (4)	COP	Status Changed from Previous Analysis
-	Abbott		Rurai	300	5	No	0		No		
	Abernathy	Hale	Rural	2839	5	NO	24	1.17			
	Abilene	Taylor	Urb./Exurb.	115930		No	823	0.97		_	
11	Abram-Perezville	Hidalgo	Rural	5444		No	0		No	Yes	
12	Ackerly	Dawson	Rurai	245		No	0		No		
	Addison	Dallas	Urb./Exurb.	14166		Yes	0		No		
	Adrian	Oldham	Rural	159		No	0		No		
	Agua Dulce (El Paso		Rural	738		No	0		No	Yes	
10	Agua Dulce (Nueces	Nueces	Rural	737		No	Ó		No		
	Airport Road Additio	Brooks	Rural	132		No	0		No	Yes	
11	Alamo	Hidalgo	Urb./Exurb.	14760		Yes	290	2.25			
	Alamo Heights	Bexar	Urb./Exurb.	7319		Yes	0		No		
4	Alba		Rural	430		No	0		No		
2	Albany	Shackelford	Rural	1921		No	40	2.98			
6	Aldine	Harris	Urb./Exurb.	13979		Yes	120	1.13		Yes	
	Aledo	Parker	Rural	1726		No	0		No		
	Alfred-South La Palo		Rural	451		No	Ö		No	Yes	
	Alice	Jim Wells	Rural	19010		Yes	196	1.36	No		
10	Alice Acres	Jim Wells	Rural	491	4	No	0	0	No	Yes	

Page 1 of 33 5/25/2007

# EXHIBIT



#### 2007 Housing Tax Credit Site Demographic Characteristics as of April 12, 2007 Board Meeting Tract Level - Sorted by County then Tract

Tract Data Source: U.S. Census 2000

The complete tract identifier used by the Census Bureau is below provided (i.e. 48001950600). The first five digits are the state and county code. The remaining six digits are the tract code. Often in general use, only the tract code is shown with a decimal prior to the final two digits. For example, the above referenced tract would be shown as 9506.00.

Applicants may petition TDHCA to update the unit concentration data if they believe that the number of HTC units in the tract is in error. Such petition must be provided to the TDHCA Division of Policy and Public Affairs via email at info@tdhca.state.tx.us or fax at (512) 475-3746 prior to the commencement of the pre-application submission period for HTC applications. The results of such petitions will be posted on the HTC application updates portion of the website at http://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/lihtc.htm and any changes to the area designations will be e-mailed to the applicant contact e-mail adderesses as listed in the application.

#### Notes:

(1) QAP §49.9(i)(14)(D), Tract MFI > County MFI Points - If "Yes", the Application is eligible for points pursuant to this section.

(2) QAP §49.9(i)(14)(F), Developments Outside of Poverty Areas - If "Yes", the Application is eligible for points pursuant to this section.

(3) QAP \$49.9(I)(17), Developments Located in Cencus Tracts with No Other HTC Developments - If "Yes", the Application is eligible for points pursuant to this section.

(4) QAP ineligibility item 49.6(g): If "Yes", New Construction Applications are ineligible for Housing Tex Credits unless the Applicant submits to the Department an approval of the Development referencing this rule in the form of a resolution from the governing body of the appropriate municipality or county containing the Development by the required deadlines outlined in the QAP.

(5) For QAP ineligibility item 49.6(h), if "Yes", not eligible for the 130% Eligibile Basis Increase.

Traci ID	County	2000 Tract Median Family Income	2006 County Median Family Income	Eligible for §49.9(6)(14)(D) Tract MFI > County MFI Points (1)	2000 Tract Population	2000 Tract Poverty Population	Eligible for Poverty < 10% Points? (2)	Eligible for §49.9()(17)? (3)		Incligible Tract? (4)		theligible For 130% Basis Boost? (5)
48001950100	Anderson	38571	37513	Yes	4449	626	No	No	no		no	
48001950200	Anderson	40391	37513	Yes	3371	509	No	Yes	no		no	
48001950300	Anderson	40278	37513	Yes	738	117	No	Yes	no		no	
48001950400	Anderson	57788	37513	Yes	14381	3	Yes	Yes	no		no	
48001950500	Anderson	31223	37513	No	3954	981	No	No	no		no	
48001950600	Anderson	37769	37513	Yes	6363	1127	No	Yes	no		no	
48001950700	Anderson	26736	37513	No	2353	677	No	No	по		no	
48001950800	Anderson	37319	37513	No	4955	815	No	No	no		no	
48001950900	Anderson	40071	37513	Yes	8744	995	No	No	no		no	
48001951000	Anderson	38264	37513	Yes	5801	804	No	No	no		no	
48003950100	Andrews	56406	37017	Yes	1525	151	Yes	Yes	no		no	
48003950200	Andrews	39816	37017	Yes	5607	822	No	No	no		no	
48003950300	Andrews	29211	37017	No	3519	753	No	Yes	no		no	

Page 1 of 234 4/26/2007

# 07302 Initial Scoring Notice



Alton Housing Development, L.P. Jean Coburn 908 E. 5th Street, # 201 Austin, TX 78702 Phone #: (512) 474-5003 Fax #: (512) 474-5010 Email: jcoburn@nfwscmail.com

Date Issued: May 21, 2007

#### THIS NOTICE WILL ONLY BE TRANSMITTED VIA EMAIL

Second Email: mposs@nfwscmail.com

#### RE: 2007 Competitive Housing Tax Credit (HTC) Application for Casa Alton TDHCA Number: 07302

Attention: Jean Coburn

The Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (the "Department") has completed its Eligibility and Selection Criteria Review of the Application referenced above as further described in §49.9(d)(1) of the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules ("QAP"). Below, a summary is provided of the score requested, as calculated by the Applicant, followed by the score requested, as calculated by the Department. The two numbers differ if the Applicant's calculation was incorrect. The next score shown is the score awarded to the Application by the Department, followed by the difference between the score requested (as calculated by the Department) and the score awarded. An explanation of the reason(s) for any differences, including points denied, is provided at the top of the second page of this notice. The next scoring items show the number of points awarded for each of the four categories for which points could not be requested by the applicant: Quantifiable Community Participation ("QCP") §49.9(i)(2) of the 2007 QAP; letters of support or opposition from State Senators; §49.9(i)(6) letters of support or opposition from State Representatives; and §49.9(i)(16), letters of community support other than QCP. This is followed, in bold, by the final cumulative number of points awarded by the Department to the Application.

Please note that if you were awarded points under §49.9(i)(5), or (25) of the 2007 QAP this notice only provides an explanation of any point deductions for those items. Please note that should this application receive an award of tax credits, at the time the executed Commitment Notice is required to be submitted, the Applicant or Development Owner must provide evidence of a commitment approved by the governing body of a local political subdivision for the sufficient local funding and a commitment approved by a qualifying private, state, or federal source to the Department. Qualifying sources other than those submitted in the Application may be submitted to the Department at the time the executed Commitment Notice is required to be submitted to the Department at the time the executed Commitment Notice is required to be submitted pursuant to §49.9(i)(5) and (25) of the 2007 QAP.

To the extent that a threshold review is not yet completed for this application, pursuant to 949.9(d)(3), the final score may still change, in which case you will be notified.

Allocation: Rural	Set Asides:	🗹 USDA	🗆 Non Profit	$\Box$ At Risk	
Score Requested by Applicant (Does not i	nclude points for	§§49.9(i)(2),	(6) or (16) of the 2	2007 QAP):	154
Score Requested as Calculated by Departr	nent (Does not in	clude points t	for §§49.9(i)(2), (6	) or (16) of the 2007 QAP):	154
Score Awarded by Department (Does not	include points for	r §§49.9(i)(2)	, (6) or (16) of the	2007 QAP):	153
Difference between Requested and Award	ed (Does not incl	lude points fo	r §§49.9(i)(2), (6)	or (16) of the 2007 QAP):	1
Points Awarded for §49.9(i)(2), Quantifial	ble Community P	Participation:			12
Points Awarded for §49.9(i)(6), Input from	n State Senator:				7
Points Awarded for §49.9(i)(6), Input from	n State Represent	tative:			7
Points Awarded for §49.9(i)(16), Commun	nity Support Othe	er than QCP:			0
Final Score Awarded to Application by	Department:				179



#### Page 2 of Final Scoring Notice: 07302, Casa Alton

# Explanation for Difference between Points Requested and Points Awarded by the Department (explanation does not include points for §§49.9(i)(2) and (6)):

§49.9(i)(13) – Pre-Application Incentive Points: The final award of the Pre-Application was 146 points. In order to be awarded the full 6 points for participating in the Pre-Application process, the Application final score cannot be more than 5% greater than the Pre-Application score (no greater than 153 points). The final Application score exceeded the 5% variance (154 points). You selected Option A, which elects to cap the Application score at no greater than the 5% increase from Pre-Application score. Therefore, the revised final score is 153 points.

A formal appeals policy exists for the Competitive HTC Program. If you wish to appeal this scoring notice (including Set-Aside eligibility), you must file your appeal with the Department no later than 5:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 29, 2007. If an appeal is denied by the Executive Director, an Applicant may appeal to the Department Board. THE DEPARTMENT STRONGLY SUGGESTS that you submit your appeal to the Executive Director no later than Friday, May 25, 2007 by 5:00 p.m. in order to allow an ED response to the appeal and any denied appeals to be added to the June 14, 2007 Board agenda. The restrictions and requirements relating to the appeals policy can be found in §49.17(b) of the 2007 QAP.

In an effort to increase the liklihood that Board appeals related to scoring and Set-Asides are heard at the June 14, 2007 Board meeting, the Department has provided an Appeal Election Form for all appeals submitted to the Executive Director. In the event an appeal is denied by the Executive Director the form requests that the appeal automatically be added to the Board agenda. Note that the completion of the form will add the appeal to the agenda, however any additional information for the appeal to the Board must be received by the Department by 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 5, 2007. All appeals should be submitted to the attention of Audrey Martin.

A posting of all completed final Application scores will be publicized on the Department's website at www.tdhca.state.tx.us on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. A list of the Applications approved by staff to be considered by the Department's Board will be available on the website no later than June 21, 2007. If you have any concerns regarding potential miscalculations or errors made by the Department, please contact Audrey Martin by facsimile (512) 475-0764 or (512) 475-1895 or email to audrey.martin@tdhca.state.tx.us.

Sincerely,

Robbye Meyer

Robbye Meyer Director of Multifamily Finance



#### Appeal Election Form: 07302, Casa Alton

I am in receipt of my 2007 scoring notice and am filing a formal appeal to the Executive Director on or before May 29, 2007, although the Department recommends submission by May 25, 2007, for processing (attached).

If my appeal is denied by the Executive Director, I:

X

Do wish to appeal to the Board of Directors and request that my application be added to the June 14, 2007 Department Board of Directors meeting agenda. My appeal documentation which identifies my specific grounds for appeal, is attached. I understand that my Board appeal documentation must still be submitted by 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 5, 2007 to be placed with the June 14, 2007 Board materials. If no documentation is submitted, the appeal documention to the Executive Director will be utilized.

Do not wish to appeal to the Board of Directors.

Note: If you do not wish to appeal this notice, you do not need to submit this form.

Signed Title Date

Please fax or email to the attention of Audrey Martin: Fax: (512) 475-0764 or (512) 475-1895 Email: audrey.martin@tdhca.state.tx.us

# 07302 Revised Scoring Notice



Alton Housing Development, L.P. Jean Coburn 908 E. 5th Street, # 201 Austin, TX 78702 Phone #: (512) 474-5003 Fax #: (512) 474-5010 Email: jcoburn@nfwscmail.com Date Issued: June 08, 2007

THIS NOTICE WILL ONLY BE TRANSMITTED VIA EMAIL

Second Email: mposs@nfwscmail.com

#### RE: 2007 Competitive Housing Tax Credit (HTC) Application for Casa Alton TDHCA Number: 07302

Attention: Jean Coburn

The Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (the "Department") has completed its Eligibility and Selection Criteria Review of the Application referenced above as further described in §49.9(d)(1) of the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules ("QAP"). Below, a summary is provided of the score requested, as calculated by the Applicant, followed by the score requested, as calculated by the Department. The two numbers differ if the Applicant's calculation was incorrect. The next score shown is the score awarded to the Application by the Department, followed by the difference between the score requested (as calculated by the Department) and the score awarded. An explanation of the reason(s) for any differences, including points denied, is provided at the top of the second page of this notice. The next scoring items show the number of points awarded for each of the four categories for which points could not be requested by the applicant: Quantifiable Community Participation ("QCP") §49.9(i)(2) of the 2007 QAP; letters of support or opposition from State Senators; §49.9(i)(6) letters of support or opposition from State Representatives; and §49.9(i)(16), letters of community support other than QCP. This is followed, in bold, by the final cumulative number of points awarded by the Department to the Application.

Please note that if you were awarded points under §49.9(i)(5), or (25) of the 2007 QAP this notice only provides an explanation of any point deductions for those items. Please note that should this application receive an award of tax credits, at the time the executed Commitment Notice is required to be submitted, the Applicant or Development Owner must provide evidence of a commitment approved by the governing body of a local political subdivision for the sufficient local funding and a commitment approved by a qualifying private, state, or federal source to the Department. Qualifying sources other than those submitted in the Application may be submitted to the Department at the time the executed Commitment Notice is required to be submitted to \$49.9(i)(5) and (25) of the 2007 QAP.

To the extent that a threshold review is not yet completed for this application, pursuant to §49.9(d)(3), the final score may still change, in which case you will be notified.

Allocation: Rural	Set Asides:	🗹 USDA	🗆 Non Profit	$\Box$ At Risk	
Score Requested by Applicant (Does not inc	lude points for	§§49.9(i)(2),	(6) or (16) of the 2	2007 QAP):	154
Score Requested as Calculated by Departme	nt (Does not in	clude points f	for §§49.9(i)(2), (6)	) or (16) of the 2007 QAP):	154
Score Awarded by Department (Does not in	clude points for	r §§49.9(i)(2)	(6) or (16) of the	2007 QAP):	152
Difference between Requested and Awarded	l (Does not inc	lude points for	r §§49.9(i)(2), (6)	or (16) of the 2007 QAP):	2
Points Awarded for §49.9(i)(2), Quantifiable	e Community F	articipation:			12
Points Awarded for §49.9(i)(6), Input from	State Senator:				7
Points Awarded for §49.9(i)(6), Input from	State Represent	tative:			7
Points Awarded for §49.9(i)(16), Communit	y Support Othe	er than QCP:			0
Final Score Awarded to Application by D	epartment:				178



#### Page 2 of Final Scoring Notice: 07302, Casa Alton

# Explanation for Difference between Points Requested and Points Awarded by the Department (explanation does not include points for §§49.9(i)(2) and (6)):

§49.9(i)(11) - Housing Needs Characteristics: An Application is awarded points based on objective measures of housing need in the Area where the Development is located. In a challenge received by the Department on May 23, 2007, a party unrelated to the Application asserted that the Development is located in Alton, not North Alton, the Area for which the point request was made. You responded to the challenge by stating that because data from the Decennial Census is used to determine points awarded under this section, and because the Development was located in the Alton North CDP as of the last Decennial Census, the points for Alton North should be awarded. The Department determined that the current location of a Development, not its location as of the most recent Decennial Census, is used to evaluate eligibility for points based on demographic information from the most recent Decennial Census. Therefore, four points are awarded for this section, instead of six points. (Points Requested: 6, Points Awarded: 4)

A formal appeals policy exists for the Competitive HTC Program. If you wish to appeal this scoring notice (including Set-Aside eligibility), you must file your appeal with the Department no later than 5:00 p.m., Friday, June 15, 2007. If an appeal is denied by the Executive Director, an Applicant may appeal to the Department Board. THE DEPARTMENT STRONGLY SUGGESTS that you submit your appeal to the Executive Director no later than Tuesday, June 12, 2007 by 5:00 p.m. in order to allow an ED response to the appeal and any denied appeals to be added to the June 28, 2007 Board agenda. The restrictions and requirements relating to the appeals policy can be found in §49.17(b) of the 2007 QAP.



In an effort to increase the liklihood that Board appeals related to scoring and Set-Asides are heard at the June 28, 2007 Board meeting, the Department has provided an Appeal Election Form for all appeals submitted to the Executive Director. In the event an appeal is denied by the Executive Director the form requests that the appeal automatically be added to the Board agenda. Note that the completion of the form will add the appeal to the agenda, however any additional information for the appeal to the Board must be received by the Department by 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 19, 2007. All appeals should be submitted to the attention of Audrey Martin.

A posting of all completed final Application scores will be publicized on the Department's website at www.tdhca.state.tx.us on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. A list of the Applications approved by staff to be considered by the Department's Board will be available on the website no later than June 21, 2007. If you have any concerns regarding potential miscalculations or errors made by the Department, please contact Audrey Martin by facsimile (512) 475-0764 or (512) 475-1895 or email to audrey.martin@tdhca.state.tx.us.

Sincerely,

Robbye Meyer

Robbye Meyer Director of Multifamily Finance



#### Appeal Election Form: 07302, Casa Alton

I am in receipt of my 2007 scoring notice and am filing a formal appeal to the Executive Director on or before June 15, 2007, although the Department recommends submission by June 12, 2007, for processing (attached).

If my appeal is denied by the Executive Director, I:

Do wish to appeal to the Board of Directors and request that my application be added to the June 28, 2007 Department Board of Directors meeting agenda. My appeal documentation which identifies my specific grounds for appeal, is attached. I understand that my Board appeal documentation must still be submitted by 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 19, 2007 to be placed with the June 28, 2007 Board materials. If no documentation is submitted, the appeal documention to the Executive Director will be utilized.

Do not wish to appeal to the Board of Directors.

Note: If you do not wish to appeal this notice, you do not need to submit this form.

Signed Title Date

Please fax or email to the attention of Audrey Martin: Fax: (512) 475-0764 or (512) 475-1895 Email: audrey.martin@tdhca.state.tx.us

### MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION BOARD ACTION REQUEST

**June 28, 2007** 

#### Action Item

Issue a list of Approved Applications (as of June 28) for Housing Tax Credits ("HTC") in accordance with §2306.6724(e) of Texas Government Code.

#### **Requested Action**

Issue a list of Approved Applications (as of June 28) for Housing Tax Credits ("HTC") in accordance with §2306.6724(e) of Texas Government Code from the 2007 State Housing Credit Ceiling.

#### **Background**

The Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs' (the "Department") Board is required by §2306.6724(e) of Texas Government Code to "review the recommendations of department staff regarding applications and shall issue a list of approved applications each year in accordance with the qualified allocation plan no later than June 30." Based on existing legal interpretation, attached hereto, this requirement is satisfied by staff recommending to the Board all existing approved applications, which include all active applications not currently withdrawn by the applicant or terminated by the Department. This statutory language does not require that the list approved by the Board during the June Board meeting be split into a preliminary determination of those applications that may be recommended for a commitment of housing tax credits. In July, as required by §2306.6724(f) of Texas Government Code, the Board "shall issue final commitments for allocations of housing tax credits each year in accordance with the qualified allocation plan not later than July 31." At the July 30, 2007 Board meeting the list approved by the Board will clearly identify those applications being recommended for a Commitment Notice.

Therefore, attached is a list for Board approval of all current approved applications from which the July 30, 2007 awards of housing tax credits will be selected. There were 212 Pre-Applications submitted reflecting a total request for housing tax credits of \$156,807,174. Subsequently there were 111 full applications submitted with a total request for housing tax credits of \$86,638,613. At this time, six (6) of those applications have been withdrawn by the applicant. Therefore, there are 105 approved applications currently competing for housing tax credits; the list merely reflects the pool from which awarded applications will be selected. The list attached, sorted by region, includes the current score for each active application as well as relevant application information. In addition to the 105 approved applications currently

competing for housing tax credits, the attached list includes applications that received a forward commitment by the Board in 2006 out of the 2007 State Housing Tax Credit Ceiling, and 2004 Developments that received credit increases out of 2007 State Housing Credit Ceiling pursuant to the Final Policy for Addressing Cost Increases for 2004 and 2005 Competitive Housing Tax Credit Developments. The Developments that received forward commitments and increased credits are included in the list and are indicated by an "A" in the column titled "Status" as they have already received an award from the 2007 cycle. The approved applications to be considered by the Board for an award at the July 30 meeting are indicated by a "P" in the "Status" column.

At this time, not all applications have been reviewed for financial feasibility or compliance history; all applications are subject to those reviews. Through this review some applications may be found to be financially infeasible or ineligible based on compliance history, in which case they will be removed from the list of approved applications. Further, the credit amount reflected on this list is the requested credit amount and may change to reflect a recommended credit amount and/or may have conditions placed on the allocation at the time of the July 30, 2007 commitments. In addition to applications that may be removed from the list for issues of financial feasibility, applications may also be added to or removed from the list of approved applications by the Executive Director as determinations are made on appeals.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Board issue the attached recommended list of approved applications for 2007 Housing Tax Credits pursuant to §2306.6724(e).

# TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS LEGAL DETERMINATION

To: Michael Gerber; Brooke Boston; Jen Joyce; FILE

**FROM:** Kevin Hamby

General Counsel

**DATE:** June 14, 2006

**RE:** 2006 List for June Meeting

#### **QUESTION PRESENTED:**

Question 1: Does the list provided to the Board at its June meeting require any input as to the possibility of award?

Question 2: Do we need to attach all the back up to the list approved by the Board at the June Board meeting?

#### SHORT ANSWER:

No.

#### FACTS:

Each year the Department produces a list'related to the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program for approval before June 30 as is required in statute for the Board. For the past several years, this list has included a prospective, though not reliable, list of people who could potentially receive an award if all the material issues were known at the time the list was created. Because the list has contained a potential though not final award structure, the interpretation has been to include all the relevant information as called for in the QAP for the Board's decision making ability.

This year, staff requested a legal opinion as to the type and amount of information that must be provided with the list approved on or before June 30.

#### LEGAL ANALYSIS:

The relevant statutory section related to deadlines for the low income housing tax credit program is found in the Texas Government Code §2306.6724. The subsection relevant to the June deadline is (e) which states:

(e) The board shall review the recommendations of the department staff regarding applications and shall issue a list of **approved applications** each year in accordance with the qualified allocation plan not later than June 30. (emphasis added)

Also important to this legal review is subsection (f) which states:

(f) The board shall issue **final commitments for allocations** of housing tax credits each year in accordance with the qualified application plan not later than July 31. (emphasis added)

For purposes of this discussion the term application is defined in statute under Texas Government Code 2306.6702 as:

(2) "Application" means an application filed with the department by an applicant and includes any exhibits or other supporting materials.

Throughout Subchapter DD. the term "Application" is used as is described in the definition above and treated separate and apart from awards or allocations that are eventually voted upon by the Board.

I have reviewed the language in both pieces of legislation governing this section of the code since the 75<sup>th</sup> legislative session. The first bill did not contain this particular timeline and only required the July 31 allocation deadline. The second bill did alter the July date language by striking the text for allocation in subsection (e) and replacing it with the current text and then adding the current subsection (f). Clearly the legislative language indicated a document separate and apart from a final allocation due in July 31.

The QAP also clearly sets out that commitment notices are to be discussed in the July board meeting targeting several dates related to the "date of the July Board meeting at which the issuance of Commitment Notices shall be discussed." *See, §50.11 2006 QAP*.

In addition to reviewing the above referenced legislation, I held a discussion with the Department's Assistant Attorney General assigned through the Administrative Law Division about the plain language of the statute. After a review of the section, he concurred that the language indicated a clear and separate document from allocation was allowable under subsection (e).

The statutory requirement appears to only require a listing of applications that are currently approved by staff for participation in the allocation process for consideration of Low Income Housing Tax Credits. The only requirement of this section is a list recommended by the

Department and approved by the Board of <u>approved applications</u> indicating that these are the eligible applicants for award. There is no requirement that any further information be included with this list. The result would be anyone who believes they should have an application would be placed on notice that they are currently not being considered.

Additional information could be added, but there is no direct statutory requirement to exceed listing approved applicants who have successfully completed applications without regard to ultimate success or continuation in the process for the Board's approval.

#### ANSWER:

No there is no requirement to supply additional back up information with regard to the statutory requirement to provide a staff recommended list of approved applications.

#### Presentation, Discussion and Issuance of a List of Approved Applications

#### Applications Submitted for the 2007 Housing Tax Credit Competitive Cycle Sorted by Region, Allocation and Awarded

Score (Pending Appeals and Challenges)

State Ceiling to be Allocated: \$47,560,357\*

	gion atus <sup>1</sup> Develop	oment Name	Address	City	Allocation	Set-Asid <sup>2</sup> USDA NP	es <sup>3</sup> LI AR Units	Total s Units	Target Populati	<sup>4</sup> Housing on Activity	g <sup>5</sup> / AC(	6 Credit Request	Owner TE Contact H	OHCA OME	Awarde	ed 7 Notes
Region	):	1														
Allocat	ion Informati	ion for Reg	gion 1: Total	Credits Available for	Region:	\$2,232,553	Rural	Alloca	ation:	\$1,129,2	205	Urban/E	xurban Allocatio	on:	\$1,103	,348
							5% Rei	quirec	l for USD	A: \$111,6	28	15% Rec	quired for At-Ris	k:	\$334	,883
Applicati	ions Submitted	d in Region	1: Urban/Exu	rban												
07016 1	A Stone Hollo	w Village	1510 Cornell	Lubbock	U/EX		] 112	140	General	NC		\$61,781	Ron Hance		300	BA
						Tota	l: 112	140				\$61,781				
07219 1	P Canyons Re Community		2200 W. 7th Ave.	Amarillo	U/EX		106	111	Elderly	RH	<ul> <li>Image: A start of the start of</li></ul>	\$879,582	Jamie Hayden		203	REA
						Tota	l: 106	111				\$879,582				
						Tota	l: 218	251				\$941,363				
Applicati	ions Submitted	d in Region	1: Rural													
07074 1	A La Mirage V	/illas	309 S.E. 15th	Perryton	R		47	47	General	RH	✓	\$7,000	Patrick A. Barbolla		300	BA
07039 1	A Plainview V	listas	3200 Lexington	Plainview	R		60	76	General	NC		\$47,570	Cathy Graugnard		300	BA
						Tota	l: 107	123				\$54,570				
07137 1	P Hampton Vi	illages	1600 Blk of Alcock	St. Pampa			76	76	General	NC		\$1,038,857	Tim Lang		190	REA
07131 1	P StoneLeaf a	at Dalhart	1719 E. 1st St.	Dalhart	R		76	76	General	NC		\$707,970	Mike Sugrue		185	REA
07117 1	P Deer Creek	Apartments	SE Corner of W. El MLK St.	llis St. & Levelland	R		64	64	General	NC		\$516,900	Justin Zimmerman		149	REA

1 = Status of Award Abbreviation: Development Previously Awarded 2007 Housing Tax Credits=A, Pending/Non-Awarded Applications=P

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX

3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans

5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

#### Page 1 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name	Address	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup> US	Set-Asides <sup>3</sup> SDA NP AR	LI Units	Total Units F	Target <sup>4</sup> Housing <sup>5</sup> Population Activity	ACQ	Credit Request	Owner Contact	TDHCA /	
				Total:	216	216		:	\$2,263,727			
				Total:	323	339		:	\$2,318,297			
7 Applications in Region			Reg	gion Total:	541	590			\$3,259,659			 

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 2 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name Address	City Alloca	Set-Aside ation <sup>2</sup> USDA NP /	es <sup>3</sup> LI Total AR Units Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Housing <sup>5</sup> Population Activity A	<sub>6</sub> Credit Owner ACQ Request Contact	TDHCA Awarded 7 HOME Score Notes
Region: 2						
Allocation Information for Region 2:	Total Credits Available for Regi	on: \$1,547,747	Rural Allocat	ion: \$797,228	Urban/Exurban Alloca	ation: \$750,519
**One previously awarded development, the amount of \$214,749; this amount has Region 2 Rural and to the state credit ce available.	been added to the original alloc	ation for	5% Required	for USDA: \$77,387	15% Required for At-	Risk: \$232,162

Applications Submitted in Region	2: Urban/Exurban											
07133 2 P StoneLeaf at Tye	649 Scott St.	Туе	U/EX		118	118	Intg	NC	\$834,758	Mike Sugrue	198	REA
07114 2 P Washington Village Apartments	600 Flood St.	Wichita Falls	U/EX		96	96 G	General	NC	\$877,338	Rick J. Deyoe	195	REA
07285 2 P Anson Park Seniors	Ambrocio Flores Jr. Rd. & Vogel Ave.	Abilene	U/EX		80	80 E	Elderly	NC	\$729,049	Theresa Martin- Holder	195	REA
07236 2 P Green Briar Village Phase II	Approx. SH 240 at Airport Dr.	Wichita Falls	U/EX		36	36 G	General	NC	\$375,091	Randy Stevenson	191	PA
				Total:	330	330			\$2,816,236			
				Total:	330	330			 \$2,816,236		 	
Applications Submitted in Region	2: Rural											
07058 2 A Wildwood Trails Apartments	1500 Davis Ln.	Brownwood	R		75	75 G	General	NC	\$10,338	Vaughn Zimmerman	300	BA
				Total:	75	75			\$10,338			
07294 2 P Grove at Brushy Creek	NE Corner of El Dorado & Patterson	Bowie	R		42	48 G	General	NC	\$551,374	Eric Hartzell	186	REA
07194 2 P 377 Villas	4236 Hwy 377 S.	Brownwood	R		73	76 G	General	NC	\$710,919	Justin MacDonald	184	REA
				Total:	115	124			\$1,262,293			
				Total:	190	199			 \$1,272,631		 	
7 Applications in Region				Region Total:	520	529			 \$4,088,867		 	
1 - Status of Award Abbroviation: D	avalanment Providualy Awardad		ov Cradit	a A Danding/Na	~ <u>Auro</u>	rdad App	liantiana	D			 Deere	0 -6 04

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 3 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name	e Address	City A	llocatior	Set-Asid 1 <sup>2</sup> USDA NP	es <sup>3</sup> LI AR Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity A	6 Credit CQ Request	Owner T Contact H	A Awarde Score	ed Notes
Region:     3       Allocation Information for Re	gion 3: Total Credits	Available for R	egion:	\$9,158,040	Rural 5% Ree		ation: I for USDA:	\$702,956 : \$457,902		ัxurban Allocati quired for At-Ris	\$8,455, \$1,373,	
Applications Submitted in Region	3: Urban/Exurban										 	
07001 3 A Fairway Crossing	7229 Ferguson Rd.	Dallas	U/EX		297	310	General	RH 🔽	\$1,200,000	Len Vilicic	301	FWD
07091 3 A City Walk at Akard	511 N. Akard	Dallas	U/EX		204	209	General	RH 🔽	<b>\$1,200,000</b>	John P. Greenan	301	FWD
07025 3 A Villas of Seagoville	600 E. Malloy Bridge Rd.	Seagoville	U/EX		78	100	Elderly	NC	\$36,900	Deborah A. Griffin	300	BA
7028 3 A Preston Trace Apartments	8660 Preston Trace Blvd.	Frisco	U/EX		38	40	General	RH 🔽	\$9,490	Dan Allgeier	300	BA
07031 3 A Frazier Fellowship	4700-4900 Hatcher St.	Dallas	U/EX		60	76	General	NC	\$27,242	Tim Lott	300	BA
07017 3 A Spring Oaks Apartment	ts 4317 Shepherd Ln.	Balch Springs	U/EX		128	160	General	NC	\$76,305	Ron Pegram	300	BA
07037 3 A Renaissance Courts	308 S. Ruddell St.	Denton	U/EX		120	150	General	NC	\$65,771	Shirley Nell Hensley	300	BA
07040 3 A Samaritan House	929 Hemphill Ave.	Fort Worth	U/EX		126	126	General	RH 💽	\$59,531	Steve Dutton	300	BA
07053 3 A Primrose at Highland	2100 Highland Ave.	Dallas	U/EX		120	150	Elderly	NC	\$72,046	Deepak Sulakhe	300	BA
07024 3 A Villas of Forest Hill	7400 Forest Hill Dr.	Forest Hill	U/EX		78	100	Elderly	NC	\$36,629	Deborah A. Griffin	300	BA
				Tota	al: 1,249	1,421			\$2,783,914			
07289 3 P Peachtree Seniors	5009 S. Peachtree Rd.	Balch Springs	U/EX		144	144	Elderly	NC [	\$1,161,000	Ron Pegram	200	REA
07254 3 P Evergreen at Farmers Branch	11701 Mira Lago Blvd.	Farmers Branch	U/EX		90	90	Elderly	NC	\$1,200,000	Bradley E. Forslund	200	REA
07149 3 P Residences at Eastland	5500 Eastland St.	Fort Worth	U/EX		140	146	General	NC	\$1,200,000	Dan Allgeier	195	REA

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 4 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name	Address	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Set-Asides <sup>3</sup> USDA NP AR	LI Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity	ACQ	6 Credit Request	Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME		d <sub>7</sub> Notes
07126 3 P Oak Timbers-Caplin Drive	1301 Caplin Dr. & 4801 S. Collins St.	Arlington	U/EX		112	112	Elderly	NC		\$897,393	A.V. Mitchell		195	REA
07166 3 P Jeremiah Seniors	909 W. Hurst Blvd.	Hurst	U/EX		135	135	Elderly	NC		\$1,061,170	Tim Valentine		193	REA
07303 3 P Villas on Raiford	Raiford Rd.	Carrollton	U/EX		172	180	Elderly	NC		\$1,200,000	Chan II Pak		190	PA
07104 3 P Country Lane Seniors- Greenville Community	W side of O'Neal St., N. of U.S. Hwy 69 (Joe Ramsey Blvd.)	Greenville	U/EX		98	102	Elderly	NC		\$1,118,156	Kenneth H. Mitchell		190	REA
07256 3 P Evergreen at The Colony	NW Quadrant of SH 121 & Morning Star	The Colony	U/EX		145	145	Elderly	NC		\$1,200,000	Bradley E. Forslund	$\checkmark$	189	PA
07101 3 P Carpenter's Point	3326 Mingo St.	Dallas	U/EX		145	150	Elderly	NC		\$1,200,000	George King, Ji		187	PA
07190 3 P Stephen Austin School Apartments	1702 Wesley St.	Greenville	U/EX		36	36	General	NC		\$439,226	Hollis Fitch		182	PA
07191 3 P Washington Hotel Lofts	2612 Washington St.	Greenville	U/EX		36	36	General	NC		\$349,937	Hollis Fitch		175	PA
07245 3 P Sphinx at Fiji Seniors	201 Fran Way	Dallas	U/EX		124	130	Elderly	NC		\$1,200,000	Jay Oji		161	PA
				Total: 1	,377	1,406			\$	12,226,882				
				Total: 2	,626	2,827			\$	15,010,796				
Applications Submitted in Region 3	3: Rural													
07069 3 A Briarwood Apartments	513 E. 6th St.	Kaufman	R		48	48	General	RH	✓	\$7,000	Patrick A. Barbolla		300	BA
07032 3 A Churchill at Commerce	731 Culver	Commerce	R		90	100	General	NC		\$52,598	Bradley E. Forslund		300	BA
				Total:	138	148				\$59,598				
07272 3 P Plantation Valley Estates	Hopkins Rd. & E. McCart St. (FM1173)	Krum			76	76	Elderly	NC		\$669,317	Alyssa Carpent	er	189	REA
07167 3 P Meadowlake Village Apartments	209 Grand Ave.	Mabank	R		40	40	General	RH	✓	\$174,797	Warren Maupin		113	REA
				Total:	116	116				\$844,114				
				Total:	254	264				\$903,712				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 5 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name Address	City	Set-Asides <sup>3</sup> LI Total Target <sup>4</sup> H Allocation <sup>2</sup> USDA NP AR Units Units Population A		TDHCA Awarded 7 HOME Score Notes
26 Applications in Region		Region Total: 2,880 3,091	\$15,914,508	

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

- 4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC
- 6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 6 of 24

Allocation Information for Reg	gion 4: Total Credits A	vailable for	Region:	\$2,435.373	Rural	Alloca	ation:	\$1,443,19	93	Urban/E	xurban Allocati	on:	\$992,	,180
			<b>.</b>					A: \$121,76			quired for At-Ri		\$365,	-
Applications Submitted in Region	4: Urban/Exurban													
7096 4 A Moore Grocery Lofts	408 & 410 N. Broadway	Tyler	U/EX		88	88	General	NC/RH	✓	\$801,237	Jim Sari		301	FWE
				Total	: 88	88				\$801,237				
7164 4 P Covington Townhomes	E Side of Milam St. Between 13th & 11th St.	Texarkana	U/EX		126	126	General	RC		\$1,200,000	Richard Herrington		197	REA
7292 4 P North Eastman Residential	1400 N. Eastman Rd.	Longview	U/EX		73	76	General	NC		\$799,995	Stuart Shaw		196	PA
				Total	: 199	202				\$1,999,995				
				Total	: 287	290				\$2,801,232				
Applications Submitted in Region	4: Rural													
07046 4 A Lexington Court	3407 U.S. Hwy 259 N.	Kilgore	R		76	80	General	NC		\$5,105	Lynda Marino		300	BA
7043 4 A Gardens of Gladewater	108 N. Lee Dr.	Gladewater	R		34	36	Elderly	NC		\$24,972	George D. Hopper		300	BA
				Total	: 110	116				\$30,077				
77118 4 P Lakeside Apartments	1 Blk E. of S. Jefferson St. & Tennison Rd.	Mount Pleasant			64	64	General	NC		\$522,100	Justin Zimmerman		190	REA
7295 4 P Bluestone	Hwy 198 at Manning St.	Mabank	R		73	76	General	NC		\$758,354	Eric Hartzell		189	REA
7193 4 P Stone Brook Senior Apartments	NW Corner Loop 256 & Threll St.	Palestine	R		76	76	Elderly	NC		\$795,428	Matt Harris		188	REA
	215 N. Terry St.		R				General	NC			Jeffrey S. Spicer	$\checkmark$	187	

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 7 of 24

	Region Status <sup>1</sup> Development Nam	e Address	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Set-Asides USDA NP AR	<sup>3</sup> LI Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity	ACQ		Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME		d 7 Notes
07175	4 P Austin Place	Plat 2, 2200 Blk of N. Edwards Ave. (FM 1734)	Mount Pleasant	R		76	76	General	NC		\$916,970	Bonita Williams	S 🗸	182	PA
07261	4 P Lexington Court Phase II	3509 U.S. Hwy 259 N.	Kilgore	R		76	76	General	NC		\$693,735	Emanuel H. Glockzin, Jr.	$\checkmark$	178	PA
07260	4 P Victoria Place Addition	5.10 Acres Barbara St. Extension	Athens	R		16	16	General	NC		\$409,663	Emanuel H. Glockzin, Jr.	$\checkmark$	178	PA
					Total:	429	432			9	\$4,677,063				
					Total:	539	548				\$4,707,140				
1	2 Applications in Region			-	Region Total:	826	838			\$	\$7,508,372				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

- 4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC
- 6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 8 of 24

F	Region ile # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name	Address	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Set-Aside	es <sup>3</sup> LI Total AR Units Units	Target <sup>4</sup>	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity ACQ	6 Credit Owner 8 Request Contact	TDHCA HOME	Awarded 7 Score Notes
F	Region: 5										
	Allocation Information for Regi	on 5: Tot	al Credits Available for	Region: \$	51,494,977	Rural Alloc	ation:	\$0	Urban/Exurban	Allocation:	\$0
	**The original estimated allocat for Region 5 was \$1,455,362. In TDHCA Board forward allocated Therefore, all 2007 credits for R	n 2006 to addr d the 2007 cre	ess pressing disaster re dits in an amount of \$1,	elief needs ,494,977.		5% Required	I for USDA:	\$0	15% Required f	or At-Risk:	\$0

Applications Submitted in Region	5: Urban/Exurban													
07026 5 A O.W. Collins Apartments	4440 Gulfway Dr.	Port Arthur	U/EX		200	200	Elderly	RH	✓	\$40,084	K.T. (Ike) Akbari		300	BA
				Total:	200	200				\$40,084				
07162 5 P Pointe North	3710 Magnolia	Beaumont	U/EX		158	158	General	RC		\$1,200,000	Robert Reyna		193	PA
07189 5 P Sunlight Manor Apartments	2950 S. 8th St.	Beaumont	U/EX		120	120	General	RH	✓	\$678,699	K.T. (Ike) Akbari		189	PA
				Total:	278	278			ę	61,878,699				
				Total:	478	478				61,918,783				
Applications Submitted in Region 8	5: Rural													
07092 5 A Prospect Point	201 Premier Dr.	Jasper	R		69	72	General	NC		\$712,378	Eric Hartzell	✓	301	FWD
07093 5 A Cypresswood Crossing	Hwy 87 at Hwy 105	Orange	R		76	76	General	NC		\$689,500	K.T. (Ike) Akbari		301	FWD
07018 5 A Pineywoods Community Orange	36 Scattered Sites in East Town of Orange, TX	Orange	R		36	36	General	NC		\$26,874	Doug Dowler		300	BA
07011 5 A Park Estates	1200 Blk	Nacogdoches	R		34	36	General	NC		\$26,141	Mark Musemeche	•	300	BA
				Total:	215	220			9	\$1,454,893				
07257 5 P Orange Palm Garden Apt Homes	1727 37th St.	Orange	R		76	76	Elderly	NC		\$809,338	Marc Caldwell		188	REA

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 9 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name A	ddress	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Set-Asides	<sup>3</sup> LI Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity	ACQ <sup>6</sup>	Credit Request	Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME	Awarde Score	
07123 5 P Tower Village Pa	ark St. & Tower Rd.	Nacogdoche	s R		36	36	General	NC		\$545,417	Robert Crow		187	PA
				Total:	112	112			\$	1,354,755				
				Total:	327	332			\$	2,809,648				
9 Applications in Region			F	Region Total:	805	810			\$	4,728,431				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

- 4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC
- 6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 10 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name A	Address City	Set-Asic Allocation <sup>2</sup> USDA NP	des <sup>3</sup> LI Total Targe AR Units Units Populat	et <sup>4</sup> Housing <sup>5</sup> tion Activity ACC	ି Credit Owner T ସି Request Contact H	DHCA Awarded 7 OME Score Notes
Region: 6						
Allocation Information for Region	n 6: Total Credits Availabl	e for Region:\$11,333,309	<b>Rural Allocation:</b>	\$545,096	Urban/Exurban Allocati	on: \$10,788,213
**Three previously awarded devel returned credits in the amount of allocation for Region 6 Urban/Exu allocation for Region 6 Rural, and and is correctly reflected in the c	f \$487,554; \$401,044 has been curban, \$86,510 has been added d \$487,554 has been added to	added to the original d to the original	5% Required for US	DA: \$566,665	15% Required for At-Ris	sk: \$1,699,996

Applications Submitted in Regi	on 6: Urban/Exurban											
07041 6 A Village on Hobbs Ro	ad 6000 Hobbs Rd.	League City	U/EX		80	100 Elderly	NC		\$50,356 Thor	mas H. Scott	300	BA
07051 6 A Lake Jackson Mano	100 Garland	Lake Jackson	U/EX		80	100 Elderly	NC		\$37,014 H. E Your		300	BA
07042 6 A Oxford Place	605 Berry Rd.	Houston	U/EX		200	250 General	NC		\$114,593 Hora	ace Allison	300	BA
07020 6 A Baybrook Park Retirement Center	500 Texas Ave. West	Webster	U/EX		80	100 Elderly	NC		\$39,863 Barr <u>y</u>	y Kahn	300	BA
07060 6 A Freeport Oaks Apartments	NE Corner of Ave. J & Skinner St.	Freeport	U/EX		80	100 General	NC		\$48,476 Les	Kilday	300	BA
07062 6 A Lansbourough Apartments	10050 Cullen Blvd.	Houston	U/EX		141	176 General	NC			gie Lee gham	300	BA
07022 6 A Redwood Heights Apartments	7300 Jensen Dr.	Houston	U/EX		76	96 General	NC		\$41,991 Rick	k J. Deyoe	300	BA
07010 6 A South Union Place	7210 Scott St.	Houston	U/EX		100	125 Eld/Trans	NC		\$19,572 John	n N. Barineau	300	BA
07054 6 A Commons of Grace Senior	8900 Tidwell	Houston	U/EX		86	108 Eld/Trans	NC		\$48,106 Deep	pak Sulakhe	300	BA
				Total:	923	1,155			\$477,118			
07210 6 P New Hope Housing Bray's Crossing	at 6311 Gulf Freeway	Houston	U/EX		149	149 General	RH	✓	\$705,791 Joy I	Horak-Brown	209	REA

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 11 of 24

Reg File # St	gion atus <sup>1</sup> Development Narr	e Address	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Set-Asides <sup>3</sup> USDA NP AR	LI Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity	ACC	6 Credit Request		TDHCA HOME	Awarde Score	ed Notes
07179 6	P Villas at Goose Creek	SE Corner of N. Main St. & E. Defee St.	Baytown	U/EX		22	22	General	NC		\$242,318	Chris Presley		203	REA
07204 6	P Notting Hill Gate Apartments	200 S.E. of Intersection of S. Gessner & Beltway 8	Missouri City	v U/EX		108	108	Elderly	NC		\$1,093,000	Alyssa Carpent	ter	203	REA
07203 6	P Melbourne Apartments	3337 Mustang Rd.	Alvin	U/EX		110	110	Elderly	NC		\$1,200,000	Alyssa Carpent	ter	203	REA
07103 6	P Oak Tree Village	2700 Blk of FM 1266	Dickinson	U/EX		36	36	Elderly	NC		\$393,048	Charles Holcor	nb 🗌	202	REA
07309 6	P Glenwood Trails	Glenwood Dr. N. of Holton Ave	Deer Park	U/EX		114	114	General	NC		\$980,000	Les Kilday		198	REA
07310 6	P Gardens at Friendswood Lakes	1400 Blk of FM 528	Friendswood	I U/EX		114	114	Elderly	NC		\$1,000,000	Les Kilday		196	REA
07300 6	P Wentworth Apartments	SE of Corner of Timber Forest Dr. & FM 1960	Atascocita	U/EX		90	90	Elderly	NC		\$907,000	Alyssa Carpen	ter	196	REA
07306 6	P Zion Village Apartmen	s 3154 Gray St.	Houston	U/EX		50	50	Elderly	NC		\$597,543	Thomas Jones		195	REA
07293 6	P Morningstar Villas	3500 Blk of Magnolia Ave.	Texas City	U/EX		35	36	Elderly	NC		\$385,100	Diana McIver		195	REA
07291 6	P Cypress Creek at Ree Road	d Approx. 2900 Blk of Reed Rd.	Houston	U/EX		126	132	General	NC		\$1,200,000	Stuart Shaw		194	REA
07170 6	P Gibraltar	152 Blk of Brazoswood Dr.	Clute	U/EX		48	48	Elderly	NC		\$605,718	Debra Guerrer	o 🗌	193	REA
07141 6	P Pinnacle of Pleasant Humble	1200 Blk of 1st Ave. E	Humble	U/EX		147	153	Elderly	NC		\$1,200,000	Kenneth W. Fambro		187	REA
07280 6	P Andalusia	4343 Old Spanish Tr.	Houston	U/EX		102	102	Elderly	NC		\$1,095,525	Manish Verma		176	REA
07109 6	P Elrod Place	W side of Approx. 3700 Blk Elrod	Katy	U/EX		123	126	Intg	NC		\$1,200,000	Barry Kahn		169	REA
07102 6	P Chelsea Senior Community	3350 Blk of W. Little York Rd.	Houston	U/EX		35	36	Elderly	NC		\$447,631	Cherno Njie		169	REA
07217 6	P Victory Place Seniors	2001 S. Victory	Houston	U/EX		75	75	Elderly	NC	✓	\$737,449	Margie Lee Bingham		164	PA
07165 6	P Gates of Dominion North	NW Corner of JFK Blvd. & Lauder Rd.	Houston	U/EX		150	150	General	NC		\$1,200,000	Daniel Williams	S 🗌	141	PA
					Total: 1	, <b>634</b> 1	1,651			5	\$15,190,123				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

	Regio Statu	n us <sup>1</sup> Development Name	Address	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Set-Asides USDA NP AR	<sup>3</sup> LI Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Populatio	Housing <sup>t</sup> n Activity	ACQ	Credit Request	Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME		ed 7 Notes
						Total:	2,557	2,806			\$1	5,667,241				
Applie	cation	s Submitted in Region 6	: Rural													
07004	6 A	Cricket Hollow Apartments	9700 FM 1097	Willis	R		150	176	General	NC		\$82,466	Brian Cogburn		300	BA
						Total:	150	176				\$82,466				
07258	6 P	Trinity Garden Apt Homes	End of Panther Dr.	Liberty			76	76	Elderly	NC		\$808,895	Marc Caldwell		190	REA
07259	6 P	<b>o</b> ,	Corner of Old Montgomery Rd. & Cline	Huntsville	R		48	48	Elderly	NC		\$492,857	Emanuel H. Glockzin, Jr.		173	PA
07246	6 P	Lexington Square	1324 E. Hospital Dr.	Angleton	R		80	80	General	RH	✓	\$384,038	Lisa Castillo		147	REA
07252	6 P	Brooks Manor Apartments	444 Jefferson Ave.	West Colum	bia R		50	50	General	RH	✓	\$226,377	Lisa Castillo		144	REA
07268	6 P	Mid-Towne I Apartments	820 E. Carrell St.	Tomball	R		54	54	General	RH	$\checkmark$	\$285,151	Dennis Hoover	r 🗌	126	REA
						Total:	308	308			\$	52,197,318				
						Total:	458	484			\$	2,279,784				
33	App	lications in Region			F	Region Total:	3,015	3,290			\$1	7,947,026				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

- 4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC
- 6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 13 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name Address	Sity Allocation <sup>2</sup> USI	et-Asides <sup>3</sup> LI Total DA NP AR Units Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Housing <sup>5</sup> Population Activity AC	<sub>6</sub> Credit Owner TDHC Q Request Contact HOM	A Awarded 7 E Score Notes
Region: 7					
Allocation Information for Region 7:	Total Credits Available for Region: \$2,54	48,006 Rural Allocat	tion: \$269,267	Urban/Exurban Allocation:	\$2,278,739
credits in the amount of \$503,593; \$368,		ion	for USDA: \$127,400	15% Required for At-Risk:	\$382,201

Applications Submitted in Region 7: Urban/Exurb	ban								
07249 7 P Bluffs Landing Senior 2200 Old Settlers Blv Village	vd. Round Rock	U/EX	144	144 E	Elderly NC	S1,189,481 Coll	by Denison 🗸	199	REA
07234 7 P Tuscany Park at Buda FM 2001 E. of IH 35	Buda	U/EX	170	176 G	General NC	☐ \$1,200,000 Mar	k Musemeche 🗸	197	REA
07313 7 P Villas at Rabbit Hill FM 1460 Across from Timberline Dr.	n Round Rock	U/EX	136	136 E	Elderly NC	<b>\$1,000,000 Ebb</b>	oy Green 🗸	194	PA
07224 7 P Sierra Ridge Apartments Intersection of N.W. Washam Dr.	Blvd. & Georgetown	U/EX	77	80 G	General NC	S731,071 Nac	omi Walker	181	PA
07223 7 P Shady Oaks Apartments 501 Janis Dr.	Georgetown	U/EX	✓ 60	60 G	eneral RH	S369,110 Nac	omi Walker 🗸	178	REA
		Т	otal: 587	596		\$4,489,662			
		т	otal: 587	596		\$4,489,662			
Applications Submitted in Region 7: Rural									
07220 7 P San Gabriel Crossing 1625 Loop 332	Liberty Hill	R 🔽 🗌	73	76 G	eneral NC	S97,220 Mar	k Mayfield	181	REA
		Т	otal: 73	76		\$597,220			
		т	otal: 73	76		\$597,220			
6 Applications in Region		Region To	otal: 660	672		\$5,086,882			

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 14 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name	Address	City Al	location <sup>2</sup>	Set-Asides USDA NP AR	<sup>3</sup> LI Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> n Activity A	<sub>6</sub> Credit CQ Request	Owner TI Contact H	DHCA IOME	Awarde Score	d Notes
Region:       8         Allocation Information for Reg         **One previously awarded dev         amount of \$113,408; this amount         8 Rural and to the state credit	velopment, TDHCA number unt has been added to the	05225, return original alloca	ed creditation for	ts in the 59 Region		Alloca Juired		\$570,796 : \$131,266		Exurban Allocati quired for At-Ris		\$2,054, \$393,	
Applications Submitted in Region a	8: Urban/Exurban												
07034 8 A Village at Meadowbend Apartments II	1638 Case Rd.	Temple	U/EX		79	99	General	NC	\$44,275	Monica Poss		300	BA
07015 8 A Chisholm Trail Senior Village	1003 W. 9th Ave.	Belton	U/EX		54	60	Elderly	NC	\$28,703	Leslie Donaldson Holleman		300	BA
				Total:	133	159			\$72,979	1			
07263 8 P Constitution Court	Constitution Dr., Off U.S. Hwy 190	Copperas Cove	U/EX		108	108	General	NC [	\$991,075	Emanuel H. Glockzin, Jr.		192	REA
07275 8 P Mansions at Briar Creek	2500 Blk of E. Villa Maria	Bryan	U/EX		171	171	Elderly	NC	\$1,200,000	Robert R. Burchfield		191	REA
07262 8 P Santour Court	Lots 14-26 & 40-42, Blk 14 Phase 7, Edelweiss Gartens Subdivision	College Statior	n U/EX		16	16	General	NC	\$294,106	Emanuel H. Glockzin, Jr		187	REA
07192 8 P Historic Lofts of Waco High	815 Columbus Ave.	Waco	U/EX		104	104	General	NC	\$1,127,838	Hollis Fitch		169	PA
				Total:	399	399			\$3,613,019	I.			
				Total:	532	558			\$3,685,998				
Applications Submitted in Region 8	8: Rural – – – – – – –												
07038 8 A Bluffview Villas	2800 Hwy 36 S.	Brenham	R		76	76	Elderly	NC	] \$40,048	G. Granger MacDonald		300	BA
				Total:	76	76			\$40,048	ł			

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 15 of 24

	Region Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name	Address	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Set-Asides <sup>3</sup> USDA NP AR	<sup>5</sup> LI Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity	ACQ <sup>6</sup>	Credit Request	Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME		d <sub>7</sub> Notes
07177	8 P Hamilton Senior Village	Williams St. , 11 Acres at Hamilton City Limits	Hamilton	R		36	36	Elderly	NC		\$339,782	Bonita Williams	5 🗸	179	REA
07180	8 P Holland House Apartments	616 Josephine St.	Holland	R		68	68	General	RH	✓	\$324,474	Warren Maupir	ו ח	126	REA
					Total:	104	104				\$664,256				
					Total:	180	180				\$704,304				
9	Applications in Region			F	Region Total:	712	738			\$	4,390,302				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

- 4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC
- 6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 16 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name Address	Set-As City Allocation <sup>2</sup> USDA N	sides <sup>3</sup> LI Total Target <sup>4</sup>	Housing <sup>5</sup> 6 n Activity ACQ	Given Stredit Owner TDHO Request Contact HON	A Awarded 7 E Score Notes
Region: 9					
Allocation Information for Region 9:	Total Credits Available for Region: \$3,009,19	9 Rural Allocation:	\$807,115	Urban/Exurban Allocation:	\$2,202,083
credits in the amount of \$400,876; this a	s, TDHCA numbers 05226 and 05231, returned mount has been added to the original state credit ceiling and is correctly reflected in	5% Required for USDA	x: \$150,460	15% Required for At-Risk:	\$451,380

Applications Submitted in Region	9: Orban/Exurban												
07095 9 A Las Palmas Gardens Apartments	1014 S. San Eduardo	San Antonio	U/EX		100	100	General	RH 💽		\$728,581	David Marquez	301	FWD
07036 9 A Seton Home Center for Teen Moms	1115 Mission Rd.	San Antonio	U/EX		24	24	General	NC		\$22,493	Margaret Starkey	300	BA
07014 9 A Stratton Oaks Apartments	716 Stratton Ave.	Seguin	U/EX		100	100	General	NC		\$55,603	Colby Denison	300	BA
07006 9 A Palacio Del Sol	400 N. Frio	San Antonio	U/EX		160	200	Elderly	NC		\$81,457	Fernando Godinez	300	BA
				Total:	384	424				\$888,134			
07173 9 P West End Baptist Manor Apartments	934 SW 35th St.	San Antonio	U/EX		50	50	General	RH 💽		\$316,781	David Marquez	210	REA
07198 9 P West Durango Plaza Apartments	5635 W. Durango	San Antonio	U/EX		82	82	General	RH 💽		\$657,418	Ronald C. Anderson	208	REA
07171 9 P San Juan Square II	S Calaveras St. & Brady Blvd.	San Antonio	U/EX		138	144	General	RC	] :	\$1,200,000	Henry A. Alvarez III	203	REA
07233 9 P Ingram Square Apartments	5901 Flynn Dr.	San Antonio	U/EX		120	120	General	RH 💽		\$652,194	Paul Patierno	199	REA
				Total:	390	396				\$2,826,393			
				Total:	774	820			:	\$3,714,527			

**Applications Submitted in Region 9:** Rural

Applications Submitted in Region 9:

1 = Status of Award Abbreviation: Development Previously Awarded 2007 Housing Tax Credits=A, Pending/Non-Awarded Applications=P

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

Urban/Exurban

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 17 of 24

File #		gion tatus	<sup>1</sup> Development Name	Address	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Set-Aside			Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity	Credit Request	Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME		d <sub>7</sub> Notes
07008	39	AF	Friendship Place	600-700 E. Friendship Ln.	Fredericksb	ourg R		] 7	6 76	General	NC	\$40,760	Lucille Jones		300	BA
07061	19		Fowne Park in Fredericksburg II	1100 S. Adams	Fredericksb	ourg R		] 3	9 44	Elderly	NC	\$18,608	Mark Mayfield		300	BA
07007	79	AC	Daks Of Bandera	400 Old San Antonio Hwy	Bandera	R		] 7	6 76	General	NC	\$42,318	Lucille Jones		300	BA
							Tota	l: 19	1 196			\$101,686				
07242	2 9		Paseo de Paz Apartments	400 Blk of Clearwater Paseo	Kerrville			] 7	3 76	General	NC	\$749,635	Justin MacDon	ald 🗌	190	REA
07110	) 9		Poteet Housing Authority Farm Labor	Ave. N at 4th St.	Poteet	R		] 3	0 30	Family	RH	\$121,601	Gary M. Drigge	ers	186	REA
							Tota	l: 10	3 106			\$871,236				
	_						Tota	: 29	4 302			 \$972,922				
1	3 /	Applic	cations in Region				Region Tota	: 1,06	8 1,122			\$ 4,687,449				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

- 4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC
- 6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 18 of 24
Region File # Statu	n us <sup>1</sup> Development Name	e Address	City A	llocation	Set-Asides <sup>2</sup> USDA NP A	s <sup>3</sup> LI R Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity AC	6 Credit Q Request	Owner TD Contact H0	OHCA OME	Awarde Score	ed Notes
Region:	10													
	n Information for Re d score for TDHCA a	gion 10: Total Credits A application number 07199 is		-		Rural /		ation: I for USDA:	\$871,013 \$83,902		xurban Allocatic quired for At-Ris		\$807, \$251,	
Application	s Submitted in Region	10: Urban/Exurban												
)7090 10 A	Thomas Ninke Senior Village	1901 Lova Rd.	Victoria	U/EX		80	80	Elderly	NC	\$470,000	Debbie Gillespie		301	FWD
					Total:	80	80			\$470,000				
07174 10 P	LULAC Hacienda Apartments	2625 Greenwood	Corpus Christi	U/EX		60	60	Elderly	RC V	\$617,105	David Marquez		205	REA
07318 10 P	Buena Vida Senior Village	4650 Old Brownsville Rd.	Corpus Christi	U/EX		120	120	Elderly	NC	\$1,103,844	Randy Stevenson		159	REA
					Total:	180	180			\$1,720,949				
					Total:	260	260			\$2,190,949				
Application	s Submitted in Region	10: Rural												
07072 10 A	Lantana Ridge Apartments South	2200 N. Adams St.	Beeville	R		35	35	General	RH 🗸	\$1,400	Gary L. Kersch		300	BA
07071 10 A	Saltgrass Landing Apartments	1602 S. Church St.	Rockport	R		55	55	General	RH 🗸	\$2,419	Gary L. Kersch		300	BA
07021 10 A	Fenner Square	Corner of Burke & Campbell St.	Goliad	R		32	32	General	NC	\$21,258	Gary M. Driggers		300	BA
07073 10 A	Lantana Ridge Apartments	2200 N. Adams St.	Beeville	R		55	55	General	RH 🔽	\$2,380	Gary L. Kersch		300	BA
					Total:	177	177			\$27,456				
07111 10 P	Alaniz Circle	400 Stamper	Beeville	R		56	56	General	RH	\$442,720	Gary M. Driggers		198	REA
07199 10 P	Kingsville LULAC Manor Apartments	1220 N. 17th	Kingsville	R		88	88	General	RH 🔽	\$491,514	Walter Martinez	✓	192	REA

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.



Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name Address	City	Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Set-Asides	<sup>3</sup> LI Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity	ACQ		Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME	Awardeo Score	
07221 10 P Wild Horse Commons 3500-3700 Blk of S. Brahma Blvd.	Kingsville	R		73	76	Elderly	NC		\$745,535	Diana McIver		190	REA
07124 10 P King's Crossing Phase II 1505 E. Corral	Kingsville	R		72	72	General	NC		\$699,000	Mark Musemed	che 🖌	185	PA
07271 10 P Hyatt Manor Apartments 1701 Waco St.	Gonzales	R		65	65	General	RH	$\checkmark$	\$322,018	Dennis Hoover		140	REA
			Total:	354	357			\$	\$2,700,787				
			Total:	531	534			\$	2,728,243				
12 Applications in Region			Region Total:	791	794				64,919,192				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

- 4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC
- 6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 20 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name	e Address	City	Allocation	Set-Aside	es <sup>3</sup> LI AR Units	Total S Units	Target Populati	<sup>4</sup> Housing on Activity	5 ACC	6 Credit Request	Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME	Awarde Score	ed 7 Notes
Region:     11       Allocation Information for Region	gion 11: Total Credits A	vailable for	Region:	\$5,965,273	Rural	Alloca	ation:	\$2,171,9	81	Urban/E	xurban Alloca	tion:	\$3,793,	292
					5% Red	quirec	I for USD	A: \$298,2	64	15% Rec	quired for At-R	isk:	\$894,	791
Applications Submitted in Region	11: Urban/Exurban													
07094 11 A Mesquite Terrace	400 Blk of E. Thomas Rd.	Pharr	U/EX		] 106	106	Elderly	NC		\$590,170	Roy Navarro		301	FWD
07012 11 A Villa del Sol	700 E. St. Charles St.	Brownsville	U/EX		] 189	199	Elderly	RH	✓	\$28,453	William (Bill) J. Lee		300	BA
07013 11 A Las Canteras Apartments	415 E. Thomas Rd.	Pharr	U/EX		] 100	100	General	NC		\$53,407	William (Bill) J. Lee		300	BA
07044 11 A Providence at Boca Chica	Intersection of Ash St. & Elm St.	Brownsville	U/EX		] 151	158	General	RH	✓	\$72,261	Bill Fisher		300	BA
07045 11 A Providence at Edinburg	201 N. 13th Ave.	Edinburg	U/EX		] 100	100	Elderly	NC		\$29,947	Bill Fisher		300	BA
				Tota	l: 646	663				\$774,238				
07183 11 P Sunset Terrace	920 W. Villegas	Pharr	U/EX		100	100	General	RC		\$982,000	Roy Navarro		215	REA
07206 11 P Villa Estella Trevino	15 Acres of 20 Acres 1/4 Mile E. of Sugar Rd., N. Side of Mile 17 1/2 Rd.	Edinburg	U/EX		] 161	168	Elderly	NC		\$1,152,000	Gilbert de los Santos		203	REA
07182 11 P Retama Village - Phase II	2301 Jasmine Ave.	McAllen	U/EX		74	74	General	RC		\$748,000	Joe Saenz		203	REA
07226 11 P Candlewick Apartments	1155 Paredes Line Rd.	Brownsville	U/EX		132	132	General	RH		\$995,000	Saleem Jafar		196	REA
07205 11 P North Manor Estates Apartments	Southwest corner of Mile 10 Rd. and mile 4.5, entrance fronts on mile 10 road.	Weslaco	U/EX		] 126	130	General	NC		\$1,115,662	Mike Lopez		196	PA
07185 11 P Bluebonnet Senior Village	1201 W. Austin Lane	Alamo	U/EX		] 36	36	Elderly	NC		\$360,000	Mary Vela		196	PA

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 21 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Name	Address	City	Allocation	Set-Asides <sup>3</sup> USDA NP AR	<sup>3</sup> LI Units	Total Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Populatior	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity	ACC	6 Credit Request	Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME		d 7 Notes
07169 11 P Costa Madera	Poggenpohl St. & San Ignacio Ave.	Laredo	U/EX		140	140	General	NC		\$1,200,000	Abraham Rodriguez		190	PA
				Total:	769	780				\$6,552,662				
				Total: 1	,415	1,443				\$7,326,900		·		
Applications Submitted in Region	11: Rural													
07055 11 A Arbor Cove	2805 Fordyce Ave.	Donna	R		108	120	General	NC		\$83,751	Anita Kegley		300	BA
07063 11 A Bahia Palms Apartments	1303 Pino Dr.	Laguna Vista	n R		64	64	General	RH	✓	\$4,485	Patrick A. Barbolla		300	BA
07068 11 A Vista Hermosa Apartments	820 N. Bibb	Eagle Pass	R		20	20	General	RH		\$730	Patrick A. Barbolla		300	BA
07035 11 A Casa Saldana	SW Corner of Mile 8 Rd. & Baseline Rd.	Mercedes	R		156	196	General	NC		\$82,912	Monica Poss		300	BA
				Total:	348	400				\$171,878				
07227 11 P Champion Home at La Joya	945 S Leo & Various Addresses for Scattered SF Homes	La Joya			50	50	General	RC		\$689,614	Saleem Jafar		204	REA
07228 11 P Las Palmas Homes	213 Orive	Los Fresnos	R		75	75	General	RC		\$600,000	Saleem Jafar		201	REA
07178 11 P Tammye's Pointe	Old Pioneer Rd. at FM 1021	Eagle Pass	R		76	76	General	NC		\$983,288	Donald Pace		187	REA
07153 11 P Los Ebanos Apartments	300 Yards S. of 5 Mile Line Rd. on E. Side of Los Ebanos Rd.	Alton	R		76	76	General	NC		\$847,135	Alyssa Carpent	er 🗌	179	REA
07302 11 P Casa Alton	NW Corner Trosper Rd. & Proposed Oxford St.	Alton	R		74	76	General	NC		\$705,994	Jean Coburn		178	REA
07267 11 P Buena Vida Apartments	100 S. Kansas City Rd.	La Feria	R		58	58	Elderly	RH	✓	\$137,560	Dennis Hoover		150	REA
				Total:	409	411				\$3,963,591				
				Total:	757	811				\$4,135,469				
22 Applications in Region				Region Total: 2	2,172	2,254			\$	511,462,369				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 22 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Na	ime Address	City	Allocation	Set-Asides <sup>2</sup> USDA NP AF	s <sup>3</sup> LI R Units	Total s Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	<sup>-</sup> Housing <sup>5</sup> n Activity AC	6 Credit	Owner - Contact	TDHCA HOME	Awarde Score	ed e Note
Region: 12													
Allocation Information for	Region 12: Total Credits	Available for	Region:	\$1,384,829 I	Rural	Alloca	ation:	\$406,320	Urban/E	xurban Alloca	tion:	\$978	,509
				5	% Red	quired	l for USDA	A: \$69,241	15% Rec	quired for At-R	isk:	\$207	,724
Applications Submitted in Regi	on 12: Urban/Exurban												
07033 12 A Sedona Springs Villa	age 920 W. University	Odessa	U/EX		85	100	General	NC	\$15,819	Ron Hance		300	BA
				Total:	85	100			\$15,819				
07282 12 P Palermo	SE Corner of E. Taylor Ave. Wayside Dr.	& Midland	U/EX		130	136	General	NC	\$904,473	Manish Verma	✓	203	REA
07222 12 P Riverbend Trails	Intersection of Surber Dr. & Rio Concho Dr.	San Angelo	U/EX		96	100	Elderly	NC	\$901,200	Diana McIver		198	REA
07151 12 P Key West Village Phase II	1600 W. Clements	Odessa	U/EX		36	36	Elderly	NC	\$237,938	Bernadine Spea	irs 🗌	196	REA
				Total:	262	272			\$2,043,611				
					347	372			\$2,059,430				
Applications Submitted in Regi	on 12: Rural												
07115 12 P Heights Apartments	MLK Blvd., 1 Blk E. of FM 70	0 Big Spring	R		48	48	General	NC	\$410,500	Justin Zimmerman		129	REA
				Total:	48	48			\$410,500				
				Total:	48	48			\$410,500				
5 Applications in Region				Region Total:	395	420			\$2,469,930				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 23 of 24

Region File # Status <sup>1</sup> Development Nam	e Address	City	Allocatior	Set-Aside	s <sup>3</sup> LI R Unit	Total s Units	Target <sup>4</sup> Population	Housing <sup>5</sup> Activity AC	6 Credit	Owner Contact	TDHCA HOME	Awarde Score	ed Note
Region: 13													
Allocation Information for Re	gion 13: Total Credits	Available fo	or Region:	\$2,147,703	Rural	Alloca	ation:	\$284,541	Urban/E	xurban Alloca	tion:	\$1,863	161
				:	5% Re	quirec	I for USDA	: \$107,385	15% Red	quired for At-R	lisk:	\$322	,155
Applications Submitted in Regior	n 13: Urban/Exurban												
07003 13 A Diana Palms	4700 Diana St.	El Paso	U/EX		34	36	General	NC	] \$17,494	R.L. (Bobby) Bowling IV		300	BA
07047 13 A Americas Palms	12310 Lorenzo Ruiz Dr.	El Paso	U/EX		112	112	General	NC	] \$59,831	R.L. (Bobby) Bowling IV		300	BA
				Total	: 146	148			\$77,324				
07108 13 P Paseo Palms	3000 E. Joe Battle Near Pelicano Dr.	El Paso	U/EX		180	180	General	NC	] <b>\$</b> 1,200,000	R.L. (Bobby) Bowling IV		173	REA
07235 13 P Woodchase Senior Community	8410 & 8411 Tigris Dr.	El Paso	U/EX		128	128	Elderly	NC	] \$1,069,620	Ike J. Monty		158	REA
07244 13 P Alamito Place	Bordered by Delta Drive, St Vrain St. E. Third St, & Hill Street	El Paso	U/EX		58	58	Family	NC	] \$669,659	Gary Sanchez		155	REA
				Total	: 366	366			\$2,939,279				
				Total	: 512	514			\$3,016,603				
Applications Submitted in Regior	13: Rural												
07048 13 A Horizon Palms	12199 Darrington Rd.	El Paso	R		76	76	General	NC	] \$41,271	R.L. (Bobby) Bowling IV		300	BA
				Total	: 76	76			\$41,271				
				Total	: 76	76			\$41,271				
6 Applications in Region				Region Total	588	590			\$3,057,875				
167 Total Applications				14	,973 <sup>-</sup>	15,738			\$89,520,862				

2 = Allocation Abbreviation: Rural Regional Allocation=R, Urban/Exurban Regional Allocation=U/EX 3 = Set-Aside Abbreviation: TX-USDA-RHS=USDA, Nonprofit=NP, At-Risk=AR

4 = Target Population Abbreviation: Intergenerational=Intg, Elderly/Transitional=Eld/Trans 5 = Housing Activity: Rehabilitation=RH, Reconstruction=RC, New Construction=NC

6 = Acquisition=ACQ, Developments for which acquisition Housing Tax Credits are being requested

7 = Notes: 2006 Applications Awarded from the 2007 Ceiling=FWD, 2004 Developments Awarded Binding Allocation Agreements from the 2007 Ceiling=BA, Pending Applications=PA, Terminated Applications=TERM, Withdrawn Applications=WITH, Pending/Active Applications being reviewed by Real Estate Analysis however does not imply a staff recommendation=REA

\* = The State Credit Ceiling is based on 2007 population figures, plus any returned credits as of the date of this publication from previous awards.

Page 24 of 24

### MULTIFAMILY FINANCE PRODUCTION DIVISION BOARD ACTION REQUEST

June 28, 2007

#### Action Item

Presentation, Discussion and Possible Action on a requirement to install dishwashers on all developments according to §49.9(h)(4)(B)(iii) of the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules ("QAP").

#### **Requested Action**

Approve, Amend or Deny the staff recommendation for the waiver of §49.9(h)(4)(B)(iii) of the 2007 QAP.

#### **Background and Summary**

Pursuant to \$49.9 (h)(4)(B)(iii) of the 2007 QAP the applicant must submit, as part of their tax credit application, a signed certification that the Development will have dishwashers. This transaction consists of 13 properties that are all acquisition/rehabilitation and will consist of a total of 1,020 units targeting the general population, with all units affordable. The applicant is requesting a waiver of this threshold requirement for 361 (or 36%) of the units across several of the properties.

According to the applicant there are approximately 169 (or 17%) of the units that have no realistic location where a dishwasher could be installed under any circumstances. An additional 192 (or 19%) of the kitchens have only the exact 24" width of the dishwasher in available space, but at least an inch or two is required to construct the housing around the dishwasher that supports the countertop. Many of these exact 24" spaces are located in corner cabinets where, even if a dishwasher were installed, the door would not be able to open because one side would hit the cabinet perpendicular to the corner. The applicant proposes to provide portable dishwasher units to all of the apartment units in question.

As noted above, this transaction consists of 13 properties that will be pooled into one (1) bond and housing tax credit transaction. Rainbow Housing Assistance Corporation – Texas, Inc. is the General Partner, which is solely owned by Texas Council of Foundation for Social Resources, Inc. This transaction is tentatively scheduled to be brought before the Board at the July 12, 2007 Board meeting for a decision on the allocation of 4% Housing Tax Credits. The Bonds are being issued by Texas State Affordable Housing Corporation (TSAHC).

#### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Board deny the applicant's request to waive the threshold requirement to install built-in dishwashers in all units. Instead, accept the applicant's proposal to provide portable dishwashers for the approximate 361 units that do not have the needed space to install built-in units.

dia No 🐋

#### **Teresa Morales**

From: H	lans Juhle	[hiuhle@	@reliantgrou	o.com]
---------	------------	----------	--------------	--------

Wednesday, June 13, 2007 9:17 PM Sent:

Robbye Meyer To:

teresa.morales@tdhca.state.tx.us; David Danenfelzer; Katherine Closmann; Tom Gouris; Chris Cc: Porter: Joseph Sherman

Subject: Texas Portfolio - Dishwasher Solution

Robbye, following on your question this morning, I have spent the day analyzing each kitchen layout for each of the 13 properties, to attempt to respond quantitatively with the challenge and a proposed solution. As you know, dishwashers are 24" wide and must be located near a water source for proper overflow protection. drainage and of course the water supply. With approximately 100 different kitchen layouts, I pulled the plans and gave unique thought to how best to orient a new dishwasher for each and every unit type. The good news is that it appears that the vast majority of the kitchens will be able to accommodate the addition of a dishwasher without any problems. By this message, I wanted to respond to your question with a few pieces of information that I hope will be helpful in reaching a solution on the few kitchens where a dishwasher is not feasible. This is a work in progress due to the illegibility of two sets of plans, but this is my assessment at present:

Of the 1014 kitchens in the portfolio, approximately 169 (or 17%) have no realistic location where a dishwasher could be installed under any circumstances (see photos for an illustrative example). An additional 192 (or 19%) of the kitchens have only the exact 24" width of the dishwasher in available space, but at least an inch or two is required to construct the housing around the dishwasher that supports the countertop. Add to this that many of these exact 24" spaces are located in corner cabinets, meaning that even if a dishwasher were forced into place somehow, it would not be able to open its door because one side would hit the cabinets perpendicular to the corner. I'm still working on it, but it seems reasonable that an installed dishwasher will not work for these either. meaning we need another solution for 361 of the kitchens.

I am attaching a few photographs we happen to have of kitchens where a dishwasher is not feasible, as well as an example of a floorplan showing the insufficiency of space. There are many floorplans making this point, but I didn't want to overload this message with the plans for each and every kitchen I've catalogued as being a challenge. I am also attaching a link to a product summary for the type of dishwasher that has been suggested to us as the practical solution in this case. We have not decided on this particular make and model, but this product summary gives a good explanation of these machines. Here it is if you'd like to click on it to learn more:

#### http://www.haieramerica.com/en/product/HDT18PA

Best wishes,

Hans W. Juhle

Vice President

6/20/2007

(Tel) 415.788.0700 x229 (Fax) 415.788.0435

-Hans

Robbye, please let me know if you have any questions as you look through this - I'm continuing to hone the specific solutions that might work for these units, and over the coming days I'll have an even more certain exact count. The units I mentioned are based on specific measurements taken from the plans for specific unit types, so my hope is that once we agree on a product appropriate for these unit types, we can simply all agree that we'll install standard dishwashers everywhere except for a few specific unit types at a few specific properties, which would then receive a countertop version. Please take care.

grande of the application of

en 1998 - Standard Maria 1999 - Standard Maria 1999 - Standard Maria A CAR AND provide the provide state of the THE RELIANT GROUP 556 Commercial Street, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94111







### DISASTER RECOVERY DIVISION

#### **BOARD ACTION**

#### June 28, 2007

#### Action Item

Presentation and Discussion of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Disaster Recovery Status Report.

#### **Requested Action**

Presentation and discussion of the CDBG Disaster Recovery Status Report.

#### **Background**

On May 22, 2006, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) awarded the State of Texas \$74,523,000 of an \$11.5 billion supplemental appropriation for the CDBG Disaster Recovery Program (Program). The award is to address the consequences of Hurricane Rita for activities described in the *State of Texas Action Plan for CDBG Disaster Recovery Grantees under the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006*, dated April 13, 2006 (Action Plan).

The Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA/Department), in conjunction with the Office of Rural Community Affairs (ORCA), is working with four Councils of Governments (COGs) to distribute the funds. The Department is charged with administering \$40,259,276 (56.9%) of housing funds requested by three Councils of Governments (COGs): the Deep East Texas Council of Governments (DETCOG), Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC), and the South East Texas Regional Planning Commission (SETRPC). ORCA is administering \$30,537,374 (43.1%) of non-housing funds requested by these COGs and additionally the East Texas Council of Governments (ETCOG) on behalf of cities, counties, and Indian tribes.

The TDHCA Governing Board has requested a monthly report item on the status of the CDBG Disaster Recovery Program. This report item includes the activities of both housing and non-housing contractors.

	Project Activity											
	# of Applications	# Determined Eligible	# of Contracts Awarded	# of Units Under Contract	# of Assisted Households							
DETCOG	461	11	0	0	0							
H-GAC	245	90	0	0	0							
SETRPC												
SETRPC	1,561	24	3	1	2							
Beaumont	764	0	0	0	0							
Port Arthur	679	132	0	0	0							
Total	3,483	310	3	1	2							

### HOUSING ACTIVITIES AS OF JUNE 28, 2007

• • • • •

	Fillar	icial Activity		
	Current Budget	Drawn To Date	Balance CDBG Funds	% of Funds Disbursed
DETCOG	\$6,745,034.00	\$108,598.35	\$6,636,435.65	1.61%
H-GAC	\$7,015,706.00	\$83,745.54	\$6,931,960.46	1.19%
SETRPC	\$26,498,536.00	\$315,490.00	\$26,183,046.00	1.19%
SETRPC	\$15,788,536.00	\$315,490.00	\$15,473,046	
Beaumont	\$5,145,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,145,000.00	
Port Arthur	\$5,565,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,565,000.00	
Totals	\$40,259,276.00	\$507,833.89	\$39,751,442.11	3.99%

Financial Astivity

### **Current and Proposed Initiatives to Improve Performance**

The goal of the Department and the COGs is to significantly improve the commitment and expenditure rate of the CDBG Disaster Recovery Program. The Department has conducted several intensive on-sight visits with the COGs to identify impediments. The significant milestones of the Program that must be accomplished prior to activity have been achieved and the COGs are now in the process of providing assistance.

### **NON-HOUSING ACTIVITIES AS OF JUNE 28, 2007**

All available funding for non-housing activities is under contract. Each of the awarded communities has received at least one technical assistance / site visit by ORCA staff. To date, approximately \$4,174,848 has been paid to non-housing contractors and another approximately \$100,000 is under review for payment. Most of the non-housing contracts are in the process of completing procurement and environmental reviews, which is a 60 day process. At least 9 contracts totaling \$4.7 million are experiencing delays because these projects are Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) projects that are not being prioritized by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and as a result, FEMA funding for the projects is slow in being received by these communities.

On June 14th, 15th, 18th, and 20th, HUD's Office of Inspector General (HUD-OIG) held meetings in each COG to introduce OIG to the communities that received non-housing funding. These meeting were also attended by TDHCA and ORCA staff.

### **OFFICE OF RURAL COMMUNITY AFFAIRS**

#### BOARD ACTION REQUEST June 28, 2007

#### Action Item

The following action is recommended related to non-housing activities under the State of Texas Action Plan (Action Plan) for *Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Disaster Recovery Funds to Areas Most Impacted and Distressed by Hurricane Rita*:

Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Approval for Amendments to Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) contracts administered by the Office of Rural Community Affairs (ORCA).

#### **Requested Action**

Approve or deny the request for amendments related to the use of non-housing funds under the CDBG Disaster Recovery Program.

#### **Background**

The U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) approved the State of Texas Action Plan (Action Plan) related to the CDBG Disaster Recovery Funds to Areas Most Impacted & Distressed by Hurricane Rita on June 16, 2006. On August 30, 2006 the TDHCA Governing Board approved the non-housing project recommendations of the Office of Rural Community Affairs (ORCA) and the four COGs in the affected area.

The Action Plan approved by HUD specifically states "contract amendments that vary more than 5% must be approved by the TDHCA Board."

### City of Mt. Enterprise Contract Number DRS060055

#### **Summary of Request**

ORCA is recommending the cancellation of the \$5,000 contract originally approved for the City of Mt. Enterprise. Under the city's application the city had planned to acquire one portable generator to be used at its two lift stations. (Portable generators are considered to be equipment and equipment that is not permanently affixed is not generally eligible.) Based on this interpretation the city has determined that a permanently affixed generator will not meet its stated purpose and through Council action has decided to decline the award.

### City of Kilgore Contract Number DRS060045

### **Summary of Request**

ORCA is recommending the cancellation of the \$290,000 contract originally approved for the City of Kilgore. Under the city's application the city applied for a portion of the match funds required for an approximate \$3 million Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) grant to construct a 21,000 square foot community shelter that could accommodate approximately 500 evacuees. Through Council action the City has determined not to partner with FEMA because of "strict guidelines and requirements on building the shelter" and that the City's portion of the required match should be used for other projects. Therefore, they are declining the CDBG award.

### City of Alto Contract Number DRS060002

#### **Summary of Request**

The City of Alto is requesting approval of a transfer in funding categories to move two hundred seventy thousand dollars (\$270,000) from the neighborhood facilities / community centers line item to water facilities, sewer facilities, engineering, and planning / project delivery. In addition the East Texas Council of Governments (ETCOG) is recommending approval of an increase in funding to the City of Alto in the amount of forty-six thousand six hundred dollars (\$46,600) from the funds made available from the cancellation of the Kilgore and Mt. Enterprise contracts in the same region.

On August 30, 2006 the TDHCA Governing Board approved a two hundred seventy thousand dollar (\$270,000) award to the City of Alto for the renovation of a donated building into a community shelter for evacuees. Since the Board approval the building is no longer available for this purpose and acquisition of another facility would exceed the community's means. Therefore the City is requesting to amend its current award and utilize the additional funds to upgrade water and sewer facilities by installing two generators with appropriately related appurtenances at the City storage tank, and one generator with appropriately related appurtenances at the waste water treatment plant with appropriate engineering and planning / project delivery costs. There will be no change in the number of beneficiaries.

Activity	Сι	urrent Budget	ent Budget Change (+		Re	vised Budget
6 Neighborhood Facilities /						
Community Centers	\$	270,000.00	-	\$270,000.00	\$	-
1a Water Facilities			+	\$170,000.00	\$	170,000.00
1b Sewer Facilities			+	\$ 64,500.00	\$	64,500.00
30 Engineering			+	\$ 52,100.00	\$	52,100.00
33 Planning / Project Delivery			+	\$ 30,000.00	\$	30,000.00
	\$	270,000.00			\$	316,600.00

ORCA recommends approval of the City's request to transfer funding categories to move two hundred seventy thousand dollars (\$270,000) from the neighborhood facilities / community centers line item to water facilities, sewer facilities, engineering and architecture, and planning / project delivery and to increase the total award to the City of Alto by forty-six thousand six hundred dollars (\$46,600) as recommended by ETCOG.

### City of Carthage Contract Number DRS060009

#### **Summary of Request**

The East Texas Council of Governments (ETCOG) is recommending approval of an increase in funding to the City of Carthage in the amount of forty-eight thousand six hundred dollars (\$48,600) from the funds made available from the cancellation of the Kilgore and Mt. Enterprise contracts in the same region.

On August 30, 2006 the TDHCA Governing Board approved a two hundred ninety thousand dollar (\$290,000) award to the City of Carthage as match for \$3.4 million in FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) funding to convert a 44,000 square foot city owned facility into a community shelter to be able to accommodate 1000 evacuees. The additional funds made available will be used to acquire an 80kw generator for the same facility including appropriately related appurtenances and planning / project delivery expenses. There will be no change in the number of beneficiaries.

Activity	Current Budget	Change (+/-)	Revised Budget
6 Neighborhood Facilities / Community Centers	\$ 268,250.00	<b>+</b> \$ 44,955.00	\$ 313,205.00
33 Planning / Project Delivery	\$ 21,750.00	<b>+</b> \$ 3,645.00	\$ 25,395.00
	\$ 290,000.00		\$ 338,600.00

ORCA recommends increasing the total award to the City of Carthage by forty-eight thousand six hundred dollars (\$48,600) as recommended by ETCOG.

### City of Gallatin Contract Number DRS060023

#### **Summary of Request**

ETCOG is recommending approval of an increase in funding to the City of Gallatin in the amount of eighty-eight hundred dollars (\$8,800) from the funds made available from the cancellation of the Kilgore and Mt. Enterprise contracts in the same region.

On August 30, 2006 the TDHCA Governing Board approved a fifty thousand dollar (\$50,000) award to the City of Gallatin to repair and renovate a community shelter. The additional funds made available will be used to acquire a generator for the same facility including appropriately related appurtenances. There will be no change in the number of beneficiaries.

Activity	Current Budget			Cha	nge (+/-)	Rev	vised Budget
6 Neighborhood Facilities / Community Centers	\$	47,000.00	+	\$	8,800.00	\$	55,800.00
30 Engineering	\$	3,000.00			•	\$	3,000.00
	\$	50,000.00				\$	58,800.00

#### **Requested Action**

ORCA recommends increasing the total award to the City of Gallatin by eighty-eight hundred dollars (\$8,800) as recommended by ETCOG.

#### City of Henderson Contract Number DRS060009

#### **Summary of Request**

ETCOG is recommending approval of an increase in funding to the City of Henderson in the amount of forty-eight thousand six hundred dollars (\$48,600) from the funds made available from the cancellation of the Kilgore and Mt. Enterprise contracts in the same region.

On August 30, 2006 the TDHCA Governing Board approved a two hundred ninety thousand dollar (\$290,000) award to the City of Henderson as match for \$2.7 million in FEMA HMGP funding to convert a 25,000 square foot city owned facility into a community shelter to be able to accommodate 500 evacuees. The additional funds made available will be used to acquire an 80kW generator for the same facility including appropriately related appurtenances and planning / project delivery expenses. There will be no change in the number of beneficiaries.

Activity	Current Budget			Change (+/-)	Revised Budget	
6 Neighborhood Facilities / Community Centers	\$	268,250.00	+	\$ 44,955.00	\$	313,205.00
33 Planning / Project Delivery	\$	21,750.00	+	\$ 3,645.00	\$	25,395.00
	\$	290,000.00			\$	338,600.00

ORCA recommends increasing the total award to the City of Henderson by forty-eight thousand six hundred dollars (\$48,600) as recommended by ETCOG.

#### City of Jefferson Contract Number DRS060041

#### **Summary of Request**

ETCOG is recommending approval of an increase in funding to the City of Jefferson in the amount of forty-six thousand six hundred dollars (\$46,600) from the funds made available from the cancellation of the Kilgore and Mt. Enterprise contracts in the same region.

On August 30, 2006 the TDHCA Governing Board approved a two hundred seventy thousand dollar (\$270,000) award to the City of Jefferson to convert the Jefferson Visitors' Center into a community shelter. The additional funds made available will be used to acquire an 80kW generator for the same facility including appropriately related appurtenances, engineering, and planning / project delivery expenses. There will be no change in the number of beneficiaries.

Activity	Current Budget		Change (+/-)		Re	vised Budget	
6 Neighborhood Facilities / Community Centers	\$	221,000.00	+	\$	38,200.00	\$	259,200.00
30 Engineering	\$	28,750.00	+	\$	4,905.00	\$	33,655.00
33 Planning / Project Delivery	\$	20,250.00	+	\$	3,495.00	\$	23,745.00
	\$	270,000.00				\$	316,600.00

#### **Requested Action**

ORCA recommends increasing the total award to the City of Jefferson by forty-six thousand six hundred dollars (\$46,600) as recommended by ETCOG.

#### City of Longview Contract Number DRS060050

#### **Summary of Request**

ETCOG is recommending approval of an increase in funding to the City of Longview in the amount of fifty-four thousand dollars (\$54,000) from the funds made available from the cancellation of the Kilgore and Mt. Enterprise contracts in the same region.

On August 30, 2006 the TDHCA Governing Board approved a three hundred thirty-four nine hundred ninety-seven dollar (\$334,997) award to the City of Longview to acquire a generator for the Sabine River Water Treatment Plant, make improvements to a 24,000 square foot community shelter, emergency generator power to the SCADA system that controls the city's water and sewer treatment plants, with appropriate engineering and planning / project delivery. The additional funds made available will be used to acquire a generator including appropriately related appurtenances for the Dundee Booster Station that provides additional water pressure to the entire water system. There will be no change in the number of beneficiaries.

Activity	Сι	urrent Budget	get Change (+/-)		Re	vised Budget
1a Water Facilities	\$	67,273.00	+	\$ 54,000.00	\$	121,273.00
6 Neighborhood Facilities / Community Centers	\$	233,871.00			\$	233,871.00
14 Specially Authorized Public Facilities and Improvements	\$	33,853.00			\$	33,853.00
	\$	334,997.00			\$	388,997.00

### **Requested Action**

ORCA recommends increasing the total award to the City of Longview by fifty-four thousand dollars (\$54,000) as recommended ETCOG.

#### City of Rusk Contract Number DRS060075

#### **Summary of Request**

ETCOG is recommending approval of an increase in funding to the City of Rusk in the amount of forty-one thousand eight hundred dollars (\$41,800) from the funds made available from the cancellation of the Kilgore and Mt. Enterprise contracts in the same region.

On August 30, 2006 the TDHCA Governing Board approved a two hundred fifty thousand dollar (\$250,000) award to the City of Rusk to acquire 2 generators for water wells #2 and #4 repair and to renovate a community shelter. The additional funds made available will be used to acquire a generator for water well #1 including appropriately related appurtenances. There will be no change in the number of beneficiaries.

Activity	Current Budget		Change (+/-)		Re	vised Budget
1a Water Facilities	\$	100,000.00	+	\$ 41,800.00	\$	141,800.00
6 Neighborhood Facilities / Community Centers	\$	150,000.00			\$	150,000.00
	\$	250,000.00			\$	291,800.00

ORCA recommends increasing the total award to the City of Rusk by forty-one thousand eight hundred (\$41,800) as recommended by ETCOG.

### Hardin County Contract Number DRS060031

#### **Summary of Request**

Hardin County is requesting approval of a transfer in funding categories to move fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) from the flood and drainage – debris removal line item in to the planning and urban environmental design line item.

On August 30, 2006 the TDHCA Governing Board approved a one million fifty thousand dollar (\$1,050,000) award for debris removal, a community shelter, and street improvements. As the County has begun the process of removing the vast amounts of debris created by Hurricane Rita is has become necessary to complete a preliminary engineering study to determine the best course of action particularly in relation to needed repairs of the bridge at Woodway Boulevard. There will be no change in the number of beneficiaries.

Activity	Current Budget	Change (+/-)	Revised Budget
4 Street Improvements	\$ 55,000.00		\$ 55,000.00
5a Flood and Drainage Debris Removal	\$ 745,000.00	- \$ 50,000.00	\$ 795,000.00
6 Neighborhood Facilities / Community Centers	\$ 250,000.00		\$ 250,000.00
31 Planning & Urban Environmental Design		+ \$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
	\$ 1,050,000.00		\$ 1,150,000.00

#### **Requested Action**

ORCA recommends approval of a transfer in funding categories to move fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) from the flood and drainage – debris removal line item in to the planning and urban environmental design line item.

# THIS ITEM HAS BEEN PULLED FROM THE AGENDA

#### COMMUNITY AFFAIRS DIVISION EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANT PROGRAM

#### BOARD ACTION REQUEST JUNE 28, 2007

#### Action Item

Presentation, Discussion and Approval of 2007 Emergency Shelter Grants Program (ESGP) Funding Recommendations.

#### **Required Action**

Based on the Department's rankings and scoring of ESGP competitive proposals, Department staff recommends that the Board approve the organizations selected to receive FFY 2007 ESGP grant funding and the amount of funds recommended. A total of 78 applicants are recommended for funding, including one statewide project which will carry-out a statewide Special Initiative for Homelessness Prevention.

#### **Background**

The ESGP is funded by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and is included in the State of Texas' Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report. The ESGP regulations authorize HUD to make grants available to states, units of local government, and private nonprofit organizations for the rehabilitation or conversion of buildings for use as emergency shelter for the homeless, for the payment of certain operating expenses and for essential services in connection with emergency shelters for the homeless, and for homelessness prevention activities. FY 2007 ESGP funds totaled \$5,157,329 Five percent, \$257,866, of the funds will be retained by the Department to administer and monitor the grant. From that amount, we will share \$10,449 of this with two awardees that are city governments.

HUD requires that the Department make its grant amount available to units of general local government, or nonprofit organizations within 65 days of the date of the grant award letter. The 65 days deadline is July 12, 2007. Any ESGP funds that are not made available within the 65 day time period may be recovered from the Department by HUD and reallocated.

On November 13, 2006, the Department released to interested parties and eligible applicant organizations, a Request for Proposals (RFP) Application Packet for ESGP competitive funds made available to the Department from HUD. The Department received 118 applications for ESGP funding from this release. Due to technical questions with the definition of HUD regulations regarding the HUD requirement for a homeless or previously homeless person to serve on the Board of Directors of an ESGP organization, the ESGP rules were revised by the Board and the Department released a second Request for Proposals (RFP) Application Packet, based on the rule revisions, to interested parties on April 11, 2007. The Department received 6 additional applications for ESGP funding.

#### Page 2 TDHCA Board Action Item FFY 2007 ESGP Grant Awards

The funds are distributed by region, utilizing the 13 Uniform State Service Regions, according to the poverty population in each region. There are four regions (3, 6, 9, and 11), referred to as large-funded regions, which make up 63% of the poverty population and 63% of the funds are reserved for these four regions. There are nine regions (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 13), referred

to as small-funded regions, which have 37% of the poverty population and 37% of the funds are reserved for these nine regions. ESGP funds are reserved for each region based on their poverty population. Therefore, Region 6 which has the highest percentage of the poverty statewide 21.04% received 21.04% of the FFY 2007 ESGP funds available for awards.

The Department utilizes a standardized scoring instrument to evaluate and score each eligible competitive proposal. The scores from the review team members are averaged to establish a raw score, then bonus points are added to determine an adjusted score. Past performance of previously-funded ESGP subrecipients is also a factor and is taken into consideration during the final stage of the proposals review process. Points are deducted for previous contract compliance/performance deficiencies. The Department's Compliance Division is consulted to determine if potential applicants have any monitoring, audit, or compliance issues with Department-funded programs. Serious deficiencies in past or current performance can impact funding recommendations and could lead to disqualification for access to ESGP funds for the current funding cycle.

The attached document, FY 2007 ESGP Funding Recommendations, lists the applicants recommended for funding by region and by rank within the region. It also includes the amount requested and the amount recommended. The ranking takes into account all the cumulative factors previously mentioned.

Applications are ranked by score within their region and funds are distributed in each region beginning with the applicants with the highest score and decreasing by rank until the reserved funds for the region are fully distributed. When a region has a balance of funds below \$30,000, the minimum funding level, the funds are distributed to the top applicant(s) in the region.

The Department's Legislative Appropriation Request has an established target to fund 76 ESGP subrecipients. In order to fund a minimum of 76 organizations, the funding requests must be reduced. The reduction of the amount requested is done using a tier system. The first tier, the score tier, takes into account the scores received and the second tier, the request sub-tier, takes into account the amount of the request. Both the large-funded regions and the small-funded regions have three score tiers, one for scores in the 100s, one for scores in the 90s, and one for scores in the 80s. The large-funded regions and the small funded regions have three request sub-tiers. To determine the average fund request for collaborative applications, applications with 2 or more partners, an average amount requested per organization was determined.

#### Page 3 TDHCA Board Action Item FFY 2007 ESGP Grant Awards

Within each score tier, the percentage of funds awarded decreases by 5% as the scores decrease, so applications with a higher score receive a higher percentage of the amount requested. Within each request sub-tier, the percentage of funds awarded increases by 5% as the amount of the request decreases, so that applicants requesting a lower amounts receive a higher percentage of their request. This methodology enables the Department to fund the maximum number of applications.

For the large-funded regions, where the average request is \$85,000, the funds are allocated as follows:

- Requests above \$75,000 applications with a score in the 100s receive 70% of the amount requested, scores in the 90s receive 65%, and scores in the 80s receive 60%.
- Requests between \$50,000 \$74,999 applications with a score in the 100s receive 75% of the amount requested, scores in the 90s receive 70%, and scores in the 80s receive 65%.
- Requests below \$50,000 applications with a score in the 100s receive 80% of the amount requested, scores in the 90s receive 75%, and scores in the 80s receive 70%.

For the small-funded regions, where the average funding request is \$75,000, the funds are allocated as follows:

- Requests above \$65,000 applications with a score in the 100s receive 75% of the amount requested, scores in the 90s receive 70%, and scores in the 80s receive 65%.
- Requests between \$50,000 \$64,999 applications with a score in the 100s receive 80% of the amount requested, scores in the 90s receive 75%, and scores in the 80s receive 70%.
- Requests below \$50,000 applications with a score in the 100s receive 85% of the amount requested, scores in the 90s receive 80%, and scores in the 80s receive 75%.

#### **Recommendation**

The Community Affairs Division recommends Board approval of the organizations selected to receive an FFY 2007 ESGP grant award and the amount of funding recommended.

P:\rgarza\BOARD TDHCA\6.28.07 mtg\Board Action Rqst Funding Rcmndtns ESGP 07 v.2.doc

# ESGP FFY 2007 Recommended Applicants

Organization	City	Region	Rank	Total Funds Requested	Total Funds Recommended
Texas Homeless Network	Austin	0	1	100,000	75,000
Panhandle Crisis Center, Inc.	Perryton	1	1	77,013	67,249
Amarillo, City of *	Amarillo	1	2	154,147	123,317
First Step of Wichita Falls, Inc.	Wichita Falls	2	1	69,519	48,663
Salvation Army of Abilene	Abilene	2	2	100,000	71,466
Dallas Jewish Coalition	Dallas	3	1	45,500	34,125
Safe Haven of Tarrant County	Fort Worth	3	2	100,000	65,000
Family Place, The	Dallas	3	3	71,000	46,150
New Beginning Center, Inc.	Garland	3	4	82,800	53,820
Denton, City of *	Denton	3	5	229,845	137,907
Promise House, Inc.	Dallas	3	6	100,000	60,000
Family Gateway, Inc.	Dallas	3	7	70,000	45,500
Hope's Door	Plano	3	8	71,952	50,366
Mission Granbury, Inc.	Granbury	3	9	75,000	58,397
		-	10		
Salvation Army of Dallas	Dallas	3		55,000	30,000
Grayson County Juvenile Alternatives, Inc.	Sherman	3	11	81,792	57,254
Collin Intervention To Youth, Inc.	Plano	3	12	100,000	65,000
Arlington Life Shelter, The	Arlington	3	13	86,151	51,690
YMCA of Metropolitan Dallas	Dallas	3	14	60,500	42,350
Salvation Army of Fort Worth	Fort Worth	3	15	100,000	65,000
Johnson County Family Crisis Center	Cleburne	3	16	69,000	48,300
Shelter Agencies for Families in East Texas, Inc.	Mt. Pleasant	4	1	46,124	39,205
Sabine Valley Regional Mental Health and Mental Retardation					
Center	Longview	4	2	69,300	51,975
Salvation Army of Tyler	Tyler	4	3	100,000	75,000
East Texas Crisis Center, Inc. *	Tyler	4	4	200,000	69,254
Family Services of Southeast Texas, Inc.	Beaumont	5	1	83,434	64,612
Port Cities Rescue Mission Ministries	Port Arthur	5	2	100,000	76,210
Women's Shelter of East Texas, Inc.	Nacogdoches	5	3	56,679	45,885
Star of Hope Mission	Houston	6	1 ·	100,000	65,000
Harmony House, Inc.	Houston	6	2	69,853	48,897
Northwest Assistance Ministries	Houston	6	3	100,000	65,000
Womens Home. The	Houston	6	4	95,257	61,917
Houston Area Womens Center	Houston	6	5	100,000	65,000
Focusing Families	Hempstead	6	6	100,000	65,000
Childrens Center, Inc., The *	Galveston	6	7	175,000	76,305
Montgomery County Women's Center *	The Woodlands	6	8	198,480	129,012
Wesley Community Center, Inc.		6	9	99,660	64,779
Covenant House Texas	Houston			100,000	65,000
	Houston	6	10		
Bonita House of Hope	Houston	6		93,976	61,084
SEARCH *	Houston	6	12	198,967	129,328
Salvation Army of Galveston	Galveston	6	13	99,994	69,995
Bridge Over Troubled Waters, Inc., The	Pasadena	6	14	65,000	48,750
Travis County Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Survival Center dba Safeplace	Austin	-	4	46 659	38,666
	· · ·	7	<u>1</u> 2	46,658 74,000	55,473
Bastrop County Women's Shelter	Bastrop	1	2	74,000	55,475
Hays County Womens Center dba Hays-Caldwell Women's	Oon Marin		~	440.000	00 200
Center *	San Marcos	7	3	110,300	86,398
Youth and Family Alliance, dba LifeWorks	Austin	7	4	47,205	43,800
Twin City Mission, Inc.	Bryan	8	1	100,000	70,000
Family Abuse Center, Inc.	Waco	8	2	60,000	45,000
Faith Mission and Help Center, Inc.	Brenham	8	3	98,736	84,092
Compassion Ministries of Waco, Inc.	Waco	8	4	40,000	32,000
Seton Home	San Antonio	9	1	88,410	53,046
Community Council of South Central Texas, Inc. (CCSCT)	Seguin	9	2	100,000	59,724

# ESGP FFY 2007 Recommended Applicants

Organization	City	Region	Rank	Total Funds Requested	Total Funds Recommended
Family Violence Prevention Services, Inc.	San Antonio	9	3	99,800	64,870
Salvation Army of Kerrville	Kerrville	9	4	76,823	49,934
Catholic Charities, Archdiocese of San Antonio, Inc.	San Antonio	9	5	79,090	51,408
Comal County Family Violence Shelter Inc.	New Braunfels	9	6	53,000	39,750
Connections Individual and Family Services, Inc.	New Braunfels	9	7	100,000	30,000
Hope Action Care	San Antonio	9	8	100,000	64,724
Corpus Christi Hope House, Inc.	Corpus Christi	10	1.	55,199	46,659
Mid-Coast Family Services	Victoria	10	2	52,006	44,263
Salvation Army of Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi	10	3	100,000	70,259
Salvation Army of Victoria	Victoria	10	4	50,823	43,376
Family Crisis Center, Inc. *	Harlingen	11	1	200,000	147,410
Providence Ministry Corporation dba La Posada Providencia	San Benito	11	2	53,938	37,756
Bethany House of Laredo, Inc.	Laredo	11	3	100,000	60,000
Brownsville, City of *	Brownsville	11	4	287,668	186,984
Salvation Army of McAllen	McAllen	11	5	99,998	64,999
Amistad Family Violence and Rape Crisis Center	Del Rio	11	6	63,700	41,405
Advocacy Resource Center for Housing	Edinburg	11	7	80,000	48,000
Wintergarden Women's Shelter, Inc.	Carrizo Springs	11	8	82,000	53,300
Women Together Foundation, Inc.	McAllen	11	9	100,000	65,000
Salvation Army of Odessa	Odessa	12	1	41,523	33,218
Salvation Army of Big Spring	Big Spring	12	2	44,369	41,090
Midland Fair Havens, Inc.	Midland	12	3	82,000	57,400
Opportunity Center for the Homeless	El Paso	13	1	100,000	70,000
Young Women's Christian Association El Paso Del Norte Region	El Paso	13	2	100,000	73,245
Salvation Army of El Paso	El Paso	13	3	65,312	42,452
Sin Fronteras Organizing Project	El Paso	13	4	100,000	70,000
Total				7,283,501	4,899,463
* Collaborative projects					

# ESGP FFY 2007 Applicants

Organization	City	Region	Rank	Total Funds Requested	Total Funds Recommended
Texas Homeless Network	Austin	0	1	100,000	75,000
Panhandle Crisis Center, Inc.	Perryton	1	1	77,013	67,249
Amarillo, City of	Amarillo	1	2	154,147	123,317
Driskill Halfway House, Inc.	Tulia	1	3	100,000	0
Hale County Crisis Center, Inc.	Plainview	1	4	95,000	0
Caprock Community Action Association, Inc.	Crosbyton	1	5	65,800	0
Womens Protective Service of Lubbock, Inc.	Lubbock	1	6	65,000	0
South Plains Community Action Assoc., Inc.	Levelland	1	7	68,098	0
Hutchinson County Crisis Center, Inc.	Borger	1	8	39,500	0
Salvation Army of Abilene	Abilene	2	1	100,000	71,466
First Step of Wichita Falls, Inc.	Wichita Falls	2	2	69,519	48,663
Abilene Hope Haven, Inc.	Abilene	2	3	100,000	0
Mission Granbury, Inc.		3	1	75,000	58,397
Grayson County Juvenile Alternatives, Inc.	Granbury Sherman	3	2	81,792	57,254
Hope's Door	Plano	3	3	71,952	50,366
Johnson County Family Crisis Center	Cleburne	3	4	69,000	48,300
Dallas Jewish Coalition	Dallas	3	5	45,500	34,125
	~~~	3	6	82,800	53,820
New Beginning Center, Inc.	Garland		7	100,000	65,000
Salvation Army of Fort Worth	Fort Worth	3			42,350
YMCA of Metropolitan Dallas	Dallas	3	8	60,500	65,000
Safe Haven of Tarrant County	Fort Worth	3	9	100,000	
Collin Intervention To Youth, Inc.	Plano	3	10	100,000	65,000
Family Place, The	Dallas	3	11	71,000	46,150
Arlington Life Shelter, The	Arlington	3	12	86,151	51,690
Promise House, Inc.	Dallas	3	13	100,000	60,000
Family Gateway, Inc.	Dallas	3	14	70,000	45,500
Denton, City of	Denton	3	15	229,845	137,907
Salvation Army of Dallas	Dailas	3	16	55,000	30,000
Legal Aid of NorthWest Texas	Arlington	3	17	96,092	0
Presbyterian Night Shelter	Fort Worth	3	18	100,000	0
Brighter Tomorrows	Grand Prairie	3	19	100,000	0
Salvation Army of Sherman	Sherman	3	20	50,000	0
Salvation Army of Arlington	Arlington	3	21	45,000	0
Grayson County Shelter	Denison	3	22	95,710	0
Urban League of Greater Dallas and North Central Texas, Inc.	Dallas	3	23	100,000	о
Shelter Agencies for Families in East Texas, Inc.	Mt. Pleasant	4	1	46,124	39,205
Sabine Valley Regional Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center	Longview	4	2	69,300	51,975
Salvation Army of Tyler	Tyler	4	3	100,000	75,000
East Texas Crisis Center, Inc.	Tyler	4		200,000	69,254
Randy Sams Outreach Shelter, Inc.	Texarkana	4	5	100,000	. 0
Longview Interfaith Hospitality Network, Inc.	Longview	4	6	32,671	0
Kilgore Community Crisis Center	Kilgore	4	7	91,001	0
Charitable Consortium Inc. Sanctuary House	Palestine	4		55,676	0
					76,210
Port Cities Rescue Mission Ministries	Port Arthur	5	1	100,000	
Family Services of Southeast Texas, Inc.	Beaumont	5	· 2	83,434	64,612
Women's Shelter of East Texas, Inc.	Nacogdoches	5	3	56,679	45,885
Love I.N.C. of Nacogdoches	Nacogdoches	5	4	90,000	0

# ESGP FFY 2007 Applicants

Organization	City	Region	Rank	Total Funds Requested	Total Funds Recommended
Bridge Over Troubled Waters, Inc., The	Pasadena	6	1	65,000	48,750
Salvation Army of Galveston	Galveston	6	2	99,994	69,995
Womens Home, The	Houston	6	3	95,257	61,917
Wesley Community Center, Inc.	Houston	6	4	99,660	64,779
Star of Hope Mission	Houston	6	5	100,000	65,000
Focusing Families	Hempstead	6	6	100,000	65,000
SEARCH	Houston	6	7	198,967	129,328
Covenant House Texas	Houston	6	8	100,000	65,000
Houston Area Womens Center	Houston	6	9	100,000	65,000
Harmony House, Inc.	Houston	6	10	69,853	48,897
Northwest Assistance Ministries	Houston	6	11	100,000	65,000
Bonita House of Hope	Houston	6	12	93,976	61,084
Montgomery County Women's Center	The Woodlands	6	13	198,480	129,012
Childrens Center, Inc., The	Galveston	6	14	175,000	76,305
Fort Bend County Women's Center	Richmond	6	15	80,000	0
Montgomery County Emergency Assistance, Inc.	Conroe	6	16	114,250	0
Westside Homeless Partnership	Houston	6	17	198,142	0
Westside Homeless Partiership Walker County Family Violence Council	Huntsville	6	18	33,048	0
Coalition for the Homeless of Houston/Harris County,	Tuntsville				
	Houston	6	19	99,737	0
Cenikor Foundation, Inc.	Houston	6	20	100,000	0
Community of the Streets Outreach	Houston	6	21	65,000	0
Rapha Ministries	Houston	6	22	100,000	0
Youth and Family Alliance, dba LifeWorks	Austin	7	1	47,205	43,800
Travis County Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Survival Center dba Safeplace	Austin	7	2	46,658	38,666
Hays County Womens Center dba Hays-Caldwell Women's Center	San Marcos	7	3	110,300	86,398
Bastrop County Women's Shelter	Bastrop	7	4	74,000	55,473
Salvation Army of Austin	Austin	7	5	100,000	0
Williamson-Burnet County Opportunities, Inc.	Georgetown	7	6	60,500	0
Advocacy Outreach	Elgin	7	7	173,700	0
Highland Lakes Family Crisis Center, Inc.	Marble Falls	7	8	46,900	0
Merchants of Hope Children's Home	Austin	7	. <b>°</b>	325,000	0
Faith Mission and Help Center, Inc.	Brenham	8	1	98,736	84,092
	Waco	8	2	60,000	45,000
Family Abuse Center, Inc.			3	40,000	32,000
Compassion Ministries of Waco, Inc.	Waco	8		100,000	70,000
Twin City Mission, Inc.	Bryan	8	4		0
Salvation Army of Waco	Waco	8	5	100,000	
The Refuge Corporation	Copperas Cove	8	6	88,381	0
Families In Crisis, Inc. Economic Opportunities Advancement Corporation of	Killeen	8	7	100,000	0
Planning Region XI	Waco	8	8	89,997	0
Comal County Family Violence Shelter Inc.	New Braunfels	9.	1	53,000	39,750
Family Violence Prevention Services, Inc.	San Antonio	9	2	99,800	64,870
Salvation Army of Kerrville	Kerrville	9	3	76,823	49,934
Hope Action Care	San Antonio	9	4	100,000	64,724
Catholic Charities, Archdiocese of San Antonio, Inc.	San Antonio	9	5	79,090	51,408

# ESGP FFY 2007 Applicants

Organization	City	Region	Rank	Total Funds Requested	Total Funds Recommended
Seton Home	San Antonio	9	6	88,410	53,046
Community Council of South Central Texas, Inc. (CCSCT)	Seguin	9	7	100,000	59,724
Connections Individual and Family Services, Inc.	New Braunfels	9	8	100,000	30,000
San Antonio Metropolitan Ministry, Inc.	San Antonio	9	9	100,000	0
Corpus Christi Hope House, Inc.	Corpus Christi	10	1	55,199	46,659
Salvation Army of Victoria	Victoria	10	2	50,823	43,376
Mid-Coast Family Services	Victoria	10	3	52,006	44,263
Salvation Army of Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi	10	4	100,000	70,259
Corpus Christi Metro Ministries, Inc.	Corpus Christi	10	5	100,000	0
Family Crisis Center, Inc.	Harlingen	11	1	200,000	147,410
Wintergarden Women's Shelter, Inc.	Carrizo Springs	11	2	82,000	53,300
Salvation Army of McAllen	McAllen	11	3	99,998	64,999
Providence Ministry Corporation dba La Posada Providencia	San Benito	11	4	53,938	37,756
Brownsville, City of	Brownsville	11	5	287,668	186,984
Women Together Foundation, Inc.	McAllen	11	6	100,000	65,000
Amistad Family Violence and Rape Crisis Center	Del Rio	11	7	63,700	41,405
Bethany House of Laredo, Inc.	Laredo	11	8	100,000	60,000
Advocacy Resource Center for Housing	Edinburg	11	9 .	80,000	48,000
Salvation Army of Big Spring	Big Spring	12	1	44,369	41,090
Midland Fair Havens, Inc.	Midland	12	2	82,000	57,400
Salvation Army of Odessa	Odessa	12	3	41,523	33,218
Institute of Cognitive Development, Inc.	San Angelo	12	4	55,283	0
Safe Place of the Permian Basin	Midland	12	5	97,060	0
Young Women's Christian Association El Paso Del Norte Region	El Paso	13	1	100,000	73,245
Opportunity Center for the Homeless	El Paso	13	2	100,000	70,000
Sin Fronteras Organizing Project	El Paso	13	3	100,000	70,000
Salvation Army of El Paso	El Paso	13	4	65,312	42,452
Project Vida	El Paso	13	5	60,070	0
Center Against Family Violence	El Paso	13	6	100,000	0
Child Crisis Center of El Paso	El Paso	13	7	57,373	0
El Paso Villa Maria, Inc.	El Paso	13	8	42,553	0
La Posada Home, Inc.	El Paso	13	9	68,325	0
Total		<u> </u>		11,328,368	4,899,463

# **REPORT ITEMS**

### 2007 Competitive Housing Tax Credit (HTC) Challenges – Updated June 21, 2007

The attached table titled, **Status Log of 2007 Competitive Housing Tax Credit Challenges Received as of June 21, 2007** ("Status Log"), summarizes the status of the challenges received on or before June 21, 2007. The challenges were made against Applications in the 2007 Application Round. Behind the Status Log, all imaged challenges are provided in project number order. This PDF document has been bookmarked by application number for quick access.

All challenges are addressed pursuant to §49.17(c) of the 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan and Rules ("QAP"), which states, "the Department will address information or challenges received from unrelated entities to a specific 2007 active Application, utilizing a preponderance of the evidence standard, in the following manner, provided the information or challenge includes a contact name, telephone number, fax number and e-mail address of the person providing the information or challenge:

- (1) Within 14 business days of the receipt of the information or challenge, the Department will post all information and challenges received (including any identifying information) to the Department's website.
- (2) Within seven business days of the receipt of the information or challenge, the Department will notify the Applicant related to the information or challenge. The Applicant will then have seven business days to respond to all information and challenges provided to the Department.
- (3) Within 14 business days of the receipt of the response from the Applicant, the Department will evaluate all information submitted and other relevant documentation related to the investigation. This information may include information requested by the Department relating to this evaluation. The Department will post its determination summary to its website. Any determinations made by the Department cannot be appealed by any party unrelated to the Applicant."

Please note that a challenge is not eligible pursuant to this section if it is not made against a specific active 2007 HTC Application. If an Application is no longer active because the Development has been awarded tax credits by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs' (the "Department") Board, challenges relating to that awarded/inactive Application are not eligible under this section.

To the extent that the Applicant related to the challenge responds to the challenge(s), point reductions and/or terminations could possibly be made administratively. In these cases, the Applicant will be given an opportunity to appeal pursuant to §49.17(b) of the 2007 QAP, as is the case with all point reductions and terminations. To the extent that the evidence does not confirm a challenge, a memo will be written to the file for that Application relating to the challenge. The table attached reflects a summary of all such challenges received and determinations made as of June 21, 2007.

Challenge Received	TDHCA #	Development Name	Challenger	Nature and Basis of Challenge	Status
Date					
4/10/07	07109	Elrod Place	Kathi Zollinger and Katrina Thornhill	Two challenges regarding inconsistencies between information presented to the community and information contained in the 2007 HTC Application, and regarding the Development's location in a particular Municipal Utility District ("MUD"). The basis of the challenges as reflected in the challenge documentation is: information presented to the community by a representative of the Applicant in three separate meetings was different than, or incomplete when compared to, the Application; the role of the Harris County Housing Authority was not disclosed to the public; the right of first refusal	Analysis: The meetings with the public referred to in the challenges were not required by the Department, nor were they attended by any representative of the Department; therefore, assertions made with regard to discrepancies between the information presented in the meetings and in the Application cannot be evaluated by the Department. In holding three meetings not required by the Department, however, it appears that the Applicant made a good faith effort to meet with and inform the public about the proposed Development.
				provision was not disclosed to the public; the Development site may have negative site features such as chlorine gas and close proximity to power lines; the area in which the Development will be located already has a high concentration of low income individuals; and the Applicant represented in the Application that the Development is located in a MUD that it is not actually located in.	Regarding negative site features, an Environmental Site Assessment is required and has been performed for the Development site; in the event that this Application is chosen to receive a feasibility analysis, the report will be evaluated by the Department. The Department has a policy regarding concentration of low income individuals; the census tract in which the site is located is not an ineligible tract under the concentration policy. Finally, the land seller is in the process of annexing the site into a new MUD; this process is currently not under the
					<b>Resolution:</b> The Department has evaluated the challenges pursuant to the methodology outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP and has determined that no further action will be taken with regard to these challenges.

5/2/07 07118 Lakeside Eric Hartzell, Challenge regarding eligibility for points under Analysis: The provider of	
ApartmentsBETCO Development§49.9(i)(26) of the 2007 QAP, Third-Party Funding Commitment Outside of Qualified Census Tracts. The challenge asserts that the funding source is not a Third Party, and that the Application is, therefore, not eligible for points. The basis of the challenge as reflected in the challenge documentation is: the provider of funds and the Applicant are Related Parties and/or Affiliates because the Applicant holds the broker license under which the provider of funds operates.own schedule, chooses his selects his own clients, and percentage of his commissi operational costs, thus in ec own supplies and space. The meet several of the tests for whether the Person in ques to mover of an independent The provider of funds, desp broker/agent relationship, i Applicant, or an Affiliate to ensultant, the Developer, does not appear to be any for or ownership interest, a Rei desting interest, a Rei Resolution: The Department the challenge pursuant to the outlined in §49.17(c) of the has determined that no furt taken with regard to this challenge to his challenge to this challe	own sales terms, l provides a ions to offset his ssence buying his his would seem to r determining tion is an at contractor. pite the s not the hereof, a or, because there amily relationship lated Party. ent has evaluated he methodology 2007 QAP and her action will be

.

Challenge Received Date	TDHCA #	Development Name	Challenger	Nature and Basis of Challenge	Status
4/26/07	07175	Austin Place	Eric Hartzell, BETCO Development	Challenge regarding eligibility for points under §49.9(i)(17) of the 2007 QAP, Developments in Census Tracts with No Other Existing Developments Supported by Tax Credits. The challenge asserts that the Development is located in a census tract in which there are existing Developments supported by Tax Credits and that the Application is, therefore, not eligible for points. The basis of the challenge as reflected in the challenge documentation is: the Applicant represented that the Development is located in a different census tract than the census tract in which it is actually located.	<ul> <li>Analysis: The Applicant has confirmed the challenge assertions. The Application is not eligible for points under §49.9(i)(17).</li> <li>Resolution: The Department has evaluated the challenge pursuant to the methodology outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP. The Application will not be awarded points under §49.9(i)(17) of the 2007 QAP.</li> </ul>

Challenge Received	TDHCA #	Development Name	Challenger	Nature and Basis of Challenge	Status
Date 3/5/07, 3/15/07, and 3/16/07	07177	Hamilton Senior Village	Andy J. McMullen, Mark C. Henkes, Jesse T. Christopher, Lola Christopher, and Paula Patrick	Three challenges regarding fulfillment of signage requirements under §49.8(B) of the 2007 QAP. The challenges assert that the signage requirements have not been met. The basis of the challenges as reflected in the challenge documentation is: the signage is not posted within twenty feet of, and facing, the main road adjacent to the site, and is obstructed by trees.	Analysis: The Development site is located at the intersection of two public streets; the majority of the site fronts Elm Street, with only a small portion, used for ingress and egress, fronting Williams Street. The current property owner requested that the sign not be located on the portion of the site that fronts Williams Street, in order to allow the current owner continued access to the property. The Applicant does not have permission, or authority under the contract, to clear trees from the property. The Applicant placed the sign in an opening between trees on Elm Street in order to meet the requirements of the 2007 QAP, while acting within its authority under the land contract. <b>Resolution:</b> The Department has evaluated the challenges pursuant to the methodology outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP and has determined that no further action will be taken with regard to these challenges.

.

Challenge Received Date	TDHCA #	Development Name	Challenger	Nature and Basis of Challenge	Status
4/16/07	07227	Champion Homes at La Joya	Don Pace	Challenge regarding eligibility for points under §49.9(i)(2) of the 2007 QAP, Quantifiable Community Participation, §49.9(i)(5) of the 2007 QAP, Commitment of Development Funding by Local Political Subdivisions, §49.9(i)(8), Cost of the Development by Square Foot, §49.9(i)(12) of the 2007 QAP, Development Includes the Use of Existing Housing as Part of a Community Revitalization Plan, §49.9(i)(25) of the 2007 QAP, Leveraging of Private, State, and Federal Resources, and §49.9(i)(26) of the 2007 QAP, Third-Party Funding Commitment Outside of Qualified Census Tracts.	<ul> <li>Analysis: The items identified in the challenge were already identified by the Department in the scope of the review process and have already been resolved through the Administrative Deficiency process.</li> <li>Resolution: The Department has evaluated the challenge pursuant to the methodology outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP and has determined that no further action will be taken with regard to this challenge.</li> </ul>
4/16/07	07228	Las Palmas Homes	Don Pace	Challenge regarding the fulfillment of notification requirements under §49.9(h)(8)(A) of the 2007 QAP, and eligibility for points under §49.9(i)(2) of the 2007 QAP, Quantifiable Community Participation, §49.9(i)(5) of the 2007 QAP, Commitment of Development Funding by Local Political Subdivisions, §49.9(i)(12) of the 2007 QAP, Development Includes the Use of Existing Housing as Part of a Community Revitalization Plan, §49.9(i)(25) of the 2007 QAP, Leveraging of Private, State, and Federal Resources, and §49.9(i)(26) of the 2007 QAP, Third-Party Funding Commitment Outside of Qualified Census Tracts.	<ul> <li>Analysis: The items identified in the challenge were already identified by the Department in the scope of the review process and have already been resolved through the Administrative Deficiency process.</li> <li>Resolution: The Department has evaluated the challenge pursuant to the methodology outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP and has determined that no further action will be taken with regard to this challenge.</li> </ul>

.

Challenge Received	TDHCA #	Development Name	Challenger	Nature and Basis of Challenge	Status
Date				[19] 2012년 1월 2013년 1 2013년 1월 2013년 1월 201	
5/25/07	07249	Bluffs Landing Senior Village	Ebby Green, Round Rock Housing Authority		Analysis: The letter of support from the Association was originally found by the Department to meet all requirements for points under $\$49.9(i)(2)$ of the 2007 QAP. The Association was formed before the deadline required by $\$49.9(i)(2)(A)(5)$ of the 2007 QAP; the QAP does not require an explanation of the reason for formation. A certification from the Association, as well as the Association's Bylaws provide evidence that the organization is one of persons living near one another; the QAP does not require that an organization's membership be exclusively comprised of persons that live within the boundaries of the organization. The QAP does not specify what the purpose of an organization must be, except that it
				industry standards for development; and the Association is not recognized by the City as a neighborhood organization.	includes "working to maintain or improve the general welfare of the neighborhood"; the Association met this requirement, both by certification and in its Bylaws. Finally, the QAP does not require an organization to be recognized by the city; rather, an organization must be on record with the state or county, which the Association is. <b>Resolution:</b> The Department has evaluated the challenge pursuant to the methodology outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP and has determined that no further action will be taken with regard to this challenge.

Challenge TDHCA Received # Date #	A Development Name	Challenger	Nature and Basis of Challenge	Status
6/1/07 07257	Orange Palm Garden Apartment Homes	Robert Crow, Nacogdoches Housing Authority	Challenge regarding the eligibility for penalty points under §49.9(i)(27)(A) of the 2007 QAP, Scoring Criteria Imposing Penalties. The challenge asserts that a member of the Development team for the Applicant is affiliated with a 2006 Housing Tax Credit (HTC) Development for which an extension was requested, and that the Application should therefore be awarded penalty points. The basis of the challenge as reflected in the challenge documentation is: the Applicant for TDHCA # 060132 failed to meet a Department deadline; the Development team for 07257 for construction, management, and social services is the same as for 060132; and the Applicant contact for 07257 is an Affiliate of the Applicant for 060132.	Analysis: Penalty points under §49.9(i)(27)(A) of the 2007 QAP apply to the Applicant for an Application, and do not apply to other members of the development team. The Applicant for TDHCA #060132 is completely different from the Applicant for TDHCA #07257; the two do not share any common entities or individuals. Although the individuals listed in the Applicant structure for each development have partnered on Applications in the past, this partnership does not exist for either TDHCA #060132 or 07257. Despite past partnership relationships between members of each applicant, the Applicants for TDHCA #060132 and 07257 are not the same, nor do they appear to be Affiliates. <b>Resolution:</b> The Department has evaluated the challenge pursuant to the methodology outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP and has determined that no further action will be taken with regard to this challenge.

Challenge Received Date	TDHCA #	Development Name	Challenger	Nature and Basis of Challenge	Status
4/20/07	07282	Palermo	Janine Sisak, DMA Development Company, LLC	Challenge regarding eligibility for points under §49.9(i)(2) of the 2007 QAP, Quantifiable Community Participation ("QCP"), and §49.9(i)(22) of the 2007 QAP, Qualified Census Tracts with Revitalization. The challenge asserts that the QCP letter of support from Comunidad in Action is ineligible, and that the Application is not eligible for points based on the Development Site's location in an area targeted by a Community Revitalization Plan. The basis of the challenge as reflected in the challenge documentation is: Comunidad in Action is not a neighborhood organization, but rather a broader- based community organization, and; the Development Site is not located in the areas that target specific geographic areas for revitalization and development of residential developments under the Community Revitalization Plan.	<ul> <li>Analysis: The items identified in the challenge were already identified by the Department in the scope of the review process and have already been resolved through the Administrative Deficiency process.</li> <li>Resolution: The Department has evaluated the challenge pursuant to the methodology outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP and has determined that no further action will be taken with regard to this challenge.</li> </ul>

•

Challenge Received Date	TDHCA #	Development Name	Challenger	Nature and Basis of Challenge	Status
5/4/07	07295	The Bluestone	Paul Holden, Wilhoit Properties, Inc.	Challenge regarding eligibility for points under §49.9(i)(16) of the 2007 QAP, Demonstration of Community Support other than Quantifiable Community Participation. The challenge asserts that the letters of support from The American Legion Cedar Creek Post 310 ("American Legion"), Friends of the Tri-County Library, and Mabank Fire Department are ineligible, and that the Application is not eligible for these points. The basis of the challenge as reflected in the challenge documentation is: the American Legion is not located within the city limits of Mabank, the letter from the Friends of the Tri- County Library was on the library's letterhead, and the library conducts educational activities, and; the Mabank Fire Department is a part of the City of Mabank.	Analysis: Pursuant to §49.9(i)(16) of the 2007 QAP, the Development must receive letters of support from civic or community organizations that are active in and serve the community in which the Development is located. Letters from governmental entities, taxing entities or educational activities are not eligible for points. The American Legion Cedar Creek Post 310 provided sufficient evidence at the time of Application to show that the organization serves the community in which the Development is located. The QAP does not require that an organization be physically located within the city limits of the same municipality as the Development. The Friends of the Tri- County Library operates under separate bylaws and leadership from the Tri-County Library. The Friends of the Tri- County Library, and does not conduct educational activities. The letter from the Mabank Fire Department was not originally counted for points by the Department because adequate documentation was not pursuant to §49.9(i)(16) of the 2007 QAP. <b>Resolution:</b> The Department has evaluated the challenge pursuant to the methodology
					outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP and has determined that no further action will be taken with regard to this challenge.

 TDHCA #	Development Name	Challenger	Nature and Basis of Challenge	Status
 07302	Casa Alton	Alyssa Carpenter	Challenge regarding eligibility for points under §49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 QAP, Housing Needs Characteristics. The challenge asserts that the Application is eligible for fewer points than requested based on Development location. The basis of the challenge as reflected in the challenge documentation is: the Development is located in the City of Alton; the Application requested points based on the Development's location in Alton North; and the Affordable Housing Need Score for the City of Alton is lower than that of Alton North.	Analysis: The proposed Development Site is currently located within the City of Alton. At the time of the 2000 Decennial Census the proposed Development Site was located within the Alton North CDP; however, the Development Site has since been annexed into the City of Alton, as confirmed by the City's Planning Director and the Applicant. The current location of a Development, not its location as of the most recent Decennial Census, is used to evaluate eligibility for points based on demographic information from the most recent Decennial Census. <b>Resolution:</b> The Department has evaluated the challenge pursuant to the methodology outlined in §49.17(c) of the 2007 QAP. The Application score will be reduced from six points to four points for §49.9(i)(11) of the 2007 QAP based on the proposed Development's location within the City of

#### **TEXAS HOMEOWNERSHIP DIVISION**

### SINGLE FAMILY MORTGAGE REVENUE BOND PROGRAM REPORT ITEM JUNE 28, 2007

The purpose of this report item is to describe several varying factors of the First Time Homebuyer Program that will warrant discussion at ensuing Board meetings.

#### 1. Hurricane Rita "GO" Zone Set-Aside

Under the Single Family Mortgage Revenue Bond (MRB) Program, a portion of lendable proceeds are set-aside for the 22-county area designated as the Hurricane Rita Gulf Opportunity "GO" Zone on a first come, first serve basis. For borrowers purchasing homes in this area, the first time homebuyer requirement is waived and the borrowers income and purchase price limits may be higher. The first MRB Program released with funds set-aside for the Hurricane Rita GO Zone was Program 66 in June 2006. It was followed shortly with the release of Program 68 in November 2006. Under each program, a portion of the lendable proceeds was set aside for a period of one year for borrowers with incomes up to 140% of the area median family income (amfi) and a portion was reserved for borrowers earning no more than 60% amfi. There was a huge demand for the funds targeted to borrowers at the higher income limits and as a result the funds quickly originated. However, the funds targeted to the lower income borrower have not originated quickly. After the one year set-aside expires the income restriction is lifted and the funds are made available to borrowers earning incomes up to 140% amfi. The program set-asides are due to lift on June 29, 2007 (approximately \$16.9 million) and November 16, 2007 (approximately \$13 million) respectively.

While it appears these funds are being originated very quickly, the trend has been that they are not being utilized in areas impacted by Hurricane Rita, but instead are primarily being used in the city of Houston and Harris and Ft. Bend Counties. Therefore, a factor the board will need to discuss is whether a Hurricane Rita GO Zone set-aside is even warranted on the next bond issuance scheduled for this fall.

#### 2. Builder Use of the Program

Under Program 69 which was released on **June 5**, **2007**, all funds made available for the Hurricane Rita "GO" Zone were set aside for borrowers earning incomes up to 140% amfi. No funds were set-aside for lower income homebuyers. Within a matter of several hours, over \$15 million in funds within the Rita GO Zone were registered through the Master Servicer's online first come, first serve registration system. Large homebuilders with their own mortgage origination department or mortgage lenders aligned with homebuilders registered approximately 76% of the loans. As a result, staff received calls from other participating mortgage lenders within the Rita GO Zone who were frustrated the funds originated so quickly. Many of them had been working with potential borrowers to qualify them for the program but were unsuccessful at securing funds. Should the Hurricane Rita GO Zone be maintained in future program releases, the Board may want to discuss the continued use of a first come, first serve registration process.

#### 3. Creation of Program Rules

In the 80<sup>th</sup> regular legislative session, the Department was required to implement Subchapter MM of the Texas Government Code, Chapter 2306, as amended by the passage of H.B. 1637 and S.B. 1908. The new chapter relates to the Department's operation and administration of

the Texas First Time Homebuyer Program which will facilitate the origination of single family mortgage loans for eligible first time homebuyers. Any program changes or set-aside restrictions that the Board wishes to discuss or adopt may be placed in the rules. The program rules are scheduled to be presented to the Board in August for publication to receive public comment.

#### 4. Rate of Originations

For the latest program released on June 5, 2007, the daily average usage has been approximately \$3.8 million. Although we anticipate the level of usage to slow over the next several weeks with the depletion of the Hurricane Rita GO Zone set-aside and the statewide unassisted set-aside, staff does expect the level of usage to remain strong. To date, of the approximately \$97 million released, \$58 million has been reserved.

All of these factors will be discussed. The Board may take action at future Board meetings.