

**Project Narrative**

Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake  
Warner Robins, Houston County

Tupelo Ridge is a proposed 92-unit Family development to be located at 1131 S. Houston Lake Road in Warner Robins, Houston County. Units will be set-aside for 20% at 50% AMI, 30% unrestricted market rate, and the balance at 60% AMI. This development will also seek the full Enterprise Green Communities Certification, but at a minimum will commit to obtaining a sustainable certification under the EarthCraft House multi-family certification program.

The projected site enjoys close proximity to multiple services and amenities, and will be located within walking distance (<1,123 feet) of an existing Warner Robins Transit operated bus stop (accessible via existing sidewalks and crosswalks). The projected site is also districted in one of the more highly performing school districts in Houston County, with all 3 levels being considered high-performing schools. Lastly, given the area of the projected site is one of the newest, fastest growing neighborhood areas of Houston County / Warner Robins, the desirability in terms of DCA's Stable Communities initiatives for 2017 meets all criteria (less than 5% poverty, Upper income, Public Health A-3 sub-cluster, and 20% market rate units).

The Project Team is more than qualified and capable of delivering the proposed community. The principals have made Georgia a core State for expanding its affordable housing portfolio. We are committed to investing all the necessary resources to continue our tradition of building, owning and operating the highest quality affordable housing communities possible. Our track record of more than 7,000 units delivered to date, none of which were not developed as promised and proposed during an application cycle, shows the principals are committed not only to the State Agency, but the communities in which we invest. Our principals, general contractor(s), and property management company have the resources, connections, and financial capacity to ensure the delivery and long-term success of all proposed developments we submit annually.

**PART ONE - PROJECT INFORMATION - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

Please note:

- Blue-shaded cells are unlocked for your use and **do not contain** references/formulas.
- Green-shaded cells are unlocked for your use and **do contain** references/formulas that can be overwritten.
- Yellow cells - DCA Use ONLY

DCA Use ONLY - Project Nbr:

**2017-025**

**May Final Revision**

I. DCA RESOURCES	LIHTC (auto-filled from later entries) <span style="float: right;">\$ 904,000</span>	DCA HOME (from Consent Form) <span style="float: right;">\$ -</span>
II. TYPE OF APPLICATION	Competitive Round	-----> <b>Pre-Application Number</b> (if applicable) - use format 2017PA-### Have any changes occurred in the project since pre-application?
		N/A No

Was this project previously submitted to the Ga Department of Community Affairs? Yes If Yes, please provide the information requested below for the previously submitted project:

Project Name previously used: Tupelo Ridge DCA Project Nbr previously assigned: 2016-025

Has the Project Team changed? No If No, what was the DCA Qualification Determination for the Team in that review? Qualified w/out Conditions

**III. APPLICANT CONTACT FOR APPLICATION REVIEW**

Name	Timothy Bullard		Title	VP of Development
Address	1730 East Republic Road, Suite F		Direct Line	
City	Springfield		Fax	
State	MO	Zip+4	65804-0000	
Office Phone	(417) 883-1632	Ext.	E-mail: <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">tbullard@wilhoitproperties.com</span>	

(Enter phone numbers without using hyphens, parentheses, etc - ex: 1234567890)

**IV. PROJECT LOCATION**

Project Name	Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake		Phased Project?	No
Site Street Address (if known)	1131 S. Houston Lake Road		DCA Project Nbr of previous phase:	N/A
Nearest Physical Street Address *	N/A		Scattered Site?	No
Site Geo Coordinates (##.#####)	Latitude: 32.573503	Longitude: -83.662875	Acreage	8.3600
City	Warner Robins		Census Tract Number	0211.13
Site is predominantly located:	Within City Limits	County: Houston	QCT?	No
In USDA Rural Area?	No	In DCA Rural County? No	Overall:	Urban
	Congressional: 8	State Senate: 20	State House: 146	

\* If street number unknown

Legislative Districts \*\*

If on boundary, other district:

**Political Jurisdiction**

City of Warner Robins	Website	http://www.wrga.gov/
Name of Chief Elected Official	Randy Toms	Title: Mayor
Address	700 Watson Blvd	
Zip+4	31093-0000	Phone: (478) 290-0000
	City	Warner Robins
	Email	rtoms@wrga.gov

\*\* Must be verified by applicant using following websites:

Zip Codes <http://zip4.usps.com/zip4/welcome.jsp>

Legislative Districts: <http://volesmart.org/>

**V. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**A. Type of Construction:**

New Construction	92	Adaptive Reuse:	Non-historic: 0	Historic: 0
Substantial Rehabilitation	0	Historic Rehab		0
Acquisition/Rehabilitation	0	For Acquisition/Rehabilitation, date of original construction:		N/A

**PART ONE - PROJECT INFORMATION - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**B. Mixed Use**

No

**C. Unit Breakdown**

		PBRA
Number of Low Income Units	58	0
Number of 50% Units	22	0
Number of 60% Units	36	0
Number of Unrestricted (Market) Units	34	
Total Residential Units	92	
Common Space Units	0	
Total Units	92	

**D. Unit Area**

Total Low Income Residential Unit Square Footage	63,350
Total Unrestricted (Market) Residential Unit Square Footage	36,950
Total Residential Unit Square Footage	100,300
Total Common Space Unit Square Footage	0
Total Square Footage from Units	100,300

**E. Buildings**

Number of Residential Buildings	4
Number of Non-Residential Buildings	1
Total Number of Buildings	5

Total Common Area Square Footage from Nonresidential areas	2,000
Total Square Footage	102,300

**F. Total Residential Parking Spaces**

189

(If no local zoning requirement: DCA minimum 1.5 spaces per unit for family projects, 1 per unit for senior projects)

**VI. TENANCY CHARACTERISTICS**

**A. Family or Senior** (if Senior, specify Elderly or HFOP)

Family

If Other, specify:

If combining Other with	Family		Elderly	
Family or Sr, show # Units:	HFOP		Other	

<b>B. Mobility Impaired</b>	Nbr of Units Equipped:	5
Roll-In Showers	Nbr of Units Equipped:	4
<b>C. Sight / Hearing Impaired</b>	Nbr of Units Equipped:	2

% of Total Units	5.4%	Required:	5%
% of Units for the Mobility-Impaired	80.0%	Required:	40%
% of Total Units	2.2%	Required:	2%

**VII. RENT AND INCOME ELECTIONS**

**A. Tax Credit Election**

40% of Units at 60% of AMI

**B. DCA HOME Projects Minimum Set-Aside Requirement (Rent & Income)**

20% of HOME-Assisted Units at 50% of AMI  

**VIII. SET ASIDES**

<b>A. LIHTC:</b>	Nonprofit	No
<b>B. HOME:</b>	CHDO	No

(must be pre-qualified by DCA as CHDO)

**IX. COMPETITIVE POOL**

Flexible

**X. TAX EXEMPT BOND FINANCED PROJECT**

Issuer:					Inducement Date:	
Office Street Address					Applicable QAP:	
City	State	Zip+4			T-E Bond \$ Allocated:	
Contact Name	Title			E-mail		
10-Digit Office Phone	Direct line	Website				

**PART ONE - PROJECT INFORMATION - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**XI. AWARD LIMITATIONS FOR CURRENT DCA COMPETITIVE ROUND**

The following sections apply to all direct and indirect Owners, Developers and Consultants (Entity and Principal) :

A. Number of Applications Submitted:

B. Amount of Federal Tax Credits in All Applications:

C. Names of Projects in which an Owner, Developer and Consultant(s) and each of its principals has a direct or indirect Ownership interest:

Project Participant	Name of Project	Interest	Project Participant	Name of Project	Interest
Vaughn C. Zimmerman	Tupelo Creek / Ridge	Indirect	7		
Rebecca A. Zimmerman	Tupelo Creek / Ridge	Indirect	8		
Justin M. Zimmerman	Tupelo Creek / Ridge	Indirect	9		
D. Leah Zimmerman	Tupelo Creek / Ridge	Indirect	10		
5			11		
6			12		

D. Names of Projects in which the Owner, Developer and Consultant(s) and each of its principals is partnering with an inexperienced unrelated entity for purposes of meeting DCA Experience Requirements:

Project Participant	Name of Project	Project Participant	Name of Project
1		7	
2		8	
3		9	
4		10	
5		11	
6		12	

**XII. PRESERVATION**

**A. Subsequent Allocation**

Year of Original Allocation

Original GHFA/DCA Project Number

First Year of Credit Period

Expiring Tax Credit (15 Year)

Date all buildings will complete 15 yr Compliance pd

First Building ID Nbr in Project

Last Building ID Nbr in Project

**B. Expiring Section 8**

**C. Expiring HUD**

HUD funded affordable nonpublic housing project

HUD funded affordable public housing project

**PART ONE - PROJECT INFORMATION - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**XIII. ADDITIONAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

**A. PHA Units**

Is proposed project part of a local public housing replacement program?		No
Number of Public Housing Units reserved and rented to public housing tenants:		0%
Nbr of Units Reserved and Rented to:	PHA Tenants w/ PBRA:	0%
	Households on Waiting List:	0%
Local PHA	Contact	
Street Address	Direct line	
City	Zip+4	Cellular
Area Code / Phone	Email	

**B. Existing properties: currently an Extension of Cancellation Option?**  No If yes, expiration year:  Nbr yrs to forgo cancellation option:

**New properties: to exercise an Extension of Cancellation Option?**  Yes If yes, expiration year:  Nbr yrs to forgo cancellation option:

**C. Is there a Tenant Ownership Plan?**  No

**D. Is the Project Currently Occupied?**  No

If Yes ----->: Total Existing Units

Number Occupied

% Existing Occupied

**E. Waivers and/or Pre-Approvals - have the following waivers and/or pre-approvals been approved by DCA?**

Amenities?	No	Qualification Determination?	Yes
Architectural Standards?	No	Payment and Performance Bond (HOME only)?	No
Sustainable Communities Site Analysis Packet or Feasibility study?	No	Other (specify):	No
HOME Consent?	No	State Basis Boost (extraordinary circumstances)	No
Operating Expense?	No	If Yes, new Limit is ----->:	No
Credit Award Limitation (extraordinary circumstances)?	No	If Yes, new Limit is ----->:	No

**F. Projected Place-In-Service Date**

Acquisition	<input type="text"/>
Rehab	<input type="text"/>
New Construction	October 1, 2019

**XIV. APPLICANT COMMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

**XV. DCA COMMENTS - DCA USE ONLY**

The Applicant submitted for PT qualification and was determined Qualified w/out Conditions. All requisite information pertaining to the proposed development has been provided in the electronically submitted application, along with the required fees.	
---	--

**PART TWO - DEVELOPMENT TEAM INFORMATION - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Do NOT delete this tab from this workbook. Do NOT Copy from another workbook to "Paste" here . Use "Paste Special" and select "Values" instead.**

**I. OWNERSHIP INFORMATION**

**A. OWNERSHIP ENTITY**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.  
(Enter phone nbrs w/out using hyphens, parentheses, etc - ex: 1234567890)

Tupelo Ridge, LP				Name of Principal		Vaughn Zimmerman
1730 East Republic Road, Suite F				Title of Principal		Member
Springfield		Fed Tax ID:	To Be Applied For		Direct line	
MO	Zip+4	65804-0000	Org Type:	For Profit	Cellular	
(417) 883-1632		E-mail		vzimmerman@wilhoitproperties.com		

\* Must be verified by applicant using following website:

<http://zip4.usps.com/zip4/welcome.jsp>

**B. PROPOSED PARTNERSHIP INFORMATION**

**1. GENERAL PARTNER(S)**

**a. Managing Gen'l Partner**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

Tupelo Ridge Housing, LLC				Name of Principal		Vaughn Zimmerman
1730 East Republic Road, Suite F				Title of Principal		Member
Springfield		Website			Direct line	
MO	Zip+4	65804-0000			Cellular	
(417) 883-1632		E-mail		vzimmerman@wilhoitproperties.com		

**b. Other General Partner**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

				Name of Principal		
				Title of Principal		
		Website			Direct line	
	Zip+4	65804-0000			Cellular	
		E-mail				

**c. Other General Partner**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

				Name of Principal		
				Title of Principal		
		Website			Direct line	
	Zip+4				Cellular	
		E-mail				

**2. LIMITED PARTNERS (PROPOSED OR ACTUAL)**

**a. Federal Limited Partner**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

Raymond James Tax Credit Funds, Inc.				Name of Principal		James Dunton
880 Carillon Parkway				Title of Principal		VP - Director of Acquisitions
St. Petersburg		Website			Direct line	
FL	Zip+4	33716-0000			Cellular	
(800) 438-8088		E-mail		james.dunton@raymondjames.com		

**b. State Limited Partner**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

Sugar Creek Capital				Name of Principal		Chris Hite
1819 Peachtree Road, NE				Title of Principal		President
Atlanta		Website			Direct line	
GA	Zip+4	30309-0000			Cellular	
(404) 343-1062		E-mail		chite@sugarcreekcapital.com		

**3. NONPROFIT SPONSOR**

Nonprofit Sponsor  
Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

				Name of Principal		
				Title of Principal		
		Website			Direct line	
	Zip+4				Cellular	
		E-mail				

**PART TWO - DEVELOPMENT TEAM INFORMATION - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Do NOT delete this tab from this workbook. Do NOT Copy from another workbook to "Paste" here . Use "Paste Special" and select "Values" instead.**

**II. DEVELOPER(S)**

**A. DEVELOPER**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

Zimmerman Properties SE, LLC			Name of Principal	Vaughn Zimmerman
1730 East Republic Road, Suite F			Title of Principal	Member
Springfield	Website		Direct line	
MO	Zip+4	65804-0000	Cellular	
(417) 883-1632	E-mail	vzimmerman@wilhoitproperties.com		

**B. CO-DEVELOPER 1**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

			Name of Principal	
			Title of Principal	
	Website		Direct line	
	Zip+4		Cellular	
	E-mail			

**C. CO-DEVELOPER 2**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

			Name of Principal	
			Title of Principal	
	Website		Direct line	
	Zip+4		Cellular	
	E-mail			

**D. DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANT**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

			Name of Principal	
			Title of Principal	
	Website		Direct line	
	Zip+4		Cellular	
	E-mail			

**III. OTHER PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS**

**A. OWNERSHIP CONSULTANT**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

			Name of Principal	
			Title of Principal	
	Website		Direct line	
	Zip+4		Cellular	
	E-mail			

**B. GENERAL CONTRACTOR**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

Base Construction & Management, LLC			Name of Principal	Cody Ritter
620 W. Republic Road, Suite 101			Title of Principal	President
Springfield	Website	www.base-cm.com	Direct line	
MO	Zip+4	65807-0000	Cellular	
(417) 351-2380	E-mail	cody@base-com.com		

**C. MANAGEMENT COMPANY**

Office Street Address  
City  
State  
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.

Wilhoit Properties, Inc.			Name of Principal	Bob Davidson
1730 East Republic Road, Suite F			Title of Principal	Member
Springfield	Website		Direct line	
MO	Zip+4	65804-0000	Cellular	
(417) 883-1632	E-mail	bdavidson@wilhoitproperties.com		

**PART TWO - DEVELOPMENT TEAM INFORMATION - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Do NOT delete this tab from this workbook. Do NOT Copy from another workbook to "Paste" here . Use "Paste Special" and select "Values" instead.**

<b>D. ATTORNEY</b>	Kendall McPhail, LLC			Name of Principal	Kendall McPhail
Office Street Address	2828 S. Ingram Road			Title of Principal	Owner
City	Springfield	Website		Direct line	
State	MO	Zip+4	65804-0000	Cellular	
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.	(417) 883-2828	E-mail	kmcphail@myexcel.com		

<b>E. ACCOUNTANT</b>	Duckett & Ladd, LLC			Name of Principal	Jared Duckett
Office Street Address	4650 S. National Ave, Suite B-4			Title of Principal	Principal
City	Springfield	Website		Direct line	
State	MO	Zip+4	65804-0000	Cellular	
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.	(417) 883-6590	E-mail	jduckett@duckettladd.com		

<b>F. ARCHITECT</b>	Martin Riley & Associates			Name of Principal	Mike Riley
Office Street Address	215 Church St			Title of Principal	Partner
City	Decatur	Website		Direct line	
State	GA	Zip+4	30030-0000	Cellular	
10-Digit Office Phone / Ext.	(404) 373-2800	E-mail	mriley@martinriley.com		

**IV. OTHER REQUIRED INFORMATION (Answer each of the questions below for each participant listed below.)**

<b>A. LAND SELLER</b> (If applicable)	Platinum Properties, LLC	Principal	Vaughn Zimmerman	10-Digit Phone / Ext.	(417) 883-1632
Office Street Address	1730 East Republic Road, Suite F			City	Springfield
State	MO	Zip+4	65804-0000	E-mail	vzimmerman@wilhoitproperties.com

**B. IDENTITY OF INTEREST**

Is there an ID of interest between:	Yes/No	If Yes, explain relationship in boxes provided below, and use Comment box at bottom of this tab or attach additional pages as needed:
1. Developer and Contractor?	No	
2. Buyer and Seller of Land/Property?	Yes	The underlying individual owners of the GP have either a direct, or indirect ownership interest in the Seller of the land / property for the proposed application. An as-is Land Appraisal has been provided as required by the QAP.
3. Owner and Contractor?	No	
4. Owner and Consultant?	No	
5. Syndicator and Developer?	No	
6. Syndicator and Contractor?	No	
7. Developer and Consultant?	No	N/A
8. Other	Yes	The underlying individual owners of the GP have either a direct, or indirect ownership interest in the Management Company.

**PART TWO - DEVELOPMENT TEAM INFORMATION - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Do NOT delete this tab from this workbook. Do NOT Copy from another workbook to "Paste" here . Use "Paste Special" and select "Values" instead.**

**V. OTHER REQUIRED INFORMATION - Continued (Answer each of the questions below for each participant listed below.)**

**C. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Participant	1. Has any person, principal, or agent for this entity ever been convicted of a felony (Yes or No)?	2. Is entity a MBE/WBE?	3. Org Type (FP,NP, CHDO)	4. Project Ownership Percentage	5. Does this entity or a member of this entity have a conflict of interest with any member, officer, or employee of an entity that partners or contracts with the Applicant? <b>If yes, explain briefly in boxes below and use Comment box at the bottom of this tab or attach explanation.</b>	
	<i>If yes, explain</i> briefly in boxes below and either use Comment box or attach explanation.				Yes/No	Yes/No
Managing Genrl Prtnr	No	No	For Profit	0.0100%	Yes	The underlying individual owners of the GP have a direct / indirect ownership interest in the Developer and Mgmt Co.
Other Genrl Prtnr 1	No	No				
Other Genrl Prtnr 2	No	No				
Federal Ltd Partner	No	No	For Profit	98.9900%	No	
State Ltd Partner	No	No	For Profit	1.0000%	No	
NonProfit Sponsor	No	No				
Developer	No	No	For Profit		Yes	The underlying individual owners of the Developer have a direct / indirect ownership interest in the GP and Mgmt Co.
Co-Developer 1	No	No				
Co-Developer 2	No	No				
Owner Consultant	No	No				
Developer Consultant	No	No				
Contractor	No	No	For Profit		No	
Managemen t Company	No	No	For Profit		Yes	The underlying individual owners of the GP have a direct / indirect ownership interest in the Developer and Mgmt Co.
				<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0000%</b>	

**VI. APPLICANT COMMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

**VI. DCA COMMENTS - DCA USE ONLY**

The Applicant has an IOI with the Developer, Management Company and Land Owner / Seller, but no other IOI exists within the project team. While no MBE/WBE entity is currently part of the project team, there will be efforts made to engage the minimum necessary MBE/WBE entities for relevant aspects of the proposed development.	
--	--

**PART THREE - SOURCES OF FUNDS - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**I. GOVERNMENT FUNDING SOURCES (check all that apply)**

Yes	Tax Credits			FHA Risk Share		Georgia TCAP *
	Historic Rehab Credits		Yes	FHA Insured Mortgage		USDA 515
	Tax Exempt Bonds: \$			Replacement Housing Funds		USDA 538
	Taxable Bonds			McKinney-Vento Homeless		USDA PBRA
	CDBG			FHLB / AHP *		Section 8 PBRA
	HUD 811 Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD)			NAHASDA		Other PBRA - Source: <input type="text" value="Specify Other PBRA Source here"/>
	DCA HOME * -- Amt \$			Neighborhood Stabilization Program *		National Housing Trust Fund
	Other HOME * -- Amt \$			HUD CHOICE Neighborhoods		Other <b>Type</b> of Funding - describe <i>type/program</i> here
	Other HOME - Source	<input type="text" value="Specify Other HOME Source here"/>				Specify <b>Administrator</b> of Other Funding Type here

\*This source may possibly trigger Uniform Relocation Act and/or HUD 104(d) reqmts. Check with source. For DCA HOME, refer to Relocation Manual. DCA HOME amount from DCA Consent Ltr.

**II. CONSTRUCTION FINANCING**

Financing Type	Name of Financing Entity	Amount	Effective Interest Rate	Term (In Months)
Mortgage A	Lancaster Pollard (221d4)	3,080,000	4.650%	24
Mortgage B	Oakstar Bank	9,304,000	4.000%	24
Mortgage C				
Federal Grant				
State, Local, or Private Grant				
Deferred Developer Fees				
Federal Housing Credit Equity	Raymond James Tax Credit Funds, Inc.	760,700		
State Housing Credit Equity	Sugar Creek Capital	504,900		
Other Type (specify)				
Other Type (specify)				
Other Type (specify)				
<b>Total Construction Financing:</b>		<b>13,649,600</b>		
Total Construction Period Costs from Development Budget:		<b>13,445,940</b>		
Surplus / (Shortage) of Construction funds to Construction costs:		<b>203,660</b>		

**PART THREE - SOURCES OF FUNDS - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**III. PERMANENT FINANCING**

Financing Type	Name of Financing Entity	Principal Amount	Effective Int Rate	Term (Years)	Amort. (Years)	Annual Debt Service in Year One	Loan Type
Mortgage A (Lien Position 1)	Lancaster Pollard (221d4)	3,080,000	4.650%	40	40	169,739	Amortizing
Mortgage B (Lien Position 2)							
Mortgage C (Lien Position 3)							
Other:							
Foundation or charity funding*							
Deferred Devlpr Fee 6.46%	Zimmerman Properties SE, LLC	116,340	0.000%	13	n/a	71,740	Cash Flow

Total Cash Flow for Years 1 - 15: 1,115,427  
 DDF Percent of Cash Flow (Yrs 1-15) 10.430% 10.430%  
 Cash flow covers DDF P&I? **Yes**

Financing Type	Principal Amount	Equity Check	+ / -	TC Equity % of TDC
Federal Grant				
State, Local, or Private Grant				
Federal Housing Credit Equity	Raymond James Tax Credit Funds, Inc. 7,607,000	7,684,000	-77,000.00	48%
State Housing Credit Equity	Sugar Creek Capital 5,049,000	4,972,000	77,000.00	32%
Historic Credit Equity				80%
Invstmt Earnings: T-E Bonds				
Invstmt Earnings: Taxable Bonds				
Income from Operations				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Total Permanent Financing:	15,852,340			
Total Development Costs from Development Budget:	15,852,340			
Surplus/(Shortage) of Permanent funds to development costs:	0			

\*Foundation or charity funding to cover costs exceeding DCA cost limit (see Appendix I, Section II).

**IV. APPLICANT COMMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

**IV. DCA COMMENTS - DCA USE ONLY**

The Applicant has several contacts for debt and equity financing of the proposed development. All letters of intent / interest have been provided based on fair market estimates as of the application date.	
--	--

**PART FOUR - USES OF FUNDS - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**I. DEVELOPMENT BUDGET**

				TOTAL COST	New Construction Basis	Acquisition Basis	Rehabilitation Basis	Amortizable or Non-Depreciable Basis
<b>PRE-DEVELOPMENT COSTS</b>								
Property Appraisal				6,000	6,000			-
Market Study				6,100	6,100			-
Environmental Report(s)				10,000	10,000			-
Soil Borings				14,000	14,000			-
Boundary and Topographical Survey				10,000	10,000			-
Zoning/Site Plan Fees								-
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>								-
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>								-
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>								-
				<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>46,100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>ACQUISITION</b>								
Land				413,000				413,000
Site Demolition								-
Acquisition Legal Fees (if existing structures)								-
Existing Structures								-
				<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>413,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>413,000</b>
<b>LAND IMPROVEMENTS</b>								
Site Construction (On-site)	Per acre:	192,584		1,610,000	1,529,500			80,500
Site Construction (Off-site)								-
				<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,610,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>80,500</b>
<b>STRUCTURES</b>								
Residential Structures - New Construction				7,837,000	7,837,000			-
Residential Structures - Rehab								-
Accessory Structures (ie. community bldg, maintenance bldg, etc.) - New Constr				259,000	184,000			75,000
Accessory Structures (ie. community bldg, maintenance bldg, etc.) - Rehab								-
				<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>8,096,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>75,000</b>
<b>CONTRACTOR SERVICES</b>								
Builder Profit:	<b>DCA Limit</b>	<b>14.000%</b>		582,360	582,360			-
Builder Overhead	6.000%	582,360	6.000%	194,120	194,120			-
General Requirements*	2.000%	194,120	2.000%	582,360	582,360			-
	6.000%	582,360	6.000%					-
*See QAP: General Requirements policy	<b>14.000%</b>	<b>1,358,840</b>		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,358,840</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>OTHER CONSTRUCTION HARD COSTS (Non-GC work scope items done by Owner)</b>								
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>								-
<b>Total Construction Hard Costs</b>				<b>11,064,840.00</b>				
<b>Average TCHC:</b>				120,270.00 per Res'l unit	120,270.00 per unit	108.16 per total sq ft		
				110.32 per Res'l unit SF	110.32 per unit sq ft			
<b>CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY</b>								
Construction Contingency		4.52%		500,000	500,000			-

**PART FOUR - USES OF FUNDS - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**I. DEVELOPMENT BUDGET** *(cont'd)*

	TOTAL COST	New Construction Basis	Acquisition Basis	Rehabilitation Basis	Amortizable or Non-Depreciable Basis
<b>CONSTRUCTION PERIOD FINANCING</b>					
Bridge Loan Fee					-
Bridge Loan Interest					-
Construction Loan Fee	93,100	93,100			-
Construction Loan Interest	305,000	235,000			70,000
Construction Legal Fees	5,000	-			5,000
Construction Period Inspection Fees	15,000	15,000			-
Construction Period Real Estate Tax	6,000	6,000			-
Construction Insurance	6,000	6,000			-
Title and Recording Fees	22,000	-			22,000
Payment and Performance bonds					-
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>					-
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>					-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>452,100</b>	<b>355,100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>97,000</b>
<b>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</b>					
Architectural Fee - Design	177,000	177,000			-
Architectural Fee - Supervision	30,000	30,000			-
Green Building Consultant Fee Max: 20,000	20,000	20,000			-
Green Building Program Certification Fee (LEED or Earthcraft)					-
Accessibility Inspections and Plan Review	5,000	5,000			-
Construction Materials Testing	20,000	20,000			-
Engineering	75,000	75,000			-
Real Estate Attorney	20,000	-			20,000
Accounting	12,500	12,500			-
As-Built Survey	10,000	10,000			-
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>					-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>369,500</b>	<b>349,500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20,000</b>
<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT FEES</b> Avg per unit: 832					
Building Permits	29,000	29,000			-
Impact Fees					-
Water Tap Fees waived? <input type="text" value="No"/>	29,511	29,511			-
Sewer Tap Fees waived? <input type="text" value="No"/>	18,069	18,069			-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>76,580</b>	<b>76,580</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>PERMANENT FINANCING FEES</b>					
Permanent Loan Fees	61,600				61,600
Permanent Loan Legal Fees	10,000				10,000
Title and Recording Fees					-
Bond Issuance Premium					-
Cost of Issuance / Underwriter's Discount					-
Other: FHA 221d4 Upfront MIP, App, and Inspection Fees	46,200				46,200
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>117,800</b>				<b>117,800</b>

**PART FOUR - USES OF FUNDS - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**I. DEVELOPMENT BUDGET** *(cont'd)*

		TOTAL COST	New Construction Basis	Acquisition Basis	Rehabilitation Basis	Amortizable or Non-Depreciable Basis
		<b>DCA-RELATED COSTS</b>				
DCA HOME Loan Pre-Application Fee (\$1000 FP/JV, \$500 NP)						-
Tax Credit Application Fee (\$6500 ForProf/JntVent, \$5500 NonProf)		6,500				6,500
DCA Waiver and Pre-approval Fees						-
LIHTC Allocation Processing Fee	72,320	72,320				72,320
LIHTC Compliance Monitoring Fee	73,600	73,600				73,600
DCA HOME Front End Analysis Fee (when ID of Interest; \$3000)						-
DCA Final Inspection Fee (Tax Credit only - no HOME; \$3000)		3,000				3,000
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>						-
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>						-
	<b>Subtotal</b>	155,420				155,420
		<b>EQUITY COSTS</b>				
Partnership Organization Fees		10,000				10,000
Tax Credit Legal Opinion		10,000				10,000
Syndicator Legal Fees		40,000				40,000
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>						-
	<b>Subtotal</b>	60,000				60,000
		<b>DEVELOPER'S FEE</b>				
Developer's Overhead	20.000%	360,000	360,000			-
Consultant's Fee	0.000%					-
Guarantor Fees	0.000%					-
Developer's Profit	80.000%	1,440,000	1,440,000			-
	<b>Subtotal</b>	1,800,000	1,800,000	-	-	-
		<b>START-UP AND RESERVES</b>				
Marketing						-
Rent-Up Reserves	105,352	124,000				124,000
Operating Deficit Reserve:	300,941	301,000				301,000
Replacement Reserve						-
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	Proposed Avg Per Unit: 489	45,000	45,000			-
Other: Pre-Stabilization Property Tax Escrow		327,000	-			327,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	797,000	45,000	-	-	752,000
		<b>OTHER COSTS</b>				
Relocation						-
Other: << Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>						-
	<b>Subtotal</b>	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST (TDC)</b>		<b>15,852,340</b>	<b>14,081,620</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,770,720</b>
<b>Average TDC Per:</b>	<b>Unit:</b>	172,308.04	<b>Square Foot:</b>	154.96		

**PART FOUR - USES OF FUNDS - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**II. TAX CREDIT CALCULATION - BASIS METHOD**

**Subtractions From Eligible Basis**

	New Construction Basis	4% Acquisition Basis	Rehabilitation Basis
Amount of federal grant(s) used to finance qualifying development costs			
Amount of nonqualified nonrecourse financing			
Costs of Nonqualifying units of higher quality			
Nonqualifying excess portion of higher quality units			
Historic Tax Credits (Residential Portion Only)			
Other <Enter detailed description here; use Comments section if needed>			
<b>Total Subtractions From Basis:</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>

**Eligible Basis Calculation**

Total Basis	14,081,620	0	0
Less Total Subtractions From Basis (see above)	0		0
Total Eligible Basis	14,081,620	0	0
Eligible Basis Adjustment (DDA/QCT Location or State Designated Boost)	114.00%		
Adjusted Eligible Basis	16,053,047	0	0
Multiply Adjusted Eligible Basis by Applicable Fraction	63.04%	63.04%	63.04%
Qualified Basis	10,120,399	0	0
Multiply Qualified Basis by Applicable Credit Percentage	9.00%		
Maximum Tax Credit Amount	910,836	0	0
<b>Total Basis Method Tax Credit Calculation</b>	<b>910,836</b>		

Type: State Boost

**III. TAX CREDIT CALCULATION - GAP METHOD**

**Equity Gap Calculation**

Project Cost Limit (PCL) - Explain in Comments if Applicant's PCL calculation > QAP PCL.

Total Development Cost (TDC, PCL, or TDC less Foundation Funding; explain in Comments if TDC > PCL)

Subtract Non-LIHTC (excluding deferred fee) Source of Funds

Equity Gap

Divide Equity Gap by 10

Annual Equity Required

Enter Final Federal and State Equity Factors (not including GP contribution)

**Total Gap Method Tax Credit Calculation**

TAX CREDIT PROJECT MAXIMUM - Lower of Basis Method, Gap Method or DCA Limit:

TAX CREDIT REQUEST - Cannot exceed Tax Credit Project Maximum, but may be lower:

**IV. TAX CREDIT ALLOCATION - Lower of Tax Credit Request and Tax Credit Project Maximum**

18,001,440	If TDC > QAP Total PCL, provide amount of funding from foundation or charitable organization to cover the cost exceeding the PCL:	Funding Amount	0	Hist Desig	No
15,852,340					
3,080,000					
12,772,340	/ 10				
1,277,234			Federal	State	
1.4000	=	0.8500	+	0.5500	
<b>912,310</b>					
910,836					
904,000					
<b>904,000</b>					

PART FOUR - USES OF FUNDS - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County

V. APPLICANT COMMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS

VI. DCA COMMENTS - DCA USE ONLY

The General Contractor has built several M/F communities similar to the proposed development, and has reviewed the preliminary plans to provide reasonable estimates used for this application. Costs have been adjusted to account for project and site specific site grading needs, scope of work and level of sustainability (Enterprise Green Communities..."EGC"), and additional site amenities.

The Architect has been provided all zoning requirements, including any special conditions applicable to the site, for preparing the preliminary plans used for this application. The Architect is also familiar with, and understands the demands and requirements necessary to attain EGC certification. The Applicant is also aware, and capable of developing the site and community to the specifications and requirements necessary to attain EGC certification, and will contract with the appropriate green rater / technical adviser to ensure compliance with the appropriate program(s).

All other development costs are either in compliance with the 2017 QAP threshold and underwriting requirements, have been estimated by 3rd party professionals specific to each service and craft, or has been estimated by the Applicant using best practices and experience from other similar developments Applicant has built.

Federal and State syndication prices are conservative fair market estimates providing for market fluctuations from application submittal to closing and stabilization.

**PART FOUR (b) - OTHER COSTS - 2017-025 - Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake - Warner Robins - Houston, County**

DCA requires the Applicant provide a narrative for all "Other" development costs listed on Part IV-Uses of Funds. For any amounts shown below the Applicant needs to provide an explanation of the cost incurred by the development. The narrative should be a brief description for DCA intended to justify its inclusion as a valid development cost. Further, if the "Other" cost is included into eligible basis, a second narrative is required describing its justification into tax credit basis. Expand row size as needed to show text.

**DEVELOPMENT COST SCHEDULE**

Section Name

Section's Other Line Item

**Description/Nature of Cost**

**Basis Justification**

**PRE-DEVELOPMENT COSTS**

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost  Total Basis

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost  Total Basis

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost  Total Basis

**DEVELOPMENT COST SCHEDULE**

**Section Name**

Section's Other Line Item

**Description/Nature of Cost**

**Basis Justification**

**OTHER CONSTRUCTION HARD COSTS**

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost  Total Basis

**CONSTRUCTION PERIOD FINANCING**

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost  Total Basis

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost  Total Basis

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost  Total Basis

**DEVELOPMENT COST SCHEDULE**

**Section Name**

Section's Other Line Item

**Description/Nature of Cost**

**Basis Justification**

**PERMANENT FINANCING FEES**

FHA 221d4 Upfront MIP, App, and Inspection Fees

Budgeted costs for HUD FHA 221d4 related fees:  
 Upfront MIP of \$21,560  
 Application Fee of \$9,240  
 Inspection Fee of \$15,400

Total Cost

**DCA-RELATED COSTS**

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost

**EQUITY COSTS**

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost

**DEVELOPMENT COST SCHEDULE**

**Section Name**

Section's Other Line Item

**Description/Nature of Cost**

**Basis Justification**

**START-UP AND RESERVES**

Pre-Stabilization Property Tax Escrow

As per support provided in Tab 01 for Feasibility, the County assesses M/F properties at replacement costs until 3 years of operations have occurred, then M/F properties are taxed using the Income Capitalization approach. This reserve covers the difference between Cost-and-Income taxation methodologies for the 3 years prior to the County switching to use the Income approach using actual income and expenses.

None of the costs are included in basis as this is a reserve account used to fund operations, more specifically property taxes.

Total Cost  Total Basis

**OTHER COSTS**

<< Enter description here; provide detail & justification in tab Part IV-b >>

Total Cost  Total Basis

**PART FIVE - UTILITY ALLOWANCES - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**DCA Utility Region for project: North**

*Note: Elderly allowances cannot be used except at properties that have 100% HUD PBRA and satisfy the DCA definition of "elderly"*

**I. UTILITY ALLOWANCE SCHEDULE #1**

Source of Utility Allowances  
Date of Utility Allowances

HUD Utility Allowance Schedule		
January 1, 2017	Structure	MF

Utility	Fuel	Paid By (check one)		Tenant-Paid Utility Allowances by Unit Size (# Bdrms)					
		Tenant	Owner	Efficiency	1	2	3	4	
Heat	Electric Heat Pump	X			39.12	42.29	45.47	48.65	
Cooking	Electric	X			5.43	7.85	10.28	12.71	
Hot Water	Electric	X			12.58	16.05	19.53	23.00	
Air Conditioning	Electric	X			20.49	28.51	36.53	44.55	
Range/Microwave	Electric	X							
Refrigerator	Electric	X							
Other Electric	Electric	X			10.93	15.16	19.38	23.60	
Water & Sewer	Submetered*? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes		X						
Refuse Collection			X						
<b>Total Utility Allowance by Unit Size</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>88.5451782</b>	<b>109.867209</b>	<b>131.18924</b>	<b>152.511271</b>

**II. UTILITY ALLOWANCE SCHEDULE #2**

Source of Utility Allowances  
Date of Utility Allowances

	Structure	

Utility	Fuel	Paid By (check one)		Tenant-Paid Utility Allowances by Unit Size (# Bdrms)					
		Tenant	Owner	Efficiency	1	2	3	4	
Heat	<<Select Fuel >>								
Cooking	<<Select Fuel >>								
Hot Water	<<Select Fuel >>								
Air Conditioning	Electric								
Range/Microwave	Electric								
Refrigerator	Electric								
Other Electric	Electric								
Water & Sewer	Submetered*? <input type="checkbox"/> <Select>								
Refuse Collection									
<b>Total Utility Allowance by Unit Size</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

\*New Construction units MUST be sub-metered.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

We have utilized HUD's most current utility allowance calculation model along with the most current utility rates provided by the site's service providers to calculate allowances for the application. The HUD model has been reviewed and approved by our Property Management compliance department for accuracy.

**DCA COMMENTS**





Building Type: Detached / SemiDetached  
(for **Cost Limit** purposes)

Row House  
Walkup  
Elevator

Historic  
Historic  
Historic  
Historic

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	12	42	30	8	92	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Unit Square Footage:**

Low Income

Unrestricted  
Total Residential  
Common Space  
Total

60% AMI  
50% AMI  
Total

0	3,200	19,000	13,750	2,800	38,750
0	2,400	8,000	10,000	4,200	24,600
0	5,600	27,000	23,750	7,000	63,350
0	4,000	15,000	13,750	4,200	36,950
0	9,600	42,000	37,500	11,200	100,300
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	9,600	42,000	37,500	11,200	100,300

**III. ANCILLARY AND OTHER INCOME** (annual amounts)

**Ancillary Income**

8,280

Laundry, vending, app fees, etc. **Actual pct of PGI:**

1.07%

**Other Income (OI) by Year:**

**Included in Mgt Fee:**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Operating Subsidy										
Other:										
Total OI in Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**NOT Included in Mgt Fee:**

Property Tax Abatement										
Other:										
Total OI NOT in Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Included in Mgt Fee:**

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Operating Subsidy										
Other:										
Total OI in Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**NOT Included in Mgt Fee:**

Property Tax Abatement										
Other:										
Total OI NOT in Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Included in Mgt Fee:**

	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Operating Subsidy										
Other:										
Total OI in Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**NOT Included in Mgt Fee:**

Property Tax Abatement										
Other:										
Total OI NOT in Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Included in Mgt Fee:**

	31	32	33	34	35
Operating Subsidy					
Other:					
Total OI in Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-

**NOT Included in Mgt Fee:**

Property Tax Abatement					
Other:					
Total OI NOT in Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-

**IV. ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSE BUDGET**

**On-Site Staff Costs**

Management Salaries & Benefits	35,000
Maintenance Salaries & Benefits	35,000
Support Services Salaries & Benefits	15,000
FICA, WC, Bonus, etc.	22,440
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>107,440</b>

**On-Site Office Costs**

Office Supplies & Postage	10,000
Telephone	5,000
Travel	
Leased Furniture / Equipment	
Activities Supplies / Overhead Cost	9,925
Early Learning Center and myON subscriptions	3,075
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>28,000</b>

**Maintenance Expenses**

Contracted Repairs	
General Repairs	41,400
Grounds Maintenance	10,000
Extermination	4,600
Maintenance Supplies	9,200
Elevator Maintenance	
Redecorating	7,360
Other (describe here)	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>72,560</b>

**On-Site Security**

Contracted Guard	
Electronic Alarm System	1,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,000</b>

**Professional Services**

Legal	2,000
Accounting	9,000
Advertising	3,000
Other (describe here)	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>14,000</b>

**Utilities (Avg\$/mth/unit)**

Electricity	17	18,400
Natural Gas	0	
Water&Swr	31	34,000
Trash Collection		14,200
Other (describe here)		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>66,600</b>

**Taxes and Insurance**

Real Estate Taxes (Gross)*	52,000
Insurance**	29,013
Other (describe here)	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>81,013</b>

**Management Fee:**

**50,794**

593.67 Average per unit per year  
49.47 Average per unit per month

(Mgt Fee - see Pro Forma, Sect 1, Operating Assumptions)

**TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES 421,407**

Average per unit 4,580.51

Total OE Required 368,000

**Replacement Reserve (RR) 46,000**

Proposed average RR/unit amount: 500

**Minimum Replacement Reserve Calculation**

Unit Type	Units x RR Min	Total by Type
Multifamily		
Rehab	0 units x \$350 =	0
New Constr	92 units x \$250 =	23,000
SF or Duplex	0 units x \$420 =	0
Historic Rhb	0 units x \$420 =	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>23,000</b>

**TOTAL ANNUAL EXPENSES 467,407**

**V. APPLICANT COMMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

\* Property Taxes were estimated using the he NOI approach and current millage rate as provided in the Feasibility sub-folder of the electronic application.

\*\* Insurance quote was provided by the master policy holder / provider for Applicant's existing portfolio, and support for the amount has been included in the appropriate application folder.

All other operating expenses have been reviewed and approved by the Property Management company, and is consistent with similar communities the Applicant has built, and the Property Management company manages.

**VI. DCA COMMENTS**

**PART SEVEN - OPERATING PRO FORMA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**I. OPERATING ASSUMPTIONS**

Revenue Growth	2.00%
Expense Growth	3.00%
Reserves Growth	3.00%
Vacancy & Collection Loss	7.00%
Ancillary Income Limit	2.00%

**Please Note:** Green-shaded cells are unlocked for your use and contain references/formulas that may be overwritten if needed.

Asset Management Fee Amount (include total charged by all lenders/investors)	6,000	Yr 1 Asset Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	-0.83%
Property Mgt Fee Growth Rate (choose one):		Yr 1 Prop Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	7.00%
Expense Growth Rate (3.00%)		--> If Yes, indicate Yr 1 Mgt Fee Amt:	
Percent of Effective Gross Income	Yes	--> If Yes, indicate actual percentage:	7.000%

**II. OPERATING PRO FORMA**

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Revenues	771,960	787,399	803,147	819,210	835,594	852,306	869,352	886,739	904,474	922,564
Ancillary Income	8,280	8,446	8,615	8,787	8,963	9,142	9,325	9,511	9,701	9,895
Vacancy	(54,617)	(55,709)	(56,823)	(57,960)	(59,119)	(60,301)	(61,507)	(62,738)	(63,992)	(65,272)
Other Income (OI)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OI Not Subject to Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expenses less Mgt Fee	(370,613)	(381,731)	(393,183)	(404,979)	(417,128)	(429,642)	(442,531)	(455,807)	(469,481)	(483,566)
Property Mgmt	(50,794)	(51,809)	(52,846)	(53,903)	(54,981)	(56,080)	(57,202)	(58,346)	(59,513)	(60,703)
Reserves	(46,000)	(47,380)	(48,801)	(50,265)	(51,773)	(53,327)	(54,926)	(56,574)	(58,271)	(60,020)
NOI	258,216	259,215	260,108	260,890	261,555	262,098	262,510	262,786	262,917	262,898
Mortgage A	(180,476)	(180,379)	(180,277)	(180,171)	(180,060)	(179,943)	(179,821)	(179,693)	(179,559)	(179,419)
Mortgage B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mortgage C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
D/S Other Source, not DDF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DCA HOME Cash Resrv.										
Asset Mgmt	(6,000)	(6,180)	(6,365)	(6,556)	(6,753)	(6,956)	(7,164)	(7,379)	(7,601)	(7,829)
Cash Flow	71,740	72,656	73,465	74,162	74,742	75,199	75,525	75,713	75,758	75,651
DCR Mortgage A	1.43	1.44	1.44	1.45	1.45	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.47
DCR Mortgage B										
DCR Mortgage C										
DCR Other Source										
Total DCR	1.43	1.44	1.44	1.45	1.45	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.47
Oper Exp Coverage Ratio	1.55	1.54	1.53	1.51	1.50	1.49	1.47	1.46	1.45	1.44
Mortgage A Balance	3,041,940	3,002,171	2,960,616	2,917,196	2,871,827	2,824,422	2,774,890	2,723,136	2,669,060	2,612,558
Mortgage B Balance										
Mortgage C Balance										
Other Source Balance										

**PART SEVEN - OPERATING PRO FORMA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**I. OPERATING ASSUMPTIONS**

Revenue Growth	2.00%
Expense Growth	3.00%
Reserves Growth	3.00%
Vacancy & Collection Loss	7.00%
Ancillary Income Limit	2.00%

**Please Note:** Green-shaded cells are unlocked for your use and contain references/formulas that may be overwritten if needed.

Asset Management Fee Amount (include total charged by all lenders/investors)	6,000	Yr 1 Asset Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	-0.83%
Property Mgt Fee Growth Rate (choose one):		Yr 1 Prop Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	7.00%
Expense Growth Rate (3.00%)		--> If Yes, indicate Yr 1 Mgt Fee Amt:	
Percent of Effective Gross Income	Yes	--> If Yes, indicate actual percentage:	7.000%

**II. OPERATING PRO FORMA**

Year	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Revenues	941,015	959,835	979,032	998,613	1,018,585	1,038,957	1,059,736	1,080,930	1,102,549	1,124,600
Ancillary Income	10,093	10,295	10,501	10,711	10,925	11,144	11,367	11,594	11,826	12,062
Vacancy	(66,578)	(67,909)	(69,267)	(70,653)	(72,066)	(73,507)	(74,977)	(76,477)	(78,006)	(79,566)
Other Income (OI)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OI Not Subject to Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expenses less Mgt Fee	(498,073)	(513,015)	(528,406)	(544,258)	(560,585)	(577,403)	(594,725)	(612,567)	(630,944)	(649,872)
Property Mgmt	(61,917)	(63,155)	(64,419)	(65,707)	(67,021)	(68,362)	(69,729)	(71,123)	(72,546)	(73,997)
Reserves	(61,820)	(63,675)	(65,585)	(67,553)	(69,579)	(71,667)	(73,816)	(76,031)	(78,312)	(80,661)
NOI	262,721	262,376	261,856	261,154	260,259	259,162	257,855	256,327	254,567	252,566
Mortgage A	(179,271)	(179,117)	(178,956)	(178,787)	(178,610)	(178,424)	(178,230)	(178,026)	(177,813)	(177,590)
Mortgage B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mortgage C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
D/S Other Source, not DDF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DCA HOME Cash Resrv.										
Asset Mgmt	(8,063)	(8,305)	(8,555)	(8,811)	(9,076)	-	-	-	-	-
Cash Flow	75,386	74,954	74,346	73,556	72,574	80,738	79,625	78,300	76,754	74,976
DCR Mortgage A	1.47	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.45	1.45	1.44	1.43	1.42
DCR Mortgage B										
DCR Mortgage C										
DCR Other Source										
Total DCR	1.47	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.45	1.45	1.44	1.43	1.42
Oper Exp Coverage Ratio	1.42	1.41	1.40	1.39	1.37	1.36	1.35	1.34	1.33	1.31
Mortgage A Balance	2,553,523	2,491,841	2,427,394	2,360,058	2,289,704	2,216,197	2,139,397	2,059,157	1,975,323	1,887,734
Mortgage B Balance										
Mortgage C Balance										
Other Source Balance										

**PART SEVEN - OPERATING PRO FORMA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**I. OPERATING ASSUMPTIONS**

Revenue Growth	2.00%
Expense Growth	3.00%
Reserves Growth	3.00%
Vacancy & Collection Loss	7.00%
Ancillary Income Limit	2.00%

**Please Note:** Green-shaded cells are unlocked for your use and contain references/formulas that may be overwritten if needed.

Asset Management Fee Amount (include total charged by all lenders/investors)	6,000	Yr 1 Asset Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	-0.83%
Property Mgt Fee Growth Rate (choose one):		Yr 1 Prop Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	7.00%
Expense Growth Rate (3.00%)		--> If Yes, indicate Yr 1 Mgt Fee Amt:	
Percent of Effective Gross Income	Yes	--> If Yes, indicate actual percentage:	7.000%

**II. OPERATING PRO FORMA**

Year	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Revenues	1,147,092	1,170,034	1,193,434	1,217,303	1,241,649	1,266,482	1,291,812	1,317,648	1,344,001	1,370,881
Ancillary Income	12,304	12,550	12,801	13,057	13,318	13,584	13,856	14,133	14,416	14,704
Vacancy	(81,158)	(82,781)	(84,436)	(86,125)	(87,848)	(89,605)	(91,397)	(93,225)	(95,089)	(96,991)
Other Income (OI)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OI Not Subject to Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expenses less Mgt Fee	(669,368)	(689,449)	(710,133)	(731,437)	(753,380)	(775,981)	(799,261)	(823,239)	(847,936)	(873,374)
Property Mgmt	(75,477)	(76,986)	(78,526)	(80,096)	(81,698)	(83,332)	(84,999)	(86,699)	(88,433)	(90,202)
Reserves	(83,081)	(85,574)	(88,141)	(90,785)	(93,509)	(96,314)	(99,203)	(102,179)	(105,245)	(108,402)
NOI	250,311	247,794	244,999	241,917	238,533	234,835	230,808	226,440	221,714	216,616
Mortgage A	(177,356)	(177,111)	(176,854)	(176,585)	(176,304)	(176,008)	(175,699)	(175,376)	(175,037)	(174,681)
Mortgage B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mortgage C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
D/S Other Source, not DDF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DCA HOME Cash Resrv.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asset Mgmt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cash Flow	72,956	70,683	68,145	65,332	62,229	58,826	55,109	51,064	46,678	41,935
DCR Mortgage A	1.41	1.40	1.39	1.37	1.35	1.33	1.31	1.29	1.27	1.24
DCR Mortgage B										
DCR Mortgage C										
DCR Other Source										
Total DCR	1.41	1.40	1.39	1.37	1.35	1.33	1.31	1.29	1.27	1.24
Oper Exp Coverage Ratio	1.30	1.29	1.28	1.27	1.26	1.25	1.23	1.22	1.21	1.20
Mortgage A Balance	1,796,224	1,700,617	1,600,731	1,496,374	1,387,348	1,273,444	1,154,444	1,030,123	900,242	764,555
Mortgage B Balance										
Mortgage C Balance										
Other Source Balance										

**PART SEVEN - OPERATING PRO FORMA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**I. OPERATING ASSUMPTIONS**

Revenue Growth	2.00%
Expense Growth	3.00%
Reserves Growth	3.00%
Vacancy & Collection Loss	7.00%
Ancillary Income Limit	2.00%

**Please Note:** Green-shaded cells are unlocked for your use and contain references/formulas that may be overwritten if needed.

Asset Management Fee Amount (include total charged by all lenders/investors)	6,000	Yr 1 Asset Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	-0.83%
Property Mgt Fee Growth Rate (choose one):		Yr 1 Prop Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	7.00%
Expense Growth Rate (3.00%)		--> If Yes, indicate Yr 1 Mgt Fee Amt:	
Percent of Effective Gross Income	Yes	--> If Yes, indicate actual percentage:	7.000%

**II. OPERATING PRO FORMA**

Year	31	32	33	34	35
Revenues	1,398,299	1,426,265	1,454,790	1,483,886	1,513,563
Ancillary Income	14,998	15,298	15,604	15,916	16,234
Vacancy	(98,931)	(100,909)	(102,928)	(104,986)	(107,086)
Other Income (OI)	-	-	-	-	-
OI Not Subject to Mgt Fee	-	-	-	-	-
Expenses less Mgt Fee	(899,575)	(926,562)	(954,359)	(982,990)	(1,012,480)
Property Mgmt	(92,006)	(93,846)	(95,723)	(97,637)	(99,590)
Reserves	(111,654)	(115,004)	(118,454)	(122,007)	(125,668)
NOI	211,131	205,241	198,930	192,181	184,975
Mortgage A	(174,309)	(173,919)	(173,511)	(173,083)	(172,635)
Mortgage B	-	-	-	-	-
Mortgage C	-	-	-	-	-
D/S Other Source, not DDF	-	-	-	-	-
DCA HOME Cash Resrv.	-	-	-	-	-
Asset Mgmt	-	-	-	-	-
Cash Flow	36,822	31,322	25,419	19,098	12,339
DCR Mortgage A	1.21	1.18	1.15	1.11	1.07
DCR Mortgage B					
DCR Mortgage C					
DCR Other Source					
Total DCR	1.21	1.18	1.15	1.11	1.07
Oper Exp Coverage Ratio	1.19	1.18	1.17	1.16	1.15
Mortgage A Balance	622,802	474,713	320,006	158,388	(10,451)
Mortgage B Balance					
Mortgage C Balance					
Other Source Balance					

**PART SEVEN - OPERATING PRO FORMA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**I. OPERATING ASSUMPTIONS**

Revenue Growth	2.00%
Expense Growth	3.00%
Reserves Growth	3.00%
Vacancy & Collection Loss	7.00%
Ancillary Income Limit	2.00%

**Please Note:**   Green-shaded cells are unlocked for your use and contain references/formulas that may be overwritten if needed.

Asset Management Fee Amount (include total charged by all lenders/investors)	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">6,000</span>	Yr 1 Asset Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">-0.83%</span>
Property Mgt Fee Growth Rate (choose one):		Yr 1 Prop Mgt Fee Percentage of EGI:	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">7.00%</span>
Expense Growth Rate (3.00%)	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> </span>	--> If Yes, indicate Yr 1 Mgt Fee Amt:	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> </span>
Percent of Effective Gross Income	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Yes</span>	--> If Yes, indicate actual percentage:	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">7.000%</span>

**II. OPERATING PRO FORMA**

**III. Applicant Comments & Clarifications**

**IV. DCA Comments**

<p>The Asset Mgmt fee is the combined amount from the Federal and State equity LOIs provided by the syndicators listed as part of the proposed Development Team in Part II.</p> <p>Projected payments from available cash flow are sufficient to fully repay the DDF within the stated term shown in Part IV-Uses of Funds.</p> <p>The debt service payments shown for the first mortgage are the standard amortizing payments using the stated interest rate, plus annual MIP fees related to HUD 221d4 financing of mixed-income multi-family apartment communities, hence the hyper-amortization of the loan utilizing the Core applications model formulas. Actual amortization will occur over the stated 40-year (480 month) term and period from the provided LOI.</p>	
---	--

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.

*DCA's Overall Comments / Approval Conditions:*

1.)
2.)
3.)
4.)
5.)
6.)
7.)
8.)
9.)
10.)
11.)
12.)
13.)
14.)
15.)
16.)
17.)
18.)
19.)
20.)

**1 PROJECT FEASIBILITY, VIABILITY ANALYSIS, AND CONFORMANCE WITH PLAN**

Pass?

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

Applicant has reviewed and complied with the requirements listed in Threshold Section I. Project Feasibility, Viability Analysis & Conformance with Plan. Applicant confirms that documentation submitted is in existence as of Application Submission day and is complete and accurate.

*DCA's Comments:*

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** | **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

**2 COST LIMITS**

*NOTE: Unit counts are linked to Rent Chart in Part VI Revenues & Expenses Tab. Cost Limit Per Unit totals by unit type are auto-calculated.*

*Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.*

Unit Type	Nbr Units	New Construction and Acquisition/Rehabilitation		Nbr Units	Historic Rehab or Transit-Oriented Devlpmt qualifying for Historic Preservation or TOD pt(s)	
		Unit Cost Limit total by Unit Type			Unit Cost Limit total by Unit Type	
<b>Detached/Semi-Detached</b>	Efficiency	0	117,818 x 0 units =	0	129,599 x 0 units =	0
	1 BR	1	154,420 x 0 units =	0	169,862 x 0 units =	0
	2 BR	2	187,511 x 0 units =	0	206,262 x 0 units =	0
	3 BR	3	229,637 x 0 units =	0	252,600 x 0 units =	0
	4 BR	4	270,341 x 0 units =	0	297,375 x 0 units =	0
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Row House</b>	Efficiency	0	110,334 x 0 units =	0	121,367 x 0 units =	0
	1 BR	1	144,909 x 0 units =	0	159,399 x 0 units =	0
	2 BR	2	176,506 x 0 units =	0	194,156 x 0 units =	0
	3 BR	3	217,443 x 0 units =	0	239,187 x 0 units =	0
	4 BR	4	258,414 x 0 units =	0	284,255 x 0 units =	0
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Walkup</b>	Efficiency	0	91,210 x 0 units =	0	100,331 x 0 units =	0
	1 BR	1	125,895 x 0 units =	0	138,484 x 0 units =	0
	2 BR	2	159,553 x 0 units =	0	175,508 x 0 units =	0
	3 BR	3	208,108 x 0 units =	0	228,918 x 0 units =	0
	4 BR	4	259,274 x 0 units =	0	285,201 x 0 units =	0
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Elevator</b>	Efficiency	0	95,549 x 0 units =	0	105,103 x 0 units =	0
	1 BR	12	133,769 x 12 units =	1,605,228	147,145 x 0 units =	0
	2 BR	42	171,988 x 42 units =	7,223,496	189,186 x 0 units =	0
	3 BR	30	229,318 x 30 units =	6,879,540	252,249 x 0 units =	0
	4 BR	8	286,647 x 8 units =	2,293,176	315,311 x 0 units =	0
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>92</i>	<i>18,001,440</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Total Per Construction Type</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>18,001,440</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Pass?

Is this Criterion met?

MSA for Cost Limit purposes:

**Valdosta**

Tot Development Costs:

**15,852,340**

Cost Waiver Amount:

Historic Preservation Pts

**0**

Community Transp Opt Pts

**3**

**Project Cost Limit (PCL)**

**18,001,440**

Note: if a PUCL Waiver has been approved by DCA, that amount would supercede the amounts shown at left.

DCA's Comments:

Total Development Costs are less than the cost limits for the Valdosta MSA HUD 2016 Unit Total Development Cost Limits.

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

*Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.*

**3 TENANCY CHARACTERISTICS**

This project is designated as:

**Family**

Pass?


*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

*DCA's Comments:*

Our development is designed for housing families and to encourage community activities within the neighborhood, and will have no leasing restrictions other than standard Section 42 income and rent.

--

**4 REQUIRED SERVICES**

Pass?

--

A. Applicant certifies that they will designate the specific services and meet the additional policies related to services.

**Does Applicant agree?**

**Agree**

B. Specify at least 2 basic ongoing services from at least 2 categories below for Family projects, or at least 4 basic ongoing services from at least 3 categories below for Senior projects:

- 1) Social & recreational programs planned & overseen by project mgr Specify:
- 2) On-site enrichment classes Specify:
- 3) On-site health classes Specify:
- 4) Other services approved by DCA Specify:

**Holiday parties, semi-annual pot luck dinners, and semi-annual game nights**  
**Tax preparation assistance and financial planning / budgeting coordinated by Prop. Mgmt.**  
**Healthy Eating classes with Univ. of GA extension office and expanded nutrition program.**

C. For applications for rehabilitation of existing congregate supportive housing developments:

Name of behavioral health agency, continuum of care or service provider for which MOU is include:

**n/a - new construction**

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

*DCA's Comments:*

On-Site management provides several "services" to residents to create a community atmosphere. The above social and recreational programs are just examples of the various functions that will be sponsored by management on a regular basis throughout the year. Others can be, and typically are arranged once the project reaches stabilized operations and on-site management can evaluate those most desired by the resident population.

--

**5 MARKET FEASIBILITY**

Pass?

--

- A. Provide the name of the market study analyst used by applicant:
- B. Project absorption period to reach stabilized occupancy
- C. Overall Market Occupancy Rate
- D. Overall capture rate for tax credit units
- E. List DCA tax credit projects in close proximity to properties funded in 2014 or 2015. Include DCA project number and project name in each case.

A. **RPRG - Tad Scepaniak**  
 B. **6 months**  
 C. **96.90%**  
 D. **6.20%**

Project Nbr	Project Name
1	<b>2014-023 Oliver Place</b>
2	<b>2014-046 Potemkin Senior Ph II</b>

Project Nbr	Project Name
3	
4	

Project Nbr	Project Name
5	
6	

F. Does the unit mix/rents and amenities included in the application match those provided in the market study?

F.

--

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

No recently funded competitive DCA tax credit projects exist within 1-mile of the proposed site. Only 1 (2014-046) has been funded in the jurisdictional limits of Warner, and that deal targets Senior / HFOP while this application is for Family. The other listed property is in Perry, and both of the above listed properties are in excess of 1-mile from the proposed site. The unit mix and rent structures have been closely analyzed with the local market to ensure proper rent sizing for the various income restricted and market rate units. Applicant and Market Analyst both believe the proposed community will not have a negative impact on existing DCA communities, especially the Pines at Westdale 4% community adjacent the proposed site, and will be welcomed in the community due to the level of demand which currently exists, after taking into consideration the units proposed at Pines at Westdale.

*DCA's Comments:*

--

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response**   **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

*Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.*

**6 APPRAISALS**

- A. Is there is an identity of interest between the buyer and seller of the project?
- B. Is an appraisal included in this application submission?

If an appraisal is included, indicate Appraiser's Name and answer the following questions:

Appraiser's Name: **Crown Appraisal - Kim Garner**

- 1) Does it provide a land value?
- 2) Does it provide a value for the improvements?
- 3) Does the appraisal conform to USPAP standards?
- 4) For LIHTC projects involving DCA HOME funds, does the total hard cost of the project exceed 90% of the as completed unencumbered appraised value of the property?

C. If an identity of interest exists between the buyer and seller, did the seller purchase this property within the past three (3) years?

D. Has the property been:

- 1) Rezoned?
- 2) Subdivided?
- 3) Modified?

Pass?

- A.
- B.

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)
- 4)
- C.
- D.
- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

A.	Yes	
B.	Yes	
1)	Yes	
2)	No	
3)	Yes	
4)		
C.	Yes	
D.		
1)	No	
2)	No	
3)	No	

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

An affiliated entity owned by members of the Applicant purchased a tract of land totaling 13.16 acres. This is the entire parcel from which the proposed site is intended to be subdivided from, with the balance to be targeted for community serving commercial development pads. The affiliated entity purchased the entire parcel for \$650,000, or \$49,392/acre. Applying DCA's prorating requirement from the QAP, the proposed development will be paying roughly the same per acre price to the affiliated entity and not inflating the land cost to FMV. We believe this meets all requirements of the current year QAP, and the affiliated owner will not be profiting from the resale of the M/F acreage to the proposed development.

*DCA's Comments:*

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

*Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.*

**7 ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS**

Pass?


- A. Name of Company that prepared the Phase I Assessment in accordance with ASTM 1527-13:
- B. Is a Phase II Environmental Report included?
- C. Was a Noise Assessment performed?
  - 1) If "Yes", name of company that prepared the noise assessment?
  - 2) If "Yes", provide the maximum noise level on site in decibels over the 10 year projection:
  - 3) If "Yes", what are the contributing factors in decreasing order of magnitude?

A. <b>Kaw Valley Engineering</b>	
B. <b>No</b>	
C. <b>Yes</b>	
1) <b>Arpeggio Acoustic Consulting, LLC</b>	
2) <b>61 DNL</b>	

**S. Houston Lake Road, Feagin Mill Road**

- D. Is the subject property located in a:
  - 1) Brownfield?
  - 2) 100 year flood plain / floodway?
    - If "Yes":
      - a) Percentage of site that is within a floodplain:
      - b) Will any development occur in the floodplain?
      - c) Is documentation provided as per Threshold criteria?
  - 3) Wetlands?
    - If "Yes":
      - a) Enter the percentage of the site that is a wetlands:
      - b) Will any development occur in the wetlands?
      - c) Is documentation provided as per Threshold criteria?
  - 4) State Waters/Streams/Buffers and Setbacks area?

D.	
1) <b>No</b>	
2) <b>No</b>	
a)	
b)	
c)	
3) <b>No</b>	
a)	
b)	
c)	
4) <b>No</b>	

- E. Has the Environmental Professional identified any of the following on the subject property:

1) Lead-based paint?	<b>No</b>		5) Endangered species?	<b>No</b>		9) Mold?	<b>No</b>	
2) Noise?	<b>No</b>		6) Historic designation?	<b>No</b>		10) PCB's?	<b>No</b>	
3) Water leaks?	<b>No</b>		7) Vapor intrusion?	<b>No</b>		11) Radon?	<b>No</b>	
4) Lead in water?	<b>No</b>		8) Asbestos-containing materials?	<b>No</b>				

- 12) Other (e.g., Native American burial grounds, etc.) - describe in box below:

**No**

- F. Is all additional environmental documentation required for a HOME application included, such as:

1) Eight-Step Process for Wetlands and/or Floodplains required and included?	<b>No</b>	
2) Has Applicant/PE completed the HOME and HUD Environmental Questionnaire?	<b>No</b>	
3) Owner agrees that they must refrain from undertaking any activities that could have an adverse effect on the subject property?	<b>No</b>	
G. If HUD approval has been previously granted, has the HUD Form 4128 been included?	<b>No</b>	

**Projects involving HOME funds must also meet the following Site and Neighborhood Standards:**

H. The Census Tract for the property is characterized as [Choose either <i>Minority concentration</i> (50% or more minority), <i>Racially mixed</i> (25% - 49% minority), or <i>Non-minority</i> (less than 25% minority)]:	H. <<Select>>	<<Select>>
I. List all contiguous Census Tracts:	I.	
J. Is Contract Addendum included in Application?	J.	

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

The proposed development is not requesting HOME funds, and all required environmental information has been provided. Applicant feels the proposed development will have no negative impact on the surrounding area, or elements listed above and in the Phase I. Preliminary tests performed indicate no negative attributes exist, or are well below notification concentration levels, and therefore present no environmental concerns for the site. Should any change occur which requires abatement, Applicant hereby certifies such will be done prior to beginning construction.

DCA's Comments:

--

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.

**8 SITE CONTROL**

- A. Is site control provided through **November 30, 2017?** Expiration Date:
- B. Form of site control:
- C. Name of Entity with site control:
- D. Is there any Identity of Interest between the entity with site control and the applicant?

Pass?	
A.	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>
B.	<input type="text" value="Contract/Option"/>
C.	<input type="text" value="Tupelo Ridge Housing, LLC"/>
D.	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

An affiliated entity of the applicant purchased the land in February 2017, and has since executed a purchase contract for a sub-parcel of the land to another affiliated entity. The GP entity of the application, to which an IOI exists with the land owner, has taken over the sales contract via an assignment, and the purchase price is a price prorata what the affiliated entity purchased the land for in February 2017.

*DCA's Comments:*

--

**9 SITE ACCESS**

- A. Does this site provide a specified entrance that is legally accessible by paved roads and are the appropriate drawings, surveys, photographs and other documentation reflecting such paved roads included in the electronic application binder?
- B. If access roads are not in place, does the application contain documentation evidencing local government approval to pave the road, a commitment for funding, and the timetable for completion of such paved roads?
- C. If the road is going to be paved by the applicant, are these costs documented in the submitted electronic application binder and reflected in the development budget provided in the core application?
- D. If use of private drive proposed, is site control of private drive documented by proof of ownership or by a properly executed easement on private drive, and are the plans for paving private drive, including associated development costs, adequately addressed in Application?

Pass?	
A.	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>
B.	<input type="text"/>
C.	<input type="text"/>
D.	<input type="text"/>

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

The proposed site has full ingress/egress onto S. Houston Lake Road, and will develop a drive that provides access easements to S. Houston Lake Road for the proposed commercial development pads in front of the site. There will be a joint-maintenance agreement for the driveway between the affiliated owner, and/or its assigns or successors, unless the driveway is eventually dedicated to the County DOT.

*DCA's Comments:*

--

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

*Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.*

**10 SITE ZONING**

- A. Is Zoning in place at the time of this application submission?
- B. Does zoning of the development site conform to the site development plan?
- C. Is the zoning confirmed, in writing, by the authorized Local Government official?  
If "Yes":
  - 1) Is this written confirmation included in the Application?
  - 2) Does the letter include the zoning *and* land use classification of the property?
  - 3) Is the letter accompanied by a clear explanation of the requirements (include a copy of the applicable sections of the zoning ordinance highlighted for the stated classification)?
  - 4) Is the letter accompanied by all conditions of these zoning and land use classifications?
  - 5) If project is requesting HOME or HUD funds, does Local Government official also comment on whether project will include development of prime or unique farmland?
- D. Is documentation provided (on the Architectural Site Conceptual Development Plan either graphically or in written form) that demonstrates that the site layout conforms to any moratoriums, density, setbacks or other requirements?
- E. Are all issues and questions surrounding the zoning and land use classification clearly defined prior to this application submission?

Pass?	Applicant Response	DCA USE
A.	Yes	
B.	Yes	
C.	Yes	
1)	Yes	
2)	Yes	
3)	Yes	
4)	Yes	
5)	N/Ap	
D.	Yes	
E.	Yes	

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

The entire parcel in which the proposed site is located is zoned C-2 which has a grandfathered special use permit approved which allows M/F by right. The City has provided a zoning confirmation letter indicating such, and required supporting information has been provided as part of the overall application. Proposed 1st mortgage is not HUD monies, but rather private capital covered by HUD guarantees. Therefore, protection of prime or unique farmland is not applicable, or triggered by the existence of HUD 221d4 financing.

*DCA's Comments:*

**11 OPERATING UTILITIES**

- A. Check applicable utilities and enter provider name:
  - 1) Gas N/A - all electric, no gas
  - 2) Electric Flint Energies

Pass?	Applicant Response	DCA USE
1)	No	
2)	Yes	

Applicant does not plan to provide Gas services on-site...all services will be Electric-based and the provider is willing and capable to provide adequate service to the site.

*DCA's Comments:*

**12 PUBLIC WATER/SANITARY SEWER/STORM SEWER**

- A. 1) Is there a Waiver Approval Letter From DCA included in this application for this criterion as it pertains to single-family detached Rural projects?  
2) If Yes, is the waiver request accompanied by an engineering report confirming the availability of water and the percolation of the soil?
- B. Check all that are available to the site and enter provider name:
  - 1) Public water City of Warner Robins
  - 2) Public sewer City of Warner Robins

Pass?	Applicant Response	DCA USE
A1)	No	
2)		
B1)	Yes	
2)	Yes	

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

Applicant has not requested a waiver. The site has access to, and is serviced by public water and sewer, as evidenced in the letters submitted with the application by the service providers.

*DCA's Comments:*

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

*Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.*

**13 REQUIRED AMENITIES**

Is there a Pre-Approval Form from DCA included in this application for this criterion?

Pass?

**A.** Applicant agrees to provide following required Standard Site Amenities in conformance with DCA Amenities Guidebook (select one in each category):

- 1) Community area (select either community room or community building):
- 2) Exterior gathering area (if "Other", explain in box provided at right):
- 3) On site laundry type:

- A1) **Building**
- A2) **Covered Porch** If "Other", explain here
- A3) **Washer and dryer in each unit**

A.

**B.** Applicant agrees to provide the following required Additional Site Amenities to conform with the DCA Amenities Guidebook.

The nbr of additional amenities required depends on the total unit count: **1-125 units = 2 amenities, 126+ units = 4 amenities**

Additional Amenities (describe in space provided below)	Guidebook Met?	DCA Pre-approved?
1) Equipped computer center and library		
2) Equipped playground		

Additional Amenities (describe below)	Guidebook Met?	DCA Pre-approved?
3) Furnished exercise / fitness center		
4) Community Garden		

B.

**C.** Applicant agrees to provide the following required Unit Amenities:

- 1) HVAC systems
- 2) Energy Star refrigerators
- 3) Energy Star dishwashers (not required in senior USDA or HUD properties)
- 4) Stoves
- 5) Microwave ovens
- 6) a. Powder-based stovetop fire suppression canisters installed above the range cook top, OR  
b. Electronically controlled solid cover plates over stove top burners

C.

**D.** If proposing a Senior project or Special Needs project, Applicant agrees to provide the following additional required Amenities:

- 1) Elevators are installed for access to all units above the ground floor.
- 2) Buildings more than two story construction have interior furnished gathering areas in several locations in the lobbies and/or corridors
- 3) a. 100% of the units are accessible and adaptable, as defined by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988  
b. If No, was a DCA Architectural Standards waiver granted?

- 1) **Yes**
- 2) **Yes**
- 3) **Yes**
- 4) **Yes**
- 5) **Yes**
- 6a) **Yes**
- 6b) **Yes**
- D. 1) **Yes**
- 2) **Yes**
- 3a) **Yes**
- 3b) **Yes**

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

Applicant is proposing additional amenities over and above those required by DCA

DCA's Comments:

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

*Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.*

**14 REHABILITATION STANDARDS (REHABILITATION PROJECTS ONLY)**

Pass? 

--

- A. Type of rehab (choose one):
- B. Date of Physical Needs Assessment (PNA):  
Name of consultant preparing PNA:  
Is 20-year replacement reserve study included?
- C. Performance Rpt indicates energy audit completed by qualified BPI Building Analyst?  
Name of qualified BPI Building Analyst or equivalent professional:
- D. DCA's Rehabilitation Work Scope form is completed, included in PNA tab, and clearly indicates percentages of each item to be either "demoed" or replace DCA Rehabilitation Work Scope form referenced above clearly addresses:
  - 1. All immediate needs identified in the PNA.
  - 2. All application threshold and scoring requirements
  - 3. All applicable architectural and accessibility standards.
  - 4. All remediation issues identified in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- E. Applicant understands that in addition to proposed work scope, the project must meet state and local building codes, DCA architectural requirements as set forth in the QAP and Manuals, and health and safety codes and requirements. **Applicant agrees?**

A.	<<Select>>	<<Select>>
B.		
C.		
D.		
1)		
2)		
3)		
4)		
E.		

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

n/a New Construction

*DCA's Comments:*

**15 SITE INFORMATION AND CONCEPTUAL SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Pass? 

--

- A. Is Conceptual Site Development Plan included in application and has it been prepared in accordance with all instructions set forth in the DCA Architectural Manual?  
Are all interior and exterior site related amenities required and selected in this application indicated on the Conceptual Site Development Plan?
- B. Location/Vicinity map delineates location point of proposed property (site geo coordinates) & shows entire municipality area (city limits, etc.)?
- C. Ground level color photos of proposed property & adjacent surrounding properties & structures are included, numbered, dated & have brief descriptions?  
Site Map delineates the approximate location point of each photo?
- D. Aerial color photos are current, have high enough resolution to clearly identify existing property & adjacent land uses, and delineate property boundaries?

A.	Yes	
	Yes	
B.	Yes	
C.	Yes	
	Yes	
D.	Yes	

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

Applicant feels all required site plan information, including amenities and photographs, have been accurately presented with this application.

*DCA's Comments:*

**16 BUILDING SUSTAINABILITY**

Pass? 

--

- A. Applicant agrees that this proposed property must achieve a minimum standard for energy efficiency and sustainable building practices upon construction completion as set forth in the QAP and DCA Architectural Manual?
- B. Applicant agrees that the final construction documents must clearly indicate all components of the building envelope and all materials and equipment that meet the requirements set forth in the QAP and DCA Architectural Manual?

A.	Agree	
B.	Agree	

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

Applicant intends to develop and construct the units and buildings to meet and/or exceed the requirements for the indicated sustainable certification provided with this application.

*DCA's Comments:*

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

<b>Applicant Response</b>	<b>DCA USE</b>
---------------------------	----------------

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.

**17 ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS**

- A.** 1) Upon completion, will this project comply with all applicable Federal and State accessibility laws including but not limited to: The Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Georgia Fair Housing Law and Georgia Access Law as set forth in the 2015 Accessibility Manual? (When two or more accessibility standards apply, the applicant is required to follow and apply both standards so that a maximum accessibility is obtained.)
- 2) Owner understands that **DCA requires the Section 504** accessibility requirements to be incorporated into the design and construction of **ALL** new construction and/or rehabilitation projects selected under the 2017 Qualified Allocation Plan, regardless of whether or not the project will receive federal debt financing assistance (e.g., HOME). This constitutes a **higher standard of accessibility** than what may be required under federal laws. This means that all projects, including those financed with tax exempt bonds which receive an allocation of **4% tax credits** and **9% tax credits**-only projects, must incorporate at a minimum the requirements of the **Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards** into the design and construction of the project.
- 3) Owner claims that property is eligible for any of the stated statutory exemptions for any applicable federal, state, and local accessibility law? If so, support the claim with a legal opinion placed where indicated in Tabs Checklist.
- 4) Does this project comply with applicable DCA accessibility requirements detailed in the 2016 Architectural and Accessibility Manuals?
- B.** 1) a. Will at least **5%** of the total units (but no less than one unit) be equipped for the mobility disabled, including wheelchair restricted residents?
- |  | Nbr of Units Equipped: | Minimum Required: |            |
|--|------------------------|-------------------|------------|
|  |                        | Nbr of Units      | Percentage |
| 1) a. Mobility Impaired  | 5                      | 5                 | 5%         |
| b. Roll-in showers will be incorporated into <b>40%</b> of the mobility equipped units (but no fewer than one unit)?                       | 4                      | 2                 | 40%        |
| 2) Will least an additional <b>2%</b> of the total units (but no less than one unit) be equipped for hearing and sight-impaired residents? | 2                      | 2                 | 2%         |
- 2) Sight / Hearing Impaired
- C.** Applicant will retain a DCA qualified consultant to monitor the project for accessibility compliance who will not be a member of the proposed Project Team nor have an Identify of Interest with any member of the proposed Project Team?
- The DCA qualified consultant will perform the following: Name of Accessibility Consultant Zeffert Associates
- 1) A pre-construction plan and specification review to determine that the proposed property will meet all required accessibility requirements. The Consultant report must be included with the Step 2 construction documents submitted to DCA. At a minimum, the report will include the initial comments from the consultant, all documents related to resolution of identified accessibility issues and a certification from the consultant that the plans appear to meet all accessibility requirements.
- 2) At least two training sessions for General Contractor and Subcontractors regarding accessibility requirements. One training must be on site.
- 3) An inspection of the construction site after framing is completed to determine that the property is following the approved plans and specifications as to accessibility. DCA must receive a copy of the report issued by the consultant as well as documentation that all issues, if any, have been resolved.
- 4) A final inspection of the property after completion of construction to determine that the property has been constructed in accordance with all accessibility requirements. DCA must receive a copy of the report issued by the consultant as well as documentation that all issues, if any, have been resolved prior to submission of the project cost certification.

Pass?		
A1).	Yes	
2).	Yes	
3).	No	
4).	Yes	
B1)a.	Yes	
b.	Yes	
2).	Yes	
C.	Yes	
C1).	Yes	
2).	Yes	
3).	Yes	
4).	Yes	

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

Applicant will adhere to all accessibility standards required by DCA, as well as hold a meeting with a DCA qualified consultant to ensure plans are developed as indicated in this application.

*DCA's Comments:*

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.

**18 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN & QUALITY STANDARDS**

Is there a Waiver Approval Letter From DCA included in this application for this criterion?

Does this application meet the Architectural Standards contained in the Application Manual for quality and longevity?

**A. Constructed and Rehabilitation Construction Hard Costs** - are the following minimum review standards for rehabilitation projects met or exceeded by this project?

Rehabilitation projects will be considered for funding only if the per unit rehabilitation hard costs exceed \$25,000. The costs of furniture, fixtures, construction or rehabilitation of community buildings and common area amenities are not included in these amounts.

**B. Standard Design Options for All Projects**

- 1) Exterior Wall Finishes (select one) Exterior wall faces will have an excess of 40% brick or stone on each total wall surface
- 2) Major Bldg Component Materials & Upgraded roofing shingles, or roofing materials (warranty 30 years or greater)

**C. Additional Design Options** - not listed above, proposed by Applicant prior to Application Submittal in accordance with Exhibit A DCA Pre-application and Pre-Award Deadlines and Fee Schedule, and subsequently approved by DCA.

- 1)
- 2)

Pass?		
No		
Yes		
A.		
B.		
1) Yes		
2) Yes		
C.		
1)		
2)		

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

Applicant will meet and/or exceed the minimum architectural requirements for quality and longevity, as shown in the submitted plans.

*DCA's Comments:*

**19 QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROJECT TEAM (PERFORMANCE)**

- A. Did the Certifying Entity meet the experience requirement in 2016?
- B. Is there a pre-application Qualification of Project Team Determination from DCA included in this application for this criterion?
- C. Has there been any change in the Project Team since the initial pre-application submission?
- D. Did the project team request a waiver or waiver renewal of a Significant Adverse Event at pre-application?
- E. DCA's pre-application Qualification of Project's Team Determination indicated a status of (select one):

- E. Certifying GP/Developer
- F. << Select Designation >>

**F. DCA Final Determination**

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

Applicant received a pre-application determination stating the project team was qualified - complete

*DCA's Comments:*

**20 COMPLIANCE HISTORY SUMMARY**

- A. Was a pre-application submitted for this Determination at the Pre-Application Stage?
- B. If "Yes", has there been any change in the status of any project included in the CHS form?
- C. Has the Certifying Entity and all other project team members completed all required documents as listed in QAP Threshold Section XIX Qualifications for Project Participants?

Pass?		
A. Yes		
B. No		
C. Yes		

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

No changes to the Project Team have been made since the pre-app, which was Qualified - Complete, therefore no additional information has been provided with this full application.

*DCA's Comments:*



**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**Applicant Response** **DCA USE**

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

*Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.*

**23 REQUIRED LEGAL OPINIONS**

State legal opinions included in application using boxes provided.

Pass?

- A. Credit Eligibility for Acquisition
- B. Credit Eligibility for Assisted Living Facility
- C. Non-profit Federal Tax Exempt Qualification Status
- D. Scattered Site Developments [as defined in Section 42(g)(7) of the Code and this QAP]
- E. Other (If Yes, then also describe):

A.	No	
B.	No	
C.	No	
D.	No	

E.

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

N/A - no legal opinions required for proposed application.

*DCA's Comments:*

**24 RELOCATION AND DISPLACEMENT OF TENANTS**

Pass?

- A. Does the Applicant anticipate displacing or relocating any tenants?
- B. 1) Are any of the other sources (not DCA HOME) considered to be Federal Funding?  
If Yes, applicant will need to check with the source of these funds to determine if this project will trigger the Uniform Relocation Act or 104(d).  
2) If tenants will be displaced, has Applicant received DCA written approval and placed a copy where indicated in the Tabs Checklist?  
3) Will any funding source used trigger the Uniform Relocation Act or HUD 104 (d) requirements?
- C. Is sufficient comparable replacement housing identified in the relocation plan according to DCA relocation requirements?

A.	No	
B1)	No	
2)		
3)		
C.		

D. Provide summary data collected from DCA Relocation Displacement Spreadsheet:

1) Number of Over Income Tenants	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	4) Number of Down units	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2) Number of Rent Burdened Tenants	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	5) Number of Displaced Tenants	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
3) Number of Vacancies	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>			

E. Indicate Proposed Advisory Services to be used (see Relocation Manual for further explanation):

1) Individual interviews	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	3) Written Notifications	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2) Meetings	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	4) Other - describe in box provided:	<input type="text"/>	

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

No residents or tenants of any type will be displaced, or need relocated due to the proposed application.

*DCA's Comments:*

**PART EIGHT - THRESHOLD CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

<b>Applicant Response</b>	<b>DCA USE</b>
---------------------------	----------------

**FINAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION (DCA Use Only)**

Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.

**25 AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING (AFFH)**

Pass?

**If selected, does the Applicant agree to prepare and submit an AFFH Marketing plan that:**

- A. Incorporates outreach efforts to each service provider, homeless shelter or local disability advocacy organization in the county in which the project is located?
- B. Has a strategy that affirmatively markets to persons with disabilities and the homeless?
- C. Has a strategy that establishes and maintains relationships between the management agent and community service providers?
- D. Includes a referral and screening process that will be used to refer tenants to the projects, the screening criteria that will be used, and makes reasonable accommodations to facilitate the admittance of persons with disabilities or the homeless into the project?
- E. Includes marketing of properties to underserved populations 2-4 months prior to occupancy?
- F. Includes making applications for affordable units available to public locations including at least one that has night hours?
- G. Includes outreach to Limited English Proficiency groups for languages identified as being prevalent in the surrounding market area?
- H. If selected, does the Applicant agree to provide reasonable accommodation for these tenants in the Property Management's tenant application? Leasing criteria must clearly facilitate admission and inclusion of targeted population tenants and must not violate federal or state fair housing laws.

A.	<b>Agree</b>	
B.	<b>Agree</b>	
C.	<b>Agree</b>	
D.	<b>Agree</b>	
E.	<b>Agree</b>	
F.	<b>Agree</b>	
G.	<b>Agree</b>	
H.	<b>Agree</b>	

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

Applicant agrees to adhere to all AFFH requirements of DCA and the 2017 QAP.

*DCA's Comments:*

**26 OPTIMAL UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES**

Pass?

*Threshold Justification per Applicant*

The proposed development will be built at a cost lower than DCA / HUD mandated per unit cost limitations. The contractor is highly skilled in minimizing waste throughout the development process; plans the construction phase to allow for efficient building schedules; and sub-contracts out to the most qualified and reasonably priced professionals while making sure schedules are maintained to ensure minimal down time. The Applicant has extensive relationships with financing providers to garner the most competitive pricings for both construction, permanent, and tax credit syndication in the market. All combined, the proposed development will be built on-time, within the budget, and to the highest quality achievable, all while requiring fewer resources than most similarly structured proposed developments. Additionally, the approval of the proposed application will not result in unjust enrichment of the Project Team, or any affiliated entity therewith due in part to the IOI which exists between the Applicant and current land owner. Also, per the details and supporting research performed as part of the provided Market Study, the proposed application will not have any negative impact on affordable housing stock in the surrounding neighborhood, or MSA, as more than sufficient demand exists for multiple properties in the MSA.

*DCA's Comments:*

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMEMBER:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
 Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
 Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.

		<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
			92	64	22
<b>1. APPLICATION COMPLETENESS</b>		(Applicants start with 10 pts. Any points entered will be <u>subtracted</u> from score value)	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>A. Missing or Incomplete Documents</b>	Number: 0	For each missing or incomplete document, one (1) point will be deducted		A. <b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Organization	Number: 0	One (1) pt deducted if not organized as set out in the Tab checklist and the Application Instructions	1	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>B. Financial and Other Adjustments</b>	Number: 0	2-4 adjustments/revisions = one (1) pt deduction total; then (1) pt deducted for each add'l adjustment.		B. <b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

DCA's Comments: Enter "1" for each item listed below.

A. Missing or Illegible or Inaccurate Documents or Application Not Organized Correctly		Nbr	INCOMPLETE Documents:		Nbr	B. Financial adjustments/revisions:		Nbr
		0			0			0
1		1		n/a	1			n/a
2		2			2			
3		3		included in 2	3			included in 2
4		4			4			included in 2
5		5		included in 4	5			
6		6			6			
7		7		included in 6	7			
8		8			8			
9		9		included in 8	9			
10		10			10			
11		11		included in 10	11			
12		12			12			

**2. DEEPER TARGETING / RENT / INCOME RESTRICTIONS** Choose A or B. **3** **2** **0**

<b>A. Deeper Targeting through Rent Restrictions</b>		Total Residential Units: <b>92</b>	Actual Percent of Residential Units:				
Applicant agrees to set income limits at 50% AMI and gross rents at or below 30% of the 50% income limit for at least:		Per Applicant	Per DCA	Per Applicant	Per DCA	2	A. <b>2</b> <b>0</b>
1. 15% of total residential units		Nbr of Restricted Residential Units:		0.00%	0.00%	1	1. <b>0</b> <b>0</b>
or 2. 20% of total residential units		22		23.91%	0.00%	2	2. <b>2</b> <b>0</b>
<b>B. Deeper Targeting through New PBRA Contracts</b>		Nbr of PBRA Residential Units:				3	B. <b>0</b> <b>0</b>
1. 15% (at least) of residential units to have PBRA for 10+ yrs:				0.00%	0.00%	2	1. <b>0</b> <b>0</b>
2. Application receives at least <b>3</b> points under Section VII. Stable Communities. Points awarded in Sect VII:				7	2	1	2. <b>0</b> <b>0</b>

DCA's Comments:

**3. DESIRABLE AND UNDESIRABLE CHARACTERISTICS** See QAP Scoring for requirements. **13** **12** **0**

Is the completed and executed DCA Desirable/Undesirable Certification form included in the appropriate application tab, in both the original Excel version and signed PDF?						
		<b>Yes</b>				
<b>A. Desirable Activities</b>	(1 or 2 pts each - see OAP)	Complete this section using results from completed current DCA Desirable/Undesirable Certification form. Submit this completed form in both Excel and signed PDF, where indicated in Tabs Checklist..		12	A. <b>12</b>	
<b>B. Bonus Desirable</b>	(1 pt - see QAP)			1	B. <b>0</b>	
<b>C. Undesirable/Inefficient Site Activities/Characteristics</b>	(1 pt subtracted each)			various	C. <b>0</b>	

Scoring Justification per Applicant  
 There are no Undesirables within the stated distances of the proposed site. Applicant has provided the requisite details for ALL Desirables within the 2.0 mile walking / driving, and 0.5-mile walking distances allowed. In situations where the mapping system did not provide the accurate route "from" the site showing the actual distance, walking or driving, Applicant has provided routes both "to" and "from" the site to more accurately reflect the distances between the site and Desirable Activity.

DCA's Comments:

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMEMBER:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
**Disclaimer:** DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
**Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.**

	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>22</b>

**4. COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS**

See scoring criteria for further requirements and information

Evaluation Criteria

**Competitive Pool chosen: Flexible**

- All community transportation services are accessible to tenants by Paved Pedestrian Walkways.
- DCA has measured all required distances between a pedestrian site entrance and the transit stop along Paved Pedestrian Walkways.
- Each residential building is accessible to the pedestrian site entrance via an on-site Paved Pedestrian Walkway.
- Paved Pedestrian Walkway is in existence by Application Submission. If not, but is immediately adjacent to Applicant site, Applicant has submitted documents showing a construction timeline, commitment of funds, and approval from ownership entity of the land on which the Walkway will be built.
- The Applicant has clearly marked the routes being used to claim points on the site map submitted for this section.
- Transportation service is being publicized to the general public.

**Flexible Pool**

Choose **A or B.**

**A. Transit-Oriented Development**

Choose either option 1 or 2 under A.

- Site is **owned** by local transit agency & is strategically targeted by agency to create housing with **on site or adjacent** access to public transportation
- Site is **within one (1) mile\*** of a transit hub
- Applicant in A1 or A2 above serves Family tenancy.

**B. Access to Public Transportation**

Choose only **one** option in B.

- Site is **within 1/4 mile\*** of an established public transportation stop
- Site is **within 1/2 mile\*** of an established public transportation stop
- Site is **within one (1) mile\*** of an established public transportation stop

**Rural Pool**

- Publicly operated/sponsored and established transit service** (including on-call service onsite or fixed-route service within 1/2 mile of site entrance\*)

\*As measured from an entrance to the site that is accessible to pedestrians and connected by sidewalks or established pedestrian walkways to the transportation hub/stop.

Scoring Justification per Applicant

The site is within 1200' of a regularly serviced bus stop, located at the SE corner of the S. Houston Lake Rd and Feagin Mill Rd intersection, offered by the local public transportation agency, and can be accessed by existing PPWs adjacent the site. All information pertaining to this Community Transportation Option has been provided in the appropriate application folder. Applicant also has approval to install a covered bus stop on the site, if awarded, and the WRTA will update its route and schedules to accommodate the new stop. Additionally, Applicant will work with the County to study the need / desire for a signalized pedestrian crosswalk from the site's entrance, across S. Houston Lake Road, to Sandy Valley Baptist Church, where the WRTA will also install and service a second, new covered bus stop. Therefore, while a stop already exists within 1/4-mile of the site, future residents will ultimately have onsite access to public transportation going in both directions on S. Houston Lake Road, which will further encourage usage by residents.

DCA's Comments:

**5. BROWNFIELD**

(With EPA/EPD Documentation)

See scoring criteria for further requirements and information

- Environmental regulatory agency which has designated site as a Brownfield and determined cleanup guidelines:
- Source of opinion letter stating that property appears to meet requirements for issuance of EPD No Further Action or Limitation of Liability letter
- Has the estimated cost of the Environmental Engineer monitoring been included in the development budget?

DCA's Comments:

**6. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS**

Choose only one. See scoring criteria for further requirements.

10 Pts > Min In EF Green Communities

Competitive Pool chosen:

**Flexible**

DCA's Green Building for Affordable Housing Training Course - Participation Certificate obtained?	Date of Course	3/3/17	Robert Fink	Zimmerman Propertiese SE, LLC
	Date of Course			

An active current version of draft scoring worksheet for development, illustrating compliance w/ minimum score required under program selected, is included in application?

For Rehab developments - required Energy Audit Report submitted per current QAP? Date of Audit: Date of Report:

	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>4. COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
Applicant Agrees? DCA Agrees?			
		<b>Yes</b>	
<b>5. BROWNFIELD</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>6. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDER:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
**Disclaimer:** DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
**Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.**

	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>22</b>

**A. Sustainable Communities Certification**

Project seeks to obtain a sustainable community certification from the program chosen above?

2	A. Yes/No	Yes/No

**1. EarthCraft Communities**

Date that EarthCraft Communities Memorandum of Participation was executed for the development where the project is located:

**2. Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND v4)**

a) Date of project's Feasibility Study prepared by a nonrelated third party LEED AP:

b) Name of nonrelated third party LEED AP that prepared Feasibility Study:



**Commitments for Building Certification:**

- Project will comply with the program version in effect at the time that the drawings are prepared for permit review?
- Project will meet program threshold requirements for Building Sustainability?
- Owner will engage in tenant and building manager education in compliance with the point requirements of the respective programs?

	Yes/No	Yes/No
1.	Yes	
2.	Yes	
3.	Yes	

**B. Sustainable Building Certification**

Project commits to obtaining a sustainable building certification from the program chosen above?

1	B.	
---	----	--

**C. Exceptional Sustainable Building Certification**

1. Project commits to obtaining a sustainable building certificate from certifying body demonstrating that project achieved highest level of certification chosen above?

3	C. Yes/No	Yes/No

**D. High Performance Building Design**

The proposed building design demonstrates:

1	D.	0	0
---	----	---	---

- A worst case HERS Index that is at least 15% lower than the ENERGY STAR Target Index?
- A 10% improvement over the baseline building performance rating? The energy savings will be established following the Performance Rating Method outlined in ASHRAE 90.1-2010 Appendix G with additional guidance from the ENERGY STAR Multifamily High-Rise Simulation Guidelines.
- For minor, moderate, or substantial rehabilitations, a projected reduction in energy consumption ≥ 30%, documented by a RESNET-approved HERS Rating software or ENERGY STAR compliant whole building energy model? Baseline performance should be modeled using existing conditions.

1.		
2.		
3.		

*Scoring Justification per Applicant*

With the guidance of an Enterprise Qualified TA and the Architect, applicant has provided a draft scoring sheet showing >10 points above the minimum Enterprise Foundation Green Communities scoring requirement to claim 3 points.

*DCA's Comments:*

**7. STABLE COMMUNITIES**

(Must use data from the most current FFIEC census report, published as of January 1, 2016)

7	7	2
---	---	---

**A. Census Tract Demographics**

& Competitive Pool chosen:

**Flexible**

3	3	
---	---	--

1. Project is located in a census tract that meets the following demographics according to the most recent FFIEC Census Report (www.ffiec.gov/Census/):

	Yes/No	Yes/No
	Yes	

2. Less than **5%** below Poverty level (see Income)

Actual Percent:

3. Designated Middle or Upper Income level (see Demographics)

Designation:

4. (Flexible Pool) Project is **NOT** located in a census tract that meets the above demographics according to the most recent FFIEC Census Report (www.ffiec.gov/Census/), but **IS** located within 1/4 mile of such a census tract. (Applicant answer to Question 1 above cannot be "Yes".)

**C. Georgia Department of Public Health Stable Communities**

Sub-cluster in which project is located, according to the most recent GDPH data hosted on the DCA "Multi-Family Affordable Housing Properties" map:

Per Applicant	Per DCA
<input type="text" value="A3"/>	<input type="text" value="&lt;Select&gt;"/>

2	2	0
---	---	---

**D. Mixed-Income Developments in Stable Communities**

Market units:

Total Units:

Mkt Pct of Total:

2	2	2
---	---	---

*DCA's Comments:*

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDER:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
**Disclaimer:** DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
 Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.

<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
	92	64	22
	10	0	0
	Yes		
	N/a		
	N/a		

**8. TRANSFORMATIONAL COMMUNITIES (choose A or B)**

Is this application eligible for two or more points under 2017 Scoring Section 7 Stable Communities, regardless of whether the points are requested?  
 If applying for sub-section A, is the completed and executed DCA Neighborhood Redevelopment Certification included in the appropriate tab of the application?  
 If applying for sub-section B, is the completed and executed DCA Community Transformation Plan Certificate included in the appropriate tab of the application?

**Eligibility - The Plan** (if Transformation Plan builds on existing Revitalization Plan meeting DCA standards, fill out both Revitalization Plan and Transformation Plan columns):

	Revitalization Plan		Transformation Plan	
	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
a) Clearly delineates targeted area that includes proposed project site, but does not encompass entire surrounding city / municipality / county?	<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan>		<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan here>	
b) Includes public input and engagement <u>during the planning stages</u> ?	<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan>		<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan here>	
c) Calls for the rehabilitation or production of affordable rental housing as a policy goal for the community?	<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan >		<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan here>	
d) Designates implementation measures along w/specific time frames for achievement of policies & housing activities? The specific time frames and implementation measures are current and ongoing?	<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan>		<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan here>	
e) Discusses resources that will be utilized to implement the plan?	<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan>		<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan here>	
f) Is included <i>in full</i> in the appropriate tab of the application binder?	<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan>		<Enter page nbr(s) from Plan here>	

**Website address (URL) of Revitalization Plan:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Website address (URL) of Transformation Plan:** \_\_\_\_\_

**A. Community Revitalization**

2 **A. 0**

i.) Plan details specific work efforts directly affecting project site?		i.) Enter page nbr(s) here	i.)	Yes/No	Yes/No
ii.) Revitalization Plan has been officially adopted (and if necessary, renewed) by the Local Govt?	Date Plan originally adopted by Local Govt: Time (#yrs, #mths) from Plan Adoption to Application Submission Date: Date(s) Plan reauthorized/renewed by Local Government, if applicable:	ii.)	ii.)	N/a	
iii.) Public input and engagement <u>during the planning stages</u> :				N/a	
a) Date(s) of Public Notice to surrounding community: Publication Name(s)	a)				
b) Type of event: Date(s) of event(s):	b) <<Select Event 1 type>> <<Select Event 2 type>>				
c) Letters of Support from local non-government entities. Type: Entity Name:	c) <<Select Entity 1 type>> <<Select Entity 2 type>>				

1. <b>Community Revitalization Plan</b> - Application proposes to develop housing that contributes to a written Community Revitalization Plan for the specific community in which the property will be located.	1	1.	0	
2. <b>Qualified Census Tract and Community Revitalization Plan</b> - Application proposes to develop housing that is in a Qualified Census Tract and that contributes to a written Community Revitalization Plan for the specific community in which the property will be located. Project is in a QCT? <b>No</b> Census Tract Number: <b>0211.13</b> Eligible Basis Adjustment: <b>State Boost</b>	1	2.	0	

OR

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDEr:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
 Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.

	Score Value	Self Score	DCA Score
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>22</b>

**B. Community Transformation Plan**

Does the Applicant reference an existing Community Revitalization Plan meeting DCA standards?

**1. Community-Based Team**

Community-Based Developer (CBD)

Select at least two out of the three options (i, ii and iii) in "a" below, or "b".

CBD

Entity Name			Website		
Contact Name	Direct Line		Email		

a) i. CBD has successfully partnered with at least two (2) established community-based organizations (CBOs) that serve the area around the development (proposed or existing elsewhere) in the last two years and can document that these partnerships have measurably improved community or resident outcomes. / ▶

CBO 1 Name			Purpose:			Letter of Support included?
Community/neighborhd where partnership occurred			Website			
Contact Name	Direct Line		Email			N/a
CBO 2 Name			Purpose:			Letter of Support included?
Community/neighborhd where partnership occurred			Website			
Contact Name	Direct Line		Email			N/a

ii. In the last three years, the CBD has participated or led philanthropic activities benefitting either 1) the Defined Neighborhood or 2) a targeted area surrounding their development in another Georgia community. Use comment box or attach separate explanation page in corresponding tab of Application Binder.

						N/a
--	--	--	--	--	--	-----

iii. The CBD has been selected as a result of a community-driven initiative by the Local Government in a Request for Proposal or similar public bid process.

or b) The Project Team received a HOME consent for the proposed property and was designated as a CHDO.

Community Quarterback (CQB) See QAP for requirements. CQB 1

i. CQB is a local community-based organization or public entity and has a demonstrated record of serving the Defined Neighborhood, as delineated by the Community Transformation Plan, to increase residents' access to local resources such as employment, education, transportation, and health? Enter page nbr(s) here

ii. Letter from CQB confirming their partnership with Project Team to serve as CQB is included in electronic application binder where indicated by Tabs Checklist? N/a

iii. CQB Name  Website   
 Contact Name  Direct Line  Email

**2. Quality Transformation Plan**

Transformation Team has completed Community Engagement and Outreach prior to Application Submission? 4 2.

a) *Public and Private Engagement* Tenancy: **Family**

Family Applicants must engage at least **two** different Transformation Partner types, while Senior Applicants must engage at least **one**. Applicant agrees? N/a

i. Transformation Partner 1	<Select Transformation Partner type>		Date of Public Meeting 1 between Partners		
Org Name			Date(s) of publication of meeting notice		
Website			Publication(s)		
Contact Name	Direct Line		Social Media		
Email			Mtg Locatn		
Role			Which Partners were present at Public Mtg 1 between Partners?		
ii. Transformation Partner 2	<Select Transformation Prtnr type>		Date of Public Meeting 2 (optional) between Partnrs		
Org Name			Date(s) of publication of meeting notice		
Website			Publication(s)		
Contact Name	Direct Line		Social Media		
Email			Mtg Locatn		
Role			Which Partners were present at Public Mtg 2 between Partners?		

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDER:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
 Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.

<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
	92	64	22

b) *Citizen Outreach* Choose either "i" or "ii" below for (b).  
 i. Survey Copy of blank survey and itemized summary of results included in corresponding tab in application binder?  
 or Nbr of Respondents  
 ii. Public Meetings  
 Meeting 1 Date \_\_\_\_\_ Dates: Mtg 2 \_\_\_\_\_ Mtg Notice Publication \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date(s) of publication of Meeting 1 notice \_\_\_\_\_ Public Mtg 2 reqmt met by req'd public mtg between Transformatn Partners? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Publication(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Publication(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Social Media \_\_\_\_\_ Social Media \_\_\_\_\_  
 Meeting Location \_\_\_\_\_ Mtg Locatn \_\_\_\_\_  
 Copy(-ies) of published notices provided in application binder? \_\_\_\_\_ Copy(-ies) of published notices provided in application binder? \_\_\_\_\_

c) Please prioritize in the summary bullet-point format below the top 5 challenges preventing this community from accessing local resources (according to feedback from the low income population to be served), along with the corresponding goals and solutions for the Transformation Team and Partners to address:

i. Local Population Challenge 1  
 Goal for increasing residents' access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_  
 Goal for catalyzing neighborhood's access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Local Population Challenge 2  
 Goal for increasing residents' access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_  
 Goal for catalyzing neighborhood's access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_

iii. Local Population Challenge 3  
 Goal for increasing residents' access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_  
 Goal for catalyzing neighborhood's access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_

iv. Local Population Challenge 4  
 Goal for increasing residents' access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_  
 Goal for catalyzing neighborhood's access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_

v. Local Population Challenge 5  
 Goal for increasing residents' access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_  
 Goal for catalyzing neighborhood's access \_\_\_\_\_  
 Solution and Who Implements \_\_\_\_\_

**C. Community Investment**

<b>1. Community Improvement Fund</b>	Amount / Balance		4	<b>0</b>	
Source		<b>Family</b>	1	<b>0</b>	

Contact \_\_\_\_\_ Direct Line \_\_\_\_\_ Bank Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email \_\_\_\_\_ Account Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Bank Contact \_\_\_\_\_ Direct Line \_\_\_\_\_ Bank Website \_\_\_\_\_  
 Description of Use of Funds \_\_\_\_\_ Contact Email \_\_\_\_\_  
 Narrative of how the secured funds support the Community Revitalization Plan or Community Transformation Plan. \_\_\_\_\_

Applicants: Please use "PI IX B-Community Improvmt Narr" tab provided.

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDER:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
 Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.

	Score Value	Self Score	DCA Score
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>2. Long-term Ground Lease</b>	1	0	
a) Projects receives a long-term ground lease (no less than 45-year) for nominal consideration and no other land costs for the entire property?		N/a	
b) No funds other than what is disclosed in the Application have been or will be paid for the lease either directly or indirectly?		N/a	
<b>3. Third-Party Capital Investment</b>	2	0	
Unrelated Third-Party Name	Competitive Pool chosen: <b>Flexible</b>		
Unrelated Third-Party Type	<Select unrelated 3rd party type>	Improvement Completion Date	
Is 3rd party investment community-wide in scope or was improvement completed more than 3 yrs prior to Application Submission?			
Distance from proposed project site in miles, rounded up to the next tenth of a mile		miles	
Description of Investment or Funding Mechanism			
Description of Investment's Furtherance of Plan			
Description of how the investment will serve the tenant base for the proposed development			
Full Cost of Improvement as a Percent of TDC:	0.0000%	0.0000%	Total Development Costs (TDC): 15,852,340

<b>D. Community Designations</b>	10	0	
1. HUD Choice Neighborhood Implementation (CNI) Grant		N/a	
2. Purpose Built Communities		N/a	

Scoring Justification per Applicant  
 N/A...applicant is not seeking, nor is eligible for points under Transformational Communities.

DCA's Comments:

<b>9. PHASED DEVELOPMENTS / PREVIOUS PROJECTS</b>	(choose A or B)	4	3	0
Competitive Pool chosen:	<b>Flexible</b>			
Phased Development?	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

<b>A. Phased Developments</b>	3	0	
1. Application is in the Flexible Pool and the proposed project is part of a Phased Development in which one or more phases received an allocation of 9% tax credits within the past five (5) funding rounds (only the second and third phase of a project may receive these points) and at least one phase has commenced construction per that allocation by the 2017 Application Submission deadline?		N/a	
If Yes, indicate DCA Project Nbr and Project Name of the first phase: Number: [ ] Name: [ ]			
If current application is for third phase, indicate for second phase: Number: [ ] Name: [ ]			
2. Was the community originally designed as one development with different phases?		N/a	
3. Are any other phases for this project also submitted during the current funding round?		N/a	
4. Was site control over the entire site (including all phases) in place when the initial phase was closed?		N/a	

<b>B. Previous Projects (Flexible Pool)</b>	(choose 1 or 2)	3	3	0
The proposed development site is not within a 1-mile radius of a Georgia Housing Credit development that has received an award in the last				
1. Five (5) DCA funding cycles		3		

<b>OR</b> 2. Four (4) DCA funding cycles		2		
--	--	---	--	--

<b>C. Previous Projects (Rural Pool)</b>	(choose 1 or 3)	4	0	0
The proposed development site is within a Local Government boundary which has not received an award of 9% Credits:				
1. Within the last Five (5) DCA funding cycles		3		
2. Since the 2000 DCA Housing Credit Competitive Round (additional point)		1		
<b>OR</b> 3. Within the last Four (4) DCA funding cycles		2		

Scoring Justification per Applicant  
 No previous DCA competitively funded developments are located within a 1-mile radius of the proposed application site.

DCA's Comments:

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDEr:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
 Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.

<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
	92	64	22
	2	2	0
		Yes/No	Yes/No

**10. MARKET CHARACTERISTICS**

For DCA determination:

- A.** Are more than two DCA funded projects in the primary market area which have physical occupancy rates of less than 90 percent and which compete for the same tenant base as the proposed project?
- B.** Has there been a significant change in economic conditions in the proposed market which could detrimentally affect the long term viability of the proposed project and the proposed tenant population?
- C.** Does the proposed market area appear to be overestimated, creating the likelihood that the demand for the project is weaker than projected?
- D.** Is the capture rate of a specific bedroom type and market segment over 55%?

A.	No	
B.	No	
C.	No	
D.	No	

*Scoring Justification per Applicant*

A strong market exists for the proposed development, and unit mix and rent structures have been carefully analyzed to ensure proper fit within the local MSA.

*DCA's Comments:*

**11. EXTENDED AFFORDABILITY COMMITMENT**

(choose only one)

**A. Waiver of Qualified Contract Right**

Applicant agrees to forego cancellation option for at least 5 yrs after close of Compliance period?

**B. Tenant Ownership**

Applicant commits to a plan for tenant ownership at end of compliance period (only applies to single family units).

*DCA's Comments:*

	1	0
A.	1	
	Yes	
B.		

**12. EXCEPTIONAL NON-PROFIT**

N/A

Nonprofit Setaside selection from Project Information tab:

Is the applicant claiming these points for this project?

Is this is the only application from this non-profit requesting these points in this funding round?

Is the NonProfit Assessment form and the required documentation included in the appropriate tab of the application?

*DCA's Comments:*

No

	3	
	Yes/No	Yes/No
	N/a	
	N/a	
	N/a	

**13. RURAL PRIORITY**

Competitive Pool:

Flexible

(NOTE: Only Rural Pool applicants are eligible!)

Urban or Rural: Urban

2

Each Applicant will be limited to claiming these points for one Rural project in which they have a direct or indirect interest and which involves 80 or fewer units. Failure by the Applicant to designate these points to only one qualified project will result in no points being awarded.

Unit Total 92

MGP	Tupelo Ridge Housing, LLC	0.0100%	Vaughn Zimmerman	NPSponsr	0	0.0000%	0
OGP1	0	0.0000%	0	Developer	Zimmerman Properties SE, LLC	0.0000%	Vaughn Zimmer
OGP2	0	0.0000%	0	Co-Developer 1	0	0.0000%	0
OwnCons	0	0.0000%	0	Co-Developer 2	0	0.0000%	0
Fed LP	Raymond James Tax Credit Funds,	98.9900%	James Dunton	Developmt Consult	0	0.0000%	0
Slate LP	Sugar Creek Capital	1.0000%	Chris Hite				

*Scoring Justification per Applicant*

*DCA's Comments:*

N/A...site is not located wthin an eligible Rural area.

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDEr:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
**Disclaimer:** DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
**Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.**

<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
	92	64	22

**14. DCA COMMUNITY INITIATIVES**

**A. Georgia Initiative for Community Housing (GICH)**

Letter from an eligible Georgia Initiative for Community Housing team that clearly:

1. Identifies the project as located within their GICH community: Warner Robins
2. Is indicative of the community's affordable housing goals
3. Identifies that the project meets one of the objectives of the GICH Plan
4. Is executed by the GICH community's primary or secondary contact on record w/ University of Georgia Housing and Demographic Research Center as of 5/1/17?
5. Has not received a tax credit award in the last three years

**NOTE: If more than one letter is issued by a GICH community, no project in that community shall be awarded this point.**

**B. Designated Military Zones**

<http://www.dca.state.ga.us/economic/DevelopmentTools/programs/militaryZones.asp>

Project site is located within the census tract of a DCA-designated Military Zone (MZ).

City: **Warner Robins** County: **Houston** QCT? **No** Census Tract #: **0211.13**

Scoring Justification per Applicant

DCA's Comments:

N/A...site is not located in a DMZ, and the City has already offered the GICH to a separate proposal.

2	0	0
1	0	
A. Yes/No Yes/No		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
1	0	
B.		

**15. LEVERAGING OF PUBLIC RESOURCES**

Competitive Pool chosen: **Flexible**

<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
Yes/No	Yes/No

Indicate that the following criteria are met:

- a) Funding or assistance provided below is binding and unconditional except as set forth in this section.
- b) Resources will be utilized if the project is selected for funding by DCA.
- c) Loans are for both construction and permanent financing phases.
- d) Loans are for a minimum period of ten years and reflect interest rates at or below AFR, with the exception that HUD 221(d)4 loans and USDA 538 loans must reflect interest rates at or below Bank prime loan, as posted on the Federal Reserve H. 15 Report on April 20, 2017, plus 100 basis points.
- e) Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac ensured loans are not used as consideration for points in this section. HUD 221(d)4 loans eligible for points.
- f) If 538 loans are being considered for points in this section, the funds will be obligated by USDA by September 30, 2017.

a)	Yes	
b)	Yes	
c)	Yes	
d)	Yes	
e)	Yes	
f)	Yes	

**1. Qualifying Sources - New loans or new grants from the following sources:**

- a) Federal Home Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program (AHP)
- b) Replacement Housing Factor Funds or other HUD PHI fund
- c) HOME Funds
- d) Beltline Grant/Loan
- e) Historic tax credit proceeds
- f) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program funds
- g) National Housing Trust Fund
- h) Georgia TCAP acquisition loans passed through a Qualified CDFI revolving loan fund
- i) Foundation grants, or loans based from grant proceeds per QAP
- j) Federal Government grant funds or loans

	Amount	Amount
a)		
b)		
c)	0	
d)		
e)		
f)		
g)		
h)		
i)		
j)	3,080,000	
	<b>3,080,000</b>	<b>0</b>

Total Qualifying Sources (TQS):

**2. Point Scale**

Total Development Costs (TDC):

Scoring Justification per Applicant

TQS as a Percent of TDC:

15,852,340	0.0000%
19.4293%	

Applicant has met with HUD and provided a conceptual development for financing consideration. A Concept Meeting was held, and the applicant has since been encouraged to submit for Direct to Firm consideration. As per the 2017 QAP, the proposed HUD 221d4 mortgage meets all of the requirements to be eligible for leveraging points, the applicant intends to seek 221d4 financing should the project be selected for funding, and HUD and the DUS approved lender, Lancaster Pollard, both feel the proposed development meets their underwriting requirements to qualify.

DCA's Comments:

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDER:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
**Disclaimer:** DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
 Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.

	Score Value	Self Score	DCA Score
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>16. INNOVATIVE PROJECT CONCEPT</b>	<b>3</b>		
Is the applicant claiming these points?		<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>	<b>Ranking Pts Value Range</b>	<b>Ranking Pts</b>	
1. Presentation of the project concept narrative in the Application.	0 - 10	1.	
2. Uniqueness of innovation.	0 - 10	2.	
3. Demonstrated replicability of the innovation.	0 - 5	3.	
4. Leveraged operating funding	0 - 5	4.	
5. Measureable benefit to tenants	0 - 5	5.	
6. Collaborative solutions proposed and <i>evidence</i> of subject matter experts' <i>direct</i> involvement in the strategic concept development.	0 - 5	6.	
<b>DCA's Comments:</b>	<b>0 - 40</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>0</b>

**17. INTEGRATED SUPPORTIVE HOUSING**

**A. Integrated Supportive Housing/ Section 811 RA**

- Applicant agrees to accept Section 811 PBRA or other DCA-offered RA for up to 10% of the units for the purpose of providing Integrated Supportive Housing (ISH) opportunities to Persons w/ Disabilities (PWD), and is prepared to accept the full utilization by DCA of 10% of the units?
- Applicant understands the requirements of HUD's Section 811 Project Rental Assistance (PRA) program, including the 30-year use restriction for all PRA units?
- At least 10% of the total low-income units in the proposed Application will be one bedroom units?
- Applicant is willing to accept Assistance affordable to 50% AML tenants?

10% of Total Units (max):	<b>9</b>
Total Low Income Units	<b>58</b>
Min 1 BR LI Units required	<b>6</b>
1 BR LI Units Proposed	<b>7</b>

<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Agree</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	

**B. Target Population Preference**

- Applicant has a commitment of HUD Section 8 project-based rental assistance from a Public Housing Authority which has elected to offer a tenant selection preference in their Voucher programs for persons with specific disabilities identified in the Settlement Agreement (#1:10-CV-249-CAP)?  
 Name of Public Housing Authority providing PBRA:  PBRA Expiration:
- Applicant agrees to implement a minimum of 15% of the total units targeting the Settlement population? Nbr of Settlement units:  0.0%

<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.</b>		
<b>2.</b>		

Scoring Justification per Applicant

Applicant agrees to accept Section 811 project based rental assistance or other DCA offered rental assistance for up to 10% of the units for the purpose of providing integrated housing opportunities to Persons with Disabilities and is prepared to accept the full utilization of 10% of units.

DCA's Comments:

**18. HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

(choose A or B)

The property is:

Historic Credit Equity:

<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
----------	----------	----------

**A. Historic and Adaptive Reuse**

The proposed development includes historic tax credit proceeds and is an adaptive reuse of a certified historic structure.

Historic adaptive reuse units:	<b>0</b>
Total Units	<b>92</b>
% of Total	<b>0.00%</b>

<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	
----------	----------	--

**B. Historic**

The property is a certified historic structure per QAP or is deemed historic via a Georgia DNR-HPD approved NPS Part 1- Evaluation of Significance to have a preliminary determination of listing on the National Register

Nbr Historic units:	<b>0</b>
Total Units	<b>92</b>
% of Total	<b>0.00%</b>

<b>1</b>	<b>B.</b>	
----------	-----------	--

DCA's Comments:

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDER:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
**Disclaimer:** DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
**Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.**

	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

**19. HEALTHY HOUSING INITIATIVES (choose A or B or C)**

Pre-requisites:

- In Application submitted, Applicant used the following needs data to more efficiently target the proposed initiative for a proposed property:
  - A local Community Health Needs Assessment (CHNA)
  - The "County Health Rankings & Reports" website: <http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/health-gaps/georgia>
  - The Center for Disease Control and Prevention – Community Health Status Indicators (CHSI) website
- The Applicant identified target healthy initiatives to local community needs?
- Explain the need for the targeted health initiative proposed in this section.

Agree or Y/N Agree or Y/N

Agree	
Yes	
Yes	
Agree	

The applicant used information and data from three sources to determine the local needs for our community. The following three sources were used as the basis to determine which health initiative to target.

- 2015 Community Health Needs Assessment – Central Georgia
- County Health Rankings website (countyhealthrankings.org)
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website (www.cdc.gov/communityhealth)

Our development will be located in Houston County. Based on the research and information gathered the residents in Houston County have a need to improve their health outcomes related to obesity, diabetes, and the food environment index factor. Below is a summary of the research from each of the three data sources.

2015 Community Health Needs Assessment – Central Georgia

The applicant reviewed the 2015 Community Health Needs Assessment prepared for Navicent Health by Professional Research Consultant, Inc. The full report is included as part of the documentation for this section. The report covered the counties of Central Georgia (Bibb, Houston, Peach, Jones, Twiggs, Monroe, and Crawford). Below are key summary points which highlight community needs, primarily for Houston County, related to the prevalence of diabetes, obesity, and access to local healthy food.

- Pages 141-142 notes that Houston County has unfavorably high age-adjusted diabetes death rates.
- Pages 143-145 highlight that 14.1% of the total area adults have been diagnosed with diabetes, with a concentration of diabetes in low-income residents. This rate of diagnoses is worse than the statewide proportion.
- Page 192 of the CHNA, shows that 40% of Low Income residents in the area found it "very" or "somewhat" difficult to find affordable fresh produce.
- Page 193 shows that 42% of Houston County's population is far from a supermarket or large grocery store.
- Pages 204-205, showed results that 40% of the total area adults are obese, with a prevalence of obesity seen in low income persons.
- Page 209 states that 22.6% of the total area children are obese, which places this population in the greater 95th percentile for obesity.
- Page 211 highlights the need for locally grown food and community gardens, to alleviate obesity. Access to healthy foods is particularly crucial to fighting childhood obesity.

County Health Rankings:

- Adult obesity in Houston County is shown to be 31%, which is 16% worse than the national top performers at 26% a slightly worse than the state average of 30%. (source)
- The overall diabetes prevalence rate in Houston county is 13% while the average for Georgia is 11%. (source)
- On the Food Environment Index Factor Houston County ranks as a 6.6. The Food Environment Index measures the quality of the food environment in a county on a scale from 0 - being (worst) to 10 - being (best). The average in Georgia is a 6.6. (source)

The applicant also used the CHSI website (www.cdc.gov) to investigate community needs.

- Houston County has the least favorable (worst) rankings for indicators such as Adult Diabetes, Adult Obesity, and Limited access to healthy food.
- 10.7% of adults living in Houston County have been diagnosed with Adult Diabetes, as compared to the US average of 8.1% (source)
- The percentage of adult obesity for Houston County is 34.8% as compared to the US average of 30.4%. (source)
- Low limited access to healthy food in Houston County as 9.4% do not live close to a grocery store, with the US average being 6.2% not living close to a grocery store. (source)

Based on this information the applicant is providing a Healthy Eating Initiative. The applicant will provide an onsite community garden where residents are engaged in growing and using locally sourced foods in their diet. Our development site has access to additional greenspace which can easily support a community garden where healthy food options can be grown. To further the initiative quarterly classes, newsletters and information will be made available to the residents to promote healthy eating. With these efforts, we will address the community needs of lowering obesity, lowering the diagnosis rate of diabetes, and increasing reliable access to healthy food options.

**A. Preventive Health Screening/Wellness Program for Residents**

<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
a)		
b)		
c)		

- Applicants agrees to provide on-site preventive health screenings and or Wellness Services at the proposed project?
- The services will be provided at least monthly and be offered at minimal or no cost to the residents?
- The preventive health initiative includes wellness and preventive health care education and information for the residents?

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDER:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
 Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
 Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.

<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>Score Value</b>	<b>Self Score</b>	<b>DCA Score</b>
	92	64	22

2. Description of Service (Enter "N/a" if necessary)	Occurrence	Cost to Resident
a)		
b)		
c)		
d)		

**B. Healthy Eating Initiative**

Applicant agrees to provide a Healthy Eating Initiative, as defined in the QAP, at the proposed project?

2	2	0
---	---	---

1. The community garden and edible landscape will:
- a) Emphasize the importance of local, seasonal, and healthy food?  Yes
  - b) Have a minimum planting area of at least 400 square feet?  Yes
  - c) Provide a water source nearby for watering the garden?  Yes
  - d) Be surrounded on all sides with fence of weatherproof construction?  Yes
  - e) Meet the additional criteria outlined in DCA's Architectural Manual – Amenities Guidebook?  Yes
2. The monthly healthy eating programs will be provided free of charge to the residents and will feature related events?  Yes

Description of Monthly Healthy Eating Programs	Description of Related Event
a) University of Georgia's Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP)	Residents will be provided with a monthly healthy eating newsletter informed
b) EFNEP Food Talk Program	Food Talk consists of eight lessons, each containing simple messages con
c) UGA Extension Office of Houston County - Gardening Classes	Demonstrations on gardening techniques at the community garden and
d) UGA Extension Office of Houston County - Garden Bench News Letter	Bi-monthly newsletter providing residents with best practices on gardening

**C. Healthy Activity Initiative**

Applicant agrees to provide a Healthy Activity Initiative, as defined in the QAP, at the proposed project?

<< If Agree, enter type of Healthy Activity Initiative here >>	2	0	0
--	---	---	---

1. The dedicated multi-purpose walking trail that is ½ mile or longer that promotes walking, jogging, or biking will:
- a) Be well illuminated?
  - b) Contain an asphalt or concrete surface?
  - c) Include benches or sitting areas throughout course of trail?
  - d) Provide distance signage?
  - e) Provide 1 piece of fitness equipment per every 1/8 mile of trail?
  - f) Provide trash receptacles?
  - g) Meet the additional criteria outlined in DCA's Architectural Manual – Amenities Guidebook?
- Length of Trail \_\_\_\_\_ miles
2. The monthly educational information will be provided free of charge to the residents on related events?

*Scoring Justification per Applicant*

Based on the results of reasearch of local community needs, our development will contain onsite community gardens. These gardens will provide residents and their families with access to locally grown foods. Our management company will collaborate with the University of Georgia's Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the UGA Extension-Houston County to provide residents education on the benefits of healthy eating and best practices on maintaining a community garden. These classes and information will be provided on a monthly basis, at no cost, to our tenants.

*DCA's Comments:*

\_\_\_\_\_

**20. QUALITY EDUCATION AREAS**

Application develops a property located in the attendance zone of one or more high-performing schools as determined by the state CCRPI?

3	3	0
---	---	---

NOTE: 2013-2016 CCRPI Data Must Be Used

District / School System - from state CCRPI website:

Tenancy:

If Charter school used, does it have a designated (not district wide) attendance zone that includes the property site?  No

School Level	School Name (from state CCRPI website)	Grades Served	Charter School?	CCRPI Scores from School Years Ending In:				Average CCRPI Score	CCRPI > State Average?
				2013	2014	2015	2016		
a) Primary/Elementary	Lake Joy Elementary	3-5	No	86.30	87.90	85.20		86.47	Yes
b) Middle/Junior High	Feagin Middle	6-8	No	87.00	88.50	83.50		86.33	Yes
c) High	Houston County High	9-12	No	79.00	82.00	89.70		83.57	Yes
d) Primary/Elementary	Lake Joy Elementary	3-5	No						
e) Middle/Junior High	Feagin Middle	6-8	No						
f) High	Houston County High	9-12	No						

*Scoring Justification per Applicant*

Applicant has been provided confirmation of the sites attendance zone for the above schools and elects to use the 2013-2015 averaging as allowed by the QAP. However, the site also qualifies using 2014-2016 figures, indicating sustainable overachieving scores for the above schools.

*DCA's Comments:*

\_\_\_\_\_

**PART NINE - SCORING CRITERIA - 2017-025 Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake, Warner Robins, Houston County**

**REMINDEK:** Applicants must include comments in sections where points are claimed.  
Disclaimer: DCA Threshold and Scoring section reviews pertain only to the corresponding funding round and have no effect on subsequent or future funding round scoring decisions.  
 Failure to do so will result in a one (1) point "Application Completeness" deduction.

	Score Value	Self Score	DCA Score
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>21. WORKFORCE HOUSING NEED (choose A or B)</b> (Must use 2014 data from "OnTheMap" tool, but 2015 data may be used if available)	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>A.</b> Minimum jobs threshold met <u>and</u> 60% of workers within a 2-mile radius travel over 10 miles to their place of work	2		
<b>OR B.</b> Exceed the minimum jobs threshold by 50%	2		

Jobs Threshold	City of Atlanta	Atlanta Metro (Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Fulton, Gwinnett, Henry and Rockdale counties)	Other MSA	Rural Area
Minimum	20,000	15,000	6,000	3,000
Project Site				
Min Exceeded by:	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

	Per Applicant	Per DCA	Project City	Warner Robins
Applicable Minimum Jobs Threshold (from chart above) -- Nbr of Jobs:			Project County	Houston
Total Nbr of Jobs w/in the 2-mile radius:			HUD SA	Warner Robins
Nbr of Jobs in 2-mile radius w/ workers who travel > 10 miles to work:			MSA / Non-MSA	MSA
Percentage of Jobs w/in the 2-mile radius w/ workers travelling over 10 miles to work:	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	Urban or Rural	Urban

Scoring Justification per Applicant  
 N/A...site does not qualify for these points.

DCA's Comments:

<b>22. COMPLIANCE / PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Base Score</b>			<b>10</b>
<b>Deductions</b>			<b>0</b>
<b>Additions</b>			<b>0</b>

Scoring Justification per Applicant  
 Applicant has not been notified of any reason for point deductions by DCA, nor any other State agency, and the applicant was deemed Qualified w/out Conditions pursuant to the pre-application. Therefore, the above points are considered justified.

DCA's Comments:

<b>TOTAL POSSIBLE SCORE</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>EXCEPTIONAL NONPROFIT POINTS</b>			<b>0</b>
<b>INNOVATIVE PROJECT CONCEPT POINTS</b>			<b>0</b>
<b>NET POSSIBLE SCORE WITHOUT DCA EXTRA POINTS</b>			<b>22</b>

DCA has included the following area for Applicants to make comments in any section they claimed points but were not provided with comment section. Include the section/(s) you are referring to within this area along with any applicable comments.

Applicant believes all information required for a complete review of the proposed community has been provided in the appropriate application folders. The proposed community will set-aside at least 20% of the units for persons / families meeting the 50% AMI restrictions. The site is located in a Stable community with less than 5% poverty, and is designated as a Upper Income census tract, and also falls in the A-3 GDPH sub-cluster with at least 20% of the units designated as unrestricted, market-rate units.

The Applicant agrees to extend the affordability period an additional 5 years, as well as work with DCA on their Integrated Supportive Housing, Healthy Places initiatives, as well as the Innovative Project Concept detailed within the overall application.

**Scoring Section 8.C.1 - Transformational Communities: Community Improvement Fund Narrative**

Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake  
Warner Robins, Houston County

<< Enter paragraph(s) here. Press and hold Alt-Enter to start new paragraphs. >>

**Scoring Section 8.C.1 - Transformational Communities: Community Improvement Fund Narrative**

Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake  
Warner Robins, Houston County

**Scoring Section 14 - DCA Community Initiatives: GICH Project Narrative**

Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake

Warner Robins, Houston County

<< Enter paragraph(s) here. Press and hold Alt-Enter to start new paragraphs. >>



## Scoring Section 16 - Innovative Project Concept Narrative

Tupelo Ridge at Houston Lake  
Warner Robins, Houston County

Currently, two-thirds of Georgia's third graders aren't reading on grade level, bringing long-term negative consequences to the children, their families and communities, and the state of Georgia. Below-grade reading proficiency is a proven barrier to achieving a quality education - an issue intensified within low-income families. Zimmerman Properties is proposing an on-site Early Learning Center ("ELC") to address this issue by providing children access to resources and supportive services to become proficient readers. The goal is simple...Bring solutions to the doorsteps of Georgia's next generation to increase reading proficiency by the 3rd grade.

### Uniqueness:

The Case Studies Narrative shows...

- A direct correlation exists between a child's 3rd grade reading proficiency and their future educational achievements.
- Children of low-income families face greater risks of not becoming proficient 3rd grade readers.
- Creating a strong learning environment using a community approach can enable low-income children to become proficient 3rd grade readers.

The Staffing and Organizational Plan Narrative shows...

- Zimmerman will "Bring solutions to the doorsteps..." that address early childhood education.
- For the first time, the Four Pillars of the Get Georgia Reading campaign ("GGR") will be introduced into affordable housing communities.
- The use of myON's software, which fosters reading aptitude, will be utilized and highlighted in an affordable housing community.

### Replicability:

This Narrative shows replicability through...

- The potential for higher community buy-in and involvement due to the benefit derived.
- Simple expansion of the community center/clubhouse and leveraging of operations.
- The potential for DCA to incorporate the concept through architectural designs requirements, project amenities and/or a scoring category.

### Leveraging:

This Narrative shows...

- Leveraging of % of the combined 10-year cost to operate and initial build-out via collaborations with organizations such as GGR, its statewide partners, and others, including...
  - o Private capital partners
  - o Social services
  - o Foundational entities

### Measurable:

This Narrative shows...

- Metrics exist to track individual reading proficiency for children of our tenants and the community.
- Children, parents, and educators have access to reports which increase accountability and awareness.
- Third-party reporting through myON and the Houston County Board of Education ensures reliable reports.
- Schools can supplement reporting, capturing the ELC's impact within the community.

### Collaboration:

The Partners Narrative shows...

- The ELC is a collaborative approach among state, local governmental and non-profit partners to increase reading proficiency.
- A proper organizational plan and design with supportive services which can be improved through relationships with local subject matter experts.
- Seven organizations were directly involved in the ELC concept development, providing a focus of improving childhood reading proficiency in the housing and affordable housing industry.

Zimmerman's community proposal will help increase low-income children's reading proficiency, a proven outcome that positively impacts future educational achievements. This concept provides DCA an entry point to join GGR's campaign to improve reading proficiency across Georgia. The ELC will provide an innovative and novel solution to a complex issue of addressing early childhood education: Bring solutions to the doorsteps of Georgia's next generation to increase reading proficiency by the 3rd grade.

Georgia Department of Community Affairs  
Housing Finance and Development Division  
60 Executive Park South, NE.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30329-2231

Re: Application for Low-Income Housing Tax Credit and/or HOME Funding

To DCA:

This Application is submitted in accordance with the 2017 Qualified Allocation Plan and the Housing Finance and Development Division Manuals. In submitting this Application for funding consideration, the undersigned applicant hereby certifies:

- 1) I understand that, in the event an allocation (or an allowance) for LIHTCs was obtained with false information supplied to the Georgia Department of Community Affairs ("DCA"), DCA will recapture the LIHTCs or request that the IRS deny tax credits to the Applicant entity. Also, a supplier, including the developer or owner, who knowingly provides false information will be barred by DCA from program participation for a period of five (5) years from the date the false information was discovered, in accordance with a Memorandum of Understanding between the Internal Revenue Service and the Georgia Housing and Finance Authority.
- 2) I am responsible for ensuring the project consists or will consist of a qualified low-income building (or buildings) as defined in the Internal Revenue Code section 42(c)(2) and will satisfy all applicable requirements of State and Federal tax law in the acquisition, development and operation of the project to receive State and federal housing tax credits.
- 3) I am responsible for all calculations and figures relating to the determination of the eligible basis of the building(s). I understand and agree the amount of the credit is allocated by reference to the figures that I submit as to eligible and qualified basis. I understand that the actual amount of credit allocated may vary somewhat from the amount initially reserved or committed due to (a) the determination by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs ("DCA") as to the amount of credit necessary for the financial feasibility of the project and its viability as a qualified low-income housing project; (b) revisions in the calculations of eligible and qualified basis as finally determined; (c) fluctuations in the prevailing credit percentage; and (d) availability of the credit.
- 4) I understand and agree that DCA makes no representations or warranties regarding the financial feasibility of the project, the amount of credit, or the appropriateness of the allocation of the credit and makes no independent investigation as to the eligible and qualified basis and that any and all credit awards and credit amounts are solely based on representations made by me. I therefore agree to hold harmless and indemnify DCA and the individual directors, employees, members, officers, and agents of DCA in the event that I or anyone acting on my behalf, at my request or by and through me incurs any loss, injury, or damages in conjunction with the project including those that may result from any inquiries or gathering of information by DCA concerning the proposed project team or Application, diminution of the credit, loss of the credit, recapture of part or all of the credit, failure to allocate the credit requested in my Application or, the failure of DCA, in whole or in part, to grant my Application.
- 5) I understand and agree that neither DCA nor any of its individual directors, employees, members, officers, or agents assume any responsibility or make any representations or warranties with respect to: (i) the amount or availability of credit for the project; or (ii) the financial feasibility of the project.

- 6) I understand and agree that my Application for a low-income housing credit and/or HOME loan, all attachments thereto, amendments, and all correspondence relating to my Application in particular or the credit in general are subject to a request disclosure under the Georgia Open Records Act and I expressly consent to such disclosure. I further understand and agree that any and all correspondence to me from DCA, other DCA-generated documents, or documents to or from a third party in the possession of DCA relating to my Application are subject to a request for disclosure under the Georgia Open Records Act and I expressly consent to such disclosure. I agree to hold harmless DCA and the individual directors, employees, members, officers, and agents of DCA against all losses, costs, damages, expenses, and liability of whatsoever nature or kind (including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees, litigation, and court costs) directly or indirectly resulting from or arising out of the release of all information pertaining to my Application pursuant to a request under the Georgia Open Records Act or resulting from or arising out of the release.
- 7) I understand and agree to authorize DCA access to information relevant to DCA's Application review. I understand that DCA may request an IRS Form 8821 for any Project Participant through final allocation of credits and/or disbursement of funds. Project Participants will complete Form 8821 upon DCA's request.
- 8) I understand that any misrepresentations, which includes fraudulent, negligent, and/or innocent, in this Application or supporting documentation may result in a withdrawal of tax credits and/or HOME loan by DCA, my (and related parties) being barred from future program participation, and notification of the Internal Revenue Service and/or HUD.
- 9) I certify that all sources of funds, including but not limited to Federal, State and local funding sources, have been disclosed and revealed.

In addition, Applicant understands:

- The above certifications are of a continuing nature and apply at all stages of the Application process: initial application, commitment, carryover allocation, and final allocation/funding.
- DCA must be notified of any subsequent events or information, which would change any statements or representations in the attached Application or amendments thereto;
- DCA reserves the right to verify all information or documents used in processing the Application, including requiring credit checks on all parties involved in the transaction. Applicant hereby authorizes the financing bank, accountant, mortgage lender, creditors, other state housing agencies and others sources identified in the Application to release information to DCA or its designee in order to verify the accuracy of information in the Application and amendments thereto.

Applicant agrees and understands that it may be charged for all fees and costs incurred by DCA in the inspection of funded properties during and after construction and in the enforcement of DCA regulations and policies.

Under penalty of perjury, to the best of my knowledge, I certify that all of the information in the attached Application, including all supporting documentation, is correct, complete and accurate.

APPLICANT/OWNER

Vaughn Zimmerman  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Printed Name

Member  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date  
 [SEAL]