

## Miami-Dade County Housing and Community Development (HCD)

FY 2025 Surtax, SHIP, HOME and HOME CHDO RFA

Issuance Date: July 11, 2025

### ADDENDUM #1

---

The following corrections and applicant questions are related to the FY 2025 Request for Application (RFA), released on June 30, 2025, for Documentary Stamp Surtax (Surtax) funding, State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP) funding, Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) funding, and HOME Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO) funding. HCD's clarified responses below will become a part of the official guidance for the FY 2025 Surtax, SHIP, HOME and HOME CHDO RFA.

#### **HCD Corrections**

1. Correction – Page 19: **Only Applications meeting Minimum Threshold requirements will be scored.** Only Applications that have been scored will be ranked and may be recommended for funding. **Applicants must score a minimum of 70% of the base points, 70 points in the general section, before the addition of bonus points, to be recommended for funding.** Applications that have not been scored or ranked will be considered ineligible for funding.
2. Correction – Page 20: The County encourages all applicants to review the Loan Documents prior to submitting any application. The County expects awardees of funds to execute the Loan Documents without any substantive revisions or edits. Any substantive changes to the loan documents are at the sole and absolute discretion of the County. Loan documents are attached for review in the ZoomGrants Library section. Refer to Reference 19-24.
3. Correction – Page 34: Applicants may apply for multiple funding sources, (i.e., both HOME and SURTAX/SHIP) using one application per funding category.
4. Correction – Page 39: Proposed Developments using Florida Housing Finance Corporation resources must include the:
  - Features agreed to in the FHFC RFA for which the Applicant is receiving funding or features agreed to in the FHFC Non-Competitive Application for 4% LIHTCs; as well as, features agreed to in the local HFA application for tax exempt bond financing.
  - Pages from that RFA or other applicable applications must be included in this application submission as evidence of this provision. This documentation must be submitted ~~as Attachment(s) 7 and 13.~~ within the ZoomGrants Required Documents for Upload section - Miscellaneous Documentation (Clearly Labeled).

5. Correction – Page 37 and Page 41: HCD has amended the RFA to the following selection:
  - ☐ Multi-Family Rental Option 1, For Profit and Not-For-Profit Developers
  - ☐ Multi-Family Rental Option 2, For Profit and Not-For-Profit Developers
  - ☐ Multi-Family Rental Option 3, Homeless and Public Housing For-Profit Developers
  - ☐ Multi-Family Rental Option 4, Homeless and Public Housing Not-For-Profit Developers
  
6. Correction – Page 23 and Score Sheets for Countywide – Multifamily, Faith-Based Developments, and Small Developments - Question B6 – Bonus Section: To achieve points, ~~applications must provide documentation of County response memorandums received as part of RER's Pre-Application meeting or similar documentation from municipalities (Development Services, WASD, DERM, Traffic and Platting, and MDRF).~~ applicants may submit a completed Zoning Pre-Application Closeout Checklist form from the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources (RER) as evidence of attending a RER Pre-Application Meeting.
  
7. Correction – Scores Sheets for Small Development Projects - General Section - Question 4A and 4B: The breakdown of units completed has been revised to more than 250 units or less than 250 units with the breakdown of points revised to reflect the change of unit structure.

4 Experience of Development Team		21 points
Experience of Development Team (based on RFA submittal)		
<i>For purposes of scoring, to receive points for developer experience applicant must provide proof of unit development including certificate of occupancy. If a developer can demonstrate proof of "recent experience" additional points will be awarded. Specify if the experience on a development-by-development basis is for multi-family rental or homeownership.</i>		
<b>A. Units completed with Certificate of Occupancy</b>		
<del>More than 1000 units</del>		<del>15 points</del>
<del>700-999 units</del>		<del>12 points</del>
<del>500-699 units</del>		<del>9 points</del>
<del>200-499 units</del> More than 250 units		7 15 points
<del>100-199 units</del> 150-249 units		5 12 points
<del>50-99 units</del> 50-149 units		3 9 points
<del>25-49 units</del> 25-49 units		2 6 points
<del>1-24 units</del> 10-24 units		4 3 points
<del>No evidence</del> 9 units or less		0 points
<b>B. Recent Experience – Units completed within the last 4 years (based on units counted above)</b>		
<del>700 or more units</del> More then 250 units		6 points
<del>200-699 units</del> 150-249 units		4 <del>points</del> 5 points
<del>25-199 units</del> 50-149 units		2 <del>points</del> 4 points
25-49 units		2 points
10-24 units		1 point
9 units or less		0 points

8. Correction - Score Sheets for Countywide – Multifamily, Faith-Based Developments, and Small Developments – General Section - Question 3: All funding categories have been revised to amend the line item 100% Workforce/Affordable Housing (~~60% - 140% AMI~~)

(0%-140% AMI) with FHFC funding. The point breakdown has not been revised.

3 Mixed Income Projects			14 points
Mixed Income Projects – Ratio of Low-Moderate to Market Rate Rental Units Provided			
	Greater than or equal to 80% Workforce without FHFC funding		14 points
	50% unrestricted and 50% Workforce/Affordable		10 points
	80% unrestricted and 20% Workforce/Affordable		8 points
	100% Workforce/Affordable (60% - 140% AMI) with FHFC funding		6 points
	Does not qualify		0 points

### **Applicant Questions**

1. **Question:** Per the instructions on pages 12 and 34 Option 1 or Option 2 terms must be selected but on pages 38 and 41 there are additional options for Multifamily Rental for Homeless and/or Public Housing (For-profit and Non-Profit) with different terms. If the project qualifies for Homeless and/or Public Housing, can we select this option instead?

**Response:** HCD staff have made the necessary correction. Refer to Page 2 Correction #5 of this addendum.

2. **Question:** Page 17, Sustainable Building (Energy and Green) Certification threshold item: Is a written commitment to obtain IECC, ASHRAE, or LEED certification required in addition to the signed Energy certifications?

**Response:** The RFA has been updated to clarify that only the executed and notarized affidavit is required to meet this minimum threshold requirement. However, to successfully close out the development project with HCD, the required certification must be provided by the end of development.

3. **Question:** On page 20 regarding Average Income, is Florida Housing Finance Corporation's (FHFC) written approval required with the RFA submission or will this be determined during underwriting? If required with the RFA submission, will the average income commitment from the application submitted to FHFC suffice?

**Response:** The Applicant Income Averaging Acknowledgement and Certification (Form 8) and the FHFC documentation are required for submission in the ZoomGrants Required Documents for Upload section.

4. **Question:** Page 22, To be considered a public housing or RAD project for this RFA the Developer must provide these threshold requirements:
  - The proposed project must show that 100% of the existing Annual Contributions Contract (ACC) units on site will be replaced or substantially rehabilitated or have

been already replaced or substantially rehabilitated in a prior phase – will a letter confirming this information suffice, and in which attachment should it be included?

**Response:** Yes, a letter from the HCD Development Division must be provided. This miscellaneous supplemental documentation should be submitted in the ZoomGrants Required Documents for Upload section as Miscellaneous documentation (Clearly Labeled).

- Proposed public housing sites must have the appropriate HCD and/or HUD approval in the form of a CHAP, demolition and/or disposition application, or mixed-finance proposals with approved unit counts that include ACC and/or RAD units – in which attachment should this be included?

**Response:** All miscellaneous supplemental documentation should be submitted in the ZoomGrants Required Documents for Upload section as Miscellaneous documentation (Clearly Labeled).

5. **Question:** Pursuant to the Elderly Affordable Housing Affidavit on page 48, there are four exemptions to Miami-Dade County Resolution No. R-617-18. If the project meets one of the exemptions, is the developer still required to provide the required items listed on pages 21-22, and 39, also will the Affidavit on pages 48-49 (checklist item 50) will not be required?

**Response:** Applicants that meet at least one of the exemptions stipulated in the Miami-Dade County Resolution No. R-617-18 shall be exempt from all requirements of the resolution. Evidence of exemptions and supporting documentation must be submitted with the RFA application by the deadline of July 31, 2025.

6. **Question:** Scoring item #2, County subsidy including Surtax, CDBG, HOME, GOB or other County resources and funding requested in current application on a per unit basis. Is this calculated based on the number of restricted units or based on the total number of units in the project?

**Response:** County subsidy is calculated based on the total number of units in the project subject to the funding sources.

7. **Question:** Can a signed zoning comment memo received in March 2024 be accepted in lieu of scheduling a Pre-Application Meeting with RER to qualify for bonus points for the RER Pre-Application Meeting?

**Response:** HCD staff have made the necessary correction. Refer to Page 2 Correction #6 of this addendum.

8. **Question:** Regarding the requirements in Resolution NO. R-617-18 for elderly projects, are the requirements only for applicants that apply under the Elderly Housing Developments Category for an elderly development, or does it apply to all developments that have an Elderly set-aside demographic?

**Response:** Resolution No. R-617-18, applies to all elderly housing development projects.

### **Applicant Comments**

1. **Comment:** Minimum threshold statement on page 19 should state 70 points instead of 70 percent of the base points.

**Response:** HCD staff have made the necessary correction. Refer to Page 1 Correction #1 of this addendum.

2. **Comment:** Page 20, Elderly unit mix: For Elderly developments, the minimum percentage of 0- and 1-bedroom units is 85%, and the balance of the units cannot be larger than 2-bedroom units.

To comply with FHFC, we respectfully request for FHFC funded projects that this requirement mirror FHFC's requirements below.

Unit Mix requirements for Elderly Developments:

If the Elderly Non-ALF Demographic Commitment is selected and the Development Category of Rehabilitation, with or without Acquisition, is selected, at least 40 percent of the total units must be comprised of one bedroom or Zero Bedroom Units, and no more than 20 percent of the total units can be larger than two-bedroom units.

If the Elderly Non-ALF Demographic Commitment is selected and the Development Category of New Construction is selected, at least 50 percent of the total units must be comprised of one bedroom or Zero Bedroom Units, and no more than 15 percent of the total units can be larger than two-bedroom units.

**Response:** The current elderly unit composition criteria established by HCD shall remain.

3. **Comment:** The revised scoring criteria for Mixed-Income Projects—specifically the category awarding points for developments that are 100% Workforce/Affordable (60%–140% AMI) with FHFC funding—raises a critical question: Is it the intent that all residential units must fall strictly within the 60% to 140% AMI range? If so, all FHFC-funded projects, including the County's public housing redevelopments, would receive zero points in this category. Additionally, the County's CNI-funded public housing redevelopment, which includes 20% unrestricted units, would also fail to score points

under this item. This is because FHFC RFAs require a set-aside for Extremely Low-Income (ELI) households—50% of which are LINK units for the Homeless—placing those units below the 60% AMI scoring threshold. As a result, recently awarded FHFC projects may be unable to meet the 70-point minimum required to pass threshold under the current scoring framework.

We respectfully request that this scoring item revert to the language used in the 2022 and 2023 RFAs, which awarded four points to projects with 100% of units at or below 60% AMI, or up to 80% AMI when using LIHTC income averaging or designated as workforce housing.

**Response:** HCD staff have made the necessary correction. Refer to Page 2-3 Correction #7 of this addendum.