

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE (RHDA/OHDA)

Application for Housing Development Financing

PLEASE NOTE: AHFC Reserves the right to fund projects at a lower amount than requested, and the right to deny applications that do not coincide with the <u>Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint</u> and policy direction from the Austin City Council.

Applicant Information

(If the developer involves multiple entities, is a partnership or joint venture, please provide the requisite information for each and identify the entity that will serve as the "lead" organization.)

Developer Name	Owner Name		
Foundation Communities, Inc.	FC Austin Six Housing Corporation		
Street Address			
30	036 S 1st St		
City	State Zip		
Austin	TX 78704		
Contact Name	Contact Telephone		
Walter Moreau	512-610-4016		
Contact Email			
walter.more	eau@foundcom.org		
Federal Tax ID Number	D-U-N-S Number (visit www.dnb.com for free DUNS#.)		
74-2563260	55-635-2268		
The applicant/developer certifies that the data inc are true and correct. <i>Unsigned/undated submissic</i>	cluded in this application and the exhibits attached hereto ons will not be considered.		
Legal Name of Developer/Entity	Title of Authorized Officer		
Foundation Communities, Inc.	Executive Director		
Signature of Authorized Officer	11/1/19 Date		

INSTRUCTIONS: Applications will be reviewed on a quarterly basis. All applications submitted in the review period that achieve the minimum threshold score will be reviewed by an internal panel of NHCD staff. All awards will be made by the AHFC Board of Directors. To be considered for an award, please complete this application electronically, print, sign, and deliver to:

Department of Neighborhood Housing and Community 1000 East 11th Street Austin, Texas 78702

Attn: James May
Community Development Manager

City of Austin

MOV 1 2019

NHCD / AHFC

Project Summary F	orm							
1) Project Na	me	2) Project Ty	pe 3) N e	w Constructio	n or Rehabilita	ation?		
The Loretta 100% Affordable New Construction								
4) Location Description (Agreement and of street distance from intersection)								
4) Location Description (Acreage, side of street, distance from intersection) 5) Mobility Bond Corridor 13653 Rutledge Spur								
		<u> </u>						
6) Census Tract	7) Council D		Elementary S		Affordability	Period		
203.11	District	6 AI	NDERSON MI	LL EL	40 years			
10) Type of Structu	re	11) Occu	pied?	12) How	will funds be เ	used?		
Multi-family		No		ion, Pre-de	evelopment, ai	nd Cons		
	13) Sı	ımmary of Rent	al Unite by ME	Llovol				
		One	Two	Three	Four (+)			
Income Level	Efficiency	Bedroom	Bedroom	Bedroom	Bedroom	Total		
Up to 20% MFI						0		
Up to 30% MFI		4	7	3		14		
Up to 40% MFI						0		
Up to 50% MFI		25	38	19		82		
Up to 60% MFI		13	19	9		41		
Up to 80% MFI						0		
Up to 120% MFI						0		
No Restrictions						0		
Total Units	0	42	64	31	0	137		
		mmary of Units	for Sale at MF	l Level				
Income Level	Efficiency	One	Two	Three	Four (+)	Total		
Up to 60% MFI						0		
Up to 80% MFI						0		
Up to 120% MFI No Restrictions						0		
Total Units	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Total Ollits				<u> </u>	,	·		
In the	-4:		and Priorities	la iti ativa	Ιμ .	£ 11.5.45		
Accessible Units for	ative	# of Ui		Initiative nuum of Care		of Units 4		
			Cont	illuulii oi Cale	Offics	4		
Accessible Units for Sensory Impairments 4 Use the City of Austin GIS Map to Answer the questions below								
•	•		•		V			
16) Is the property w	itnin 1/2 mile c	or an imagine <i>P</i>	Austin Center o	or Corridor?	Yes			
17) Is the property w	ithin 1/4 mile o	ıf a High-Frequ	ency Transit S	Stop? N	lo			
18) Is the property w	ithin 3/4 mile o	of Transit Servi	ce? Yes					
19) The property has			Yes	ı				
20) Estimated Sour	•							
20) Estimated Godi	Sources	or runus		Use	s			
	Debt	11928666		Acquisition		952950		
Third Party		8639217		Off-Site				
,	Grant			Site Work				
Deferred Develop	per Fee	750000		Sit Amenities				
	Other	5086738		Building Costs	21,8	57,619		
City of A	Austin	4750000	Co	ontractor Fees				
				Soft Costs		951794		
			5	Financing		342258		
	Total \$	31,154,621	De	eveloper Fees <i>Total</i>		750000 54,621		
	ıVlai D	3 I. I 34.DZ I		ioiai		14 D/I		

	Develo	pment Sch	nedule		
	_ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =		Start Date	End Date	
Site Control			Aug-18	Sep-19	
Acquisition			Aug-18		
Zoning			Apr-19	Jun-19	
Environmental	Review		Aug-18	Sep-19	
Pre-Developm	nent		Oct-19	Aug-20	
Contract Execut	tion		Oct-19		
Closing of Othe	_		May-20		
Development S	ervices Review		Feb-20	Aug-20	
Construction			Sep-20	Jan-22	
Site Preparation	า		Sep-20	Oct-20	
25% Complete			Dec-20		
50% Complete			May-21		
75% Complete			Sep-21		
100% Complete	2		Jan-22		
Marketing			Oct-21		
Pre-Listing			Oct-21		
Marketing Plan			Oct-21		
Wait List Proces	SS		Oct-21		
Disposition			Jan-22		
Lease Up			Jan-22		
Close Out	44 14 46	C 47	Jan-22		14 22
_	c-14 May-16	Sep-17	Feb-19	Jun-20 Oct-21	Mar-23
Site Control					
Acquisition			•		
Zoning					
Environmental Review					
Pre-Development					
Contract Execution			•	_	
Closing of Other Financing					
Development Services Review					
Construction					
Site Preparation					
25% Complete				•	
50% Complete				•	
75% Complete				•	
100% Complete					
Marketing					
Pre-Listing					
Marketing Plan					
Wait List Process					
Disposition					
Lease Up					
Close Out					

Development Budget						
		Requested AHFC	Description			
	Total Project Cost	Funds	Description			
Pre-Development						
Appraisal	20,450	20,450	includes Market Analysis			
Environmental Review	37,850	37,850				
Engineering	5,900	5,900	soils report			
Survey	16,485	16,485				
Architectural	740,750	740,750	includes engineering			
Subtotal Pre-Development Cost	\$821,435	\$821,435				
Acquisition						
Site and/or Land	2,950,000	2,950,000				
Structures						
Other (specify)	2,950	2,950	closing costs			
Subtotal Acquisition Cost	\$2,952,950	\$2,952,950				
Construction						
Infrastructure	20,816,780	975,615	estimated Building Costs			
Site Work						
Demolition						
Concrete						
Masonry						
Rough Carpentry						
Finish Carpentry						
Waterproofing and Insulation						
Roofing and Sheet Metal						
Plumbing/Hot Water						
HVAC/Mechanical						
Electrical						
Doors/Windows/Glass						
Lath and Plaster/Drywall and Acoustical						
Tiel Work						
Soft and Hard Floor						
Paint/Decorating/Blinds/Shades						
Specialties/Special Equipment						
Cabinetry/Appliances						
Carpet						
Other (specify)						
Construction Contingency	1,040,839		Contingency			
Subtotal Construction Cost	\$21,857,619	\$975,615				
Soft & Carrying Costs	721,037,013	7373,013				
Legal	50,000					
Audit/Accounting	11,284					
Title/Recordin	319,287		construction and perm			
Architectural (Inspections)	43,988		all building fees			
Construction Interest	950,000					
Construction Period Insurance	71,755					
Construction Period Taxes	/1,/55					
Relocation						
Marketing						
Davis-Bacon Monitoring						
_	4.076.202		developer fee, consultants, receives, hands fees soft east			
Other (specify)	4,076,303	40	developer fee, consultants, reserves, bonds, fees, soft cost:			
Subtotal Soft & Carrying Costs	\$5,522,617	\$0				
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET	\$31,154,621	\$4,750,000				

15 Year Rental Housing Operating Pro Forma (RHDA)

The pro forma should be based on the operating income and expense information for the base year (first year of stabilized occupancy using today's best estimates of market rents, restricted rents, rental income and expenses), and principal and interest debt service. The Department uses an annual growth rate of 2% for income and 3% for expenses. Written explanation for any deviations from these growth rates or for assumptions other than straight-line growth made during the proforma period should be attached to this exhibit.

INCOME	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 10	YEAR 15
POTENTIAL GROSS ANNUAL RENTAL INCOME	\$1,633,992	\$1,666,672	\$1,700,005	\$1,734,005	\$1,768,685	\$1,952,772	\$2,156,018
Secondary Income	\$28,385	\$28,953	\$29,532	\$30,122	\$30,725	\$33,923	\$37,453
POTENTIAL GROSS ANNUAL INCOME	\$1,662,377	\$1,695,625	\$1,729,537	\$1,764,128	\$1,799,410	\$1,986,694	\$2,193,471
Provision for Vacancy & Collection Loss	-\$124,678	-\$127,172	-\$129,715	-\$132,310	-\$134,956	-\$149,002	-\$164,510
Rental Concessions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
EFFECTIVE GROSS ANNUAL INCOME	\$1,537,699	\$1,568,453	\$1,599,822	\$1,631,818	\$1,664,455	\$1,837,692	\$2,028,961
EXPENSES							
General & Administrative Expenses	\$68,560	\$70,617	\$72,735	\$74,917	\$77,165	\$89,455	\$103,703
Management Fee	\$90,687	\$93,408	\$96,210	\$99,096	\$102,069	\$118,326	\$137,172
Payroll, Payroll Tax & Employee Benefits	\$220,908	\$227,535	\$234,361	\$241,392	\$248,634	\$288,235	\$334,143
Repairs & Maintenance	\$215,532	\$221,998	\$228,658	\$235,518	\$242,583	\$281,220	\$326,011
Electric & Gas Utilities	\$15,027	\$15,478	\$15,942	\$16,420	\$16,913	\$19,607	\$22,730
Water, Sewer & Trash Utilities	\$76,576	\$78,873	\$81,239	\$83,677	\$86,187	\$99,914	\$115,828
Annual Property Insurance Premiums	\$49,448	\$50,931	\$52,459	\$54,033	\$55,654	\$64,518	\$74,795
Property Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Reserve for Replacements	\$34,250	\$35,278	\$36,336	\$37,426	\$38,549	\$44,688	\$51,806
Other Expenses	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL ANNUAL EXPENSES	\$770,988	\$794,118	\$817,941	\$842,479	\$867,754	\$1,005,964	\$1,166,189
NET OPERATING INCOME	\$766,711	\$774,335	\$781,881	\$789,339	\$796,701	\$831,728	\$862,772
DEBT SERVICE							
First Deed of Trust Annual Loan Payment	\$666,704	\$666,704	\$666,704	\$666,704	\$666,704	\$666,704	\$666,704
Second Deed of Trust Annual Loan Payment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Third Deed of Trust Annual Loan Payment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Annual Required Payment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Annual Required Payment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ANNUAL NET CASH FLOW	\$100,007	\$107,631	\$115,177	\$122,635	\$129,997	\$165,024	\$196,068
CUMULATIVE NET CASH FLOW	\$100,007	\$207,638	\$322,814	\$445,449	\$575,446	\$1,312,997	\$2,215,728
Debt Coverage Ratio	1.15	1.16	1.17	1.18	1.19	1.25	1.29

	akeline Station Phase	
Project Type	100% Affordable	
Council District Census Tract	District 6 203.11	
AHFC Funding Request Amount	\$4,750,000	
Estimated Total Project Cost	\$31,154,621	
High Opportunity	Yes	
High Displacement Risk	NO	
High Frequency Transit	No	
Imagine Austin	Yes	
Mobility Bond Corridor SCORING ELEMENTS	0	Description
SCORING ELEMENTS UNITS		Description
< 20% MFI	0	# of rental units at < 20% MFI
< 30% MFI	14	# of rental units at < 30% MFI
District Goal	1.63%	% of annual goal reached with units
High Opportunity	3.36%	% of annual goal reached with units
Displacement Risk	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
High Frequency Transit	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
Imagine Austin	10.09%	% of annual goal reached with units
Geographic Dispersion	4.61% 0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
Mobility Bond Corridor SCORE	4	% of annual goal reached with units % of Goals * 20
< 40% MFI	0	# of rental units at < 40% MFI
< 50% MFI	82	# of rental units at < 50% MFI
District Goal	9.55%	% of annual goal reached with units
High Opportunity	19.69%	% of annual goal reached with units
Displacement Risk	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
High Frequency Transit	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
Imagine Austin	59.08%	% of annual goal reached with units
Geographic Dispersion Mobility Bond Corridor	27.00% 0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units % of annual goal reached with units
SCORE	17	% of Goals * 15
< 60% MFI	0	# of units for purchase at < 60% MFI
< 80% MFI	0	# of units for purchase at < 80% MFI
District Goal	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
High Opportunity	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
Displacement Risk	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
High Frequency Transit	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
Imagine Austin	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units
Geographic Dispersion Mobility Bond Corridor	0.00%	% of annual goal reached with units % of annual goal reached with units
Widdlitty Bolia Corridor	0.0076	
SCORE	0	
SCORE Unit Score	0 21	% of Goals * 15
SCORE Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES	0 21	
Unit Score		% of Goals * 15
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES	21	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food	4 1 Yes	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS)
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score	21 4 1 Yes 1	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units	4 1 Yes 1 45	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units	4 1 Yes 1 45	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, Emobility and sensory units
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, I mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Score Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 144 72 11 18 0 4	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, to mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Core Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4 Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, social units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4 Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, In mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessibile Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4 Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, social units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING	21 4 1 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, Is mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessibile Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4 Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, Enobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, Innobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per unit score	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, Envirolity and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessibile Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per unit score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$25,675.68	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, Emobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Amount of assistance per bedroom
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Score	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$525,675.68 22	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, In mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000 (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year 5)	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 144 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479,17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, to mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Core Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20M MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITION AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per unit score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year 5) Debt Coverage Ratio (Year 5)	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19 19.49842298	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4 Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, smobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Amount of assistance per doroom (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark Minimum = 1.0; Maximum = 1.5; 1.25 = best score
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Score Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per unit score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year 5) Debt Coverage Ratio Score Underwriting Score	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 144 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479,17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, to mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Core Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20M MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITION AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per unit score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year 5) Debt Coverage Ratio (Year 5)	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19 19.49842298 80	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4 Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, smobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Amount of assistance per doroom (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark Minimum = 1.0; Maximum = 1.5; 1.25 = best score
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score FEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per unit score AHFC Per Bedroom Score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year S) Debt Coverage Ratio Score Underwriting Score	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19 19.49842298 80	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, I mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Amount of assistance per bedroom (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark Minimum = 1.0; Maximum = 1.5; 1.25 = best score MAXIMUM SCORE = 100
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per unit score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year 5) Debt Coverage Ratio Score Underwriting Score Underwriting Score Underwriting Score Underwriting Score Underwriting Score Underwriting Score APPLICANT	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19 19.49842298 80	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, I mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Amount of assistance per bedroom (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark Minimum = 1.0; Maximum = 1.5; 1.25 = best score MAXIMUM SCORE = 100
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per unit score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year 5) Debt Coverage Ratio Score Underwriting Score APPLICANT FINAL QUANTITATIVE SCORE Previous Developments Compliance Score Proposal	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19 19.49842298 80	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, I mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Amount of assistance per bedroom (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark Minimum = 1.0; Maximum = 1.5; 1.25 = best score MAXIMUM SCORE = 100
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per unit score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year S) Debt Coverage Ratio Score Underwriting Score Underwriting Score APPLICANT FINAL QUANTITATIVE SCORE Previous Developments Compliance Score Proposal Supportive Services	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19 19.49842298 80	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, E mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Amount of assistance per bedroom (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark Minimum = 1.0; Maximum = 1.5; 1.25 = best score MAXIMUM SCORE = 100
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per unit score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year 5) Debt Coverage Ratio Score Underwriting Score Popticant FINAL QUANTITATIVE SCORE Previous Developments Compliance Score Proposal Supportive Services Development Team Development Team	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19 19.49842298 80	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, E mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Amount of assistance per bedroom (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark Minimum = 1.0; Maximum = 1.5; 1.25 = best score MAXIMUM SCORE = 100
Unit Score INITIATIVES AND PRIORITIES Continuum of Care Score Access to Healthy Food Continuum of Care Weighted Score 2 Bedroom Units 3 Bedroom Units 4 Bedroom Units Multi-Generational Housing Score TEA Grade Multi-Generational Housing Weighted Score Accessible Units Non-PSH, Non-Voucher Under 20% MFI Accessibility Score Metro Access Service Accessibility Weighted Score Initiatives and Priorities Score UNDERWRITING AHFC Leverage Leverage Score AHFC Per Unit Subsidy Subsidy per unit score AHFC Per Bedroom Subsidy Subsidy per Bedroom Score Debt Coverage Ratio (Year S) Debt Coverage Ratio Score Underwriting Score Underwriting Score APPLICANT FINAL QUANTITATIVE SCORE Previous Developments Compliance Score Proposal Supportive Services	21 4 1 Yes 1 45 22 0 14 72 11 18 0 4 Yes 2 33 22% 20 \$49,479.17 19 \$25,675.68 22 1.19 19.49842298 80	% of Goals * 15 MAXIMUM SCORE = 350 Total # of units provided up to 100 per year (total CoC Units/100 + HF Units/50)*20 Within 1 Mile of Healthy Food (City GIS) Mobility, Access to Jobs, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion Total Affordable 2 Bedroom units Total Affordable 3 Bedroom units Total Affordable 4+ Bedroom units Multi-bedroom Unit/Total Units * 20 Elementary School Rating from TEA Educational Attainment, Environment, Community Institutions, Social Cohesion, E mobility and sensory units Total units under 20% MFI Accessible Unit/Total Units * 20 Within 3/4 mile of fixed route transit Housing Stability, Health, Mobility, Community Institutions MAXIMUM SCORE = 200 % of total project cost funded through AHFC request 25 - (% leverage * 25) Amount of assistance per unit (\$200,000 - per unit subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Amount of assistance per bedroom (\$200,000 - per bedroom subsidy)*25/\$200,000 Measured at the 5 Year mark Minimum = 1.0; Maximum = 1.5; 1.25 = best score MAXIMUM SCORE = 100

Introduction

Foundation Communities (FC) is a nationally recognized nonprofit founded in 1990 with a mission to provide quality affordable housing and supportive services to low-income families and individuals. FC over 25 years of experience creating housing where individuals and families succeed. Our vision for strong families and communities involves more than just providing a roof over peoples' heads. By combining affordable housing and free on-site services, we empower low-income residents with the tools they need to achieve long-term stability and self-sufficiency. FC focuses on four main areas:

- Opening Doors to Homes: We own and manage over 3,300 apartments across 20 properties in
 Austin and 3 in the North Texas. Over 6,000 residents call our communities home. We are the
 life-time owner, developer, property manager, and services provider to our Austin portfolio. We
 invest upfront in high quality design, materials, green building strategies for our new properties
 and invest heavily in capital repairs, maintenance, and green upgrades at our older properties.
- Healthy Communities: All FC residents have access to health amenities and resources including fitness, cooking and nutrition, food pantries, gardens, and disease management/prevention services. We have 727 permanent supportive housing apartments where single adults who have chronic health problems and disabilities, have been homeless, or survive on fixed incomes receive intensive case management. To support families coming out of homelessness, we created the Children's HOME Initiative (CHI). These 142 units, integrated throughout our family properties, provide reduced rents and case management to help families move from crisis to long-term stability.
- Learning in a Community: On-site Learning Centers give 1,000 children of working parents academic and enrichment support, including the Green and Healthy Kids program. 85% of students maintain or improve their grades in our free out-of-school time programs. Adult education is also a priority and includes job and computer skills, English as a Second Language, and digital and financial literacy. College Hub deepens FC's decade-long commitment to serving non-traditional students, providing intensive support and academic opportunities for low income and first generation college students.
- Financial Stability: Financial Centers provide free tax preparation to 30,000+ low-income individuals each year with the help of 750 volunteers. Annual refunds amount to more than \$40 million, and can equal 25% of a family's annual income. Each year, more than 600 families become smart consumers through financial coaching; at least 50% reduce their debt. Matched savings plans assist families to purchase a home, attend college, or start a business. We assist more than 1,000 students with FAFSA preparation, and help low-income students access nearly \$4 million in Pell grants and scholarships. Finally, by leveraging our certified volunteers, we enroll 5,000+ individuals in health insurance each season.

See attached for a summary of our Austin Portfolio.

Certification of Status

See attached




Office of the Secretary of State

Certificate of Fact

The undersigned, as Secretary of State of Texas, does hereby certify that the document, Articles Of Incorporation for FOUNDATION COMMUNITIES, INC. (file number 114499001), a Domestic Nonprofit Corporation, was filed in this office on March 05, 1990.

It is further certified that the entity status in Texas is in existence.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto signed my name officially and caused to be impressed hereon the Seal of State at my office in Austin, Texas on February 01, 2019.



Phone: (512) 463-5555

Prepared by: SOS-WEB

David Whitley Secretary of State

ax. (312) 463-37 TID: 10264

Applicant Capacity

Walter Moreau, Executive Director. During his 25-year career, Walter has secured subsidy financing of more than \$350 million to create more than 3,300 units of service-enriched, nonprofit-owned affordable housing, and 13 onsite learning centers. Moreau was recognized as a 2007 James A. Johnson Community Fellow by the Fannie Mae Foundation. He was also awarded the 2005 Social Entrepreneur of the Year Award and the 2004 Texas Houser Award. He holds a Master's degree from UT's LBJ School of Public Affairs. He has been with Foundation Communities for more than 20 years.

Sabrina Butler, Director of Real Estate Development, oversees FC's overall real estate development portfolio with a particular focus on new development opportunities and identification/packaging of subsidy and conventional financing for multi-family housing. Packaging includes running project proformas, applying for the funding, bidding out equity/mortgages, coordinating closings, and ensuring compliance with construction-related funding provisions. Sabrina joined Foundation Communities in 2017 with nearly 15 years of experience in nonprofit affordable housing and community development finance. Sabrina has a Masters in Regional Planning.

Megan Matthews, Director of Design, and licensed Architect in the State of Texas, oversees the programming, design, and construction management of all development projects. She focuses on green building and sustainability issues while seeking out the best design solutions for the end users. Before joining the Foundation Communities team, Megan worked for the architectural firm responsible for the design of M Station, Homestead Oaks, Lakeline Station, Cardinal Point, and The Jordan at Mueller and was on the design team for four of those communities. Megan coordinates the RFQ and bid processes for the architect, engineers, and general contractor and is the direct link between the third party design and construction professionals and FC's Development team. Megan has a Bachelor of Architecture degree from The University of Texas at Austin.

Tillie Croxdale, Real Estate Project Manager, underwrites all new development proposals and manages initial site analysis and due diligence. Tillie also assists the Director of Housing Finance with all phases of each capital funding stack including preparation of funding applications (including LIHTC applications), solicitation of mortgage and equity financing and coordination of financing closings. Tillie has a Bachelor in Architecture, a Master in Real Estate Finance and nine years' experience in the affordable housing field.

Anna Lake-Smith, Development Project Manager, works with the Development team to take projects through feasibility, design, and construction, including coordinating with the Sustainability, Property, and Asset Management teams. Anna brings a wide range of design experience, from residential interiors to citywide planning strategies. Anna holds a dual MS in Urban Design and MS in Community/Regional Planning from The University of Texas at Austin, and a Bachelor of Arts in Architecture from Wellesley College.

Applicant Experience

Project management: Megan Matthews oversees the design and construction of our communities, and coordinates the RFQ and bid process for the architect, engineers, and general contractor. She also acts as the direct link between the third party design and construction professionals and FC's Development team. She oversaw the construction of Cardinal Point and Garden terrace Phase III last year and is currently overseeing the construction of The Jordan at Mueller and the design of Waterloo Terrace

Market Analysis: Foundation Communities typically engages a third party firm to conduct market studies for each of our proposed projects. The market study is ordered in the contract feasibility period. Sabrina Butler receives bids and engages each project's market analyst.

Site selection and Control: Walter Moreau has over 20 years of site selection experience. Sites are selected based on a variety of factors including current funding priorities, cost of land, preservation of affordable housing opportunities, and availability of sites in close proximity to existing FC properties. FC contracts with a private, third party land broker to find sites add negotiate with sellers. Sabrina Butler works with the title company to ensure all requirements are met on the buyer side and oversees the closing on behalf of Foundation Communities.

Planning and Construction: Foundation Communities contracts with third-party general contractors and has been privileged to work with a number of quality ones. FC invites those firms to bid on all projects developed by Foundation Communities (in addition to other firms who might be interested). FC has an excellent working relationship and with several general contractors.

Design, Architecture and Engineering: Megan Matthews oversees the hiring of the design and engineering team. Typically, Megan issues an RFQ to an invited list of bidders (open to all interested parties.) The list is narrowed down based on responses and then the FC development team including Walter, Sabrina and Megan meet the finalists and make a selection based on presentations. FC has an excellent working relationship with several architectural firms and civil engineers.

Legal and Accounting: All accounting is performed in-house by an accounting team led by Ann Clift, CFO. Tax returns, audits and cost certifications for tax credit properties are contracted out to Novogradac and Company, LLC. FC has engages a third party attorney

Federal Funding Rules: FC has extensive experience working with programs funded by HUD and their associated federal regulations including: Federal Labor Standards, Davis Bacon Reporting, Section 3, Affirmative Marketing, Environmental Clearances, Public Notices and Procurement Standards.

Other Funding Source Rules: FC has a great track record for using multiple funding sources on each projects. Funding stacks often include state funds, FLHB, grants, and private fundraising.

Statement of Confidence

Foundation Communities owns 3 properties in North Texas and contracts with a 3rd party property management company to oversee the day-to day operations. Because we have extensive experience in Austin, staff advised us that Statement of Confidence from other jurisdictions is not necessary.

IRS Certification of Non-profit Status

See attached

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE DISTRICT DIRECTOR 1100 COMMERCE STREET DALLAS, TX 75242-0000

Date:

JUN 0 6 1995

CENTRAL TEXAS MUTUAL HOUSING ASSOCIATION C/O CINDY CHRISTIANSEN 2512 S IH 35 STE 350 AUSTIN, TX 78704-5751 Employer Identification Number: 74-2563260

Case Number:

755122043 Contact Person:

ANNETTE SMITH

Contact Telephone Number:

(214) 767-6023

Our Letter Dated: May 23, 1990

Addendum Applies:

No

Dear Applicant:

This modifies our letter of the above date in which we stated that you would be treated as an organization that is not a private foundation until the expiration of your advance ruling period.

Your exempt status under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) is still in effect. Based on the information you submitted, we have determined that you are not a private foundation within the meaning of section 509(a) of the Code because you are an organization of the type described in section 509(a)(2).

Grantors and contributors may rely on this determination unless the Internal Revenue Service publishes notice to the contrary. However, if you lose your section 509(a)(2) status, a grantor or contributor may not rely on this determination if he or she was in part responsible for, or was aware of, the act or failure to act, or the substantial or material change on the part of the organization that resulted in your loss of such status, or if he or she acquired knowledge that the Internal Revenue Service had given notice that you would no longer be classified as a section 509(a)(2) organization.

If we have indicated in the heading of this letter that an addendum applies, the addendum enclosed is an integral part of this letter.

Because this letter could help resolve any questions about your private foundation status, please keep it in your permanent records.

If you have any questions, please contact the person whose name and telephone number are shown above.

Sincerely yours,

Bobby E. Scott District Director

Board Resolution

See attached

SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE OF ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF FOUNDATION COMMUNITIES

I, David Hart, certify that I am the duly qualified and acting Secretary of the Board of FOUNDATION COMMUNITIES, INC., a duly organized and existing Texas non-profit corporation (the "Corporation").

I do hereby certify that said Corporation is duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas; that all franchise and other taxes required to maintain its corporate existence have been paid when due and no such taxes are delinquent; that no proceedings are pending for the forfeiture of its Certificate of Formation or for its dissolution; that it is duly qualified to do business in the State of Texas and is in good standing in such state; and that there is no provision of the Certificate of Formation or Bylaws of said Corporation limiting the power of the Board of Directors to pass the resolutions set out below and that the same are in conformity with the provisions of said Certificate of Formation and Bylaws.

Attached as Exhibit "A" is a true and correct copy of the resolutions adopted by unanimous consent of the Board of Directors of the Corporation at our legally held meeting on April 2, 2019.

ADOPTED this <u>89</u> day of <u>April</u>, 2019.

DAVID HART, Secretary Foundation Communities

Board of Directors

EXHIBIT A

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF FOUNDATION COMMUNITIES, INC.

[to be attached]

RESOLUTION BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF Foundation Communities, Inc. Foundation Village

WHEREAS, Foundation Communities, Inc., a non-profit Community Housing Development Organization (the "Corporation"), has determined that the actions set out in the following resolutions reasonably may be expected to benefit, directly or indirectly, the Corporation;

RESOLVED, that the Corporation apply for a loan for acquisition, predevelopment costs, and/or construction costs, from the Austin Housing Finance Corporation in Rental Housing Development Assistance Funding (the "Loan") for a proposed affordable housing, rental community to be constructed at 13653 Rutledge Spur, Austin, TX 78717 (the "Property", as further described on Exhibit A attached hereto);

RESOLVED, that either WALTER MOREAU, as Executive Director of the Corporation (the "ED") or Julian Huerta, as Deputy Executive Director (the "DED") may in his/her sole discretion execute all documents to effectuate the Loan;

RESOLVED, that whether concurrently with or after Closing, the Corporation secure up to \$8,500,000 of loan funds from the Austin Housing Finance Corporation (the "Lender") and pledge the Property and other related assets as collateral therefore, all on such terms and conditions as the ED or DED of the Corporation may in his/her sole discretion, deem necessary or desirable, and that the Corporation execute any and all pertinent loan documents required by Lender in connection therewith, confirming and ratifying its liability under said loan, all on such terms and conditions as the ED or DED of the Corporation may, in his/her sole discretion, deem necessary or desirable;

RESOLVED, that the grant by the Corporation of liens on the Property described above may also secure any and all other indebtedness now or hereafter owing to Lender;

RESOLVED, that the Corporation act in the future to take any and all actions necessary to renew, extend or otherwise modify the terms of the above referenced loan and any other loan from Lender, all on such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the ED or DED of the Corporation may in his/her sole discretion, deem necessary or advisable;

RESOLVED, that the ED or the DED of the Corporation be, and he/she is hereby, authorized, empowered, and directed to execute, acknowledge, and deliver, for and on behalf and in the name of the Corporation, such loan applications, assumption agreements, affidavits, assignments, bills of sale, promissory notes, deeds of trust, financing statements, security agreements, guaranties, pledges, loan documents and other instruments, containing such terms and conditions as the ED or the DED may in his/her sole discretion, deem necessary or desirable, and that the attestation by the Secretary of the Corporation and the affixation of the seal of the Corporation shall not be necessary;

RESOLVED, that the Corporation may transfer the Property to a limited partnership affiliated with the Corporation in the event that the ED or the DED of the Corporation determines, in his/her sole discretion, that such a transfer is necessary or desirable;

RESOLVED, that the ED or the DED of the Corporation be, and he/she is hereby, authorized, empowered, and directed to execute, acknowledge, and deliver, for and on behalf and in the name of the Corporation, such deeds, bills of sale and other instruments, containing such terms and

conditions as the ED or the DED may in his/her sole discretion, deem necessary or desirable, and that the attestation by the Secretary of the Corporation and the affixation of the seal of the Corporation shall not be necessary;

RESOLVED, that any instruments executed in connection with the above described transactions may contain such effective dates, whether prior to or after the date of adoption of these resolutions as set forth below, as the ED or the DED of the Corporation may in his/her sole discretion, deem necessary or advisable; and

RESOLVED, that any and all transactions by any of the officers or representatives of the Corporation with Lender and Seller prior to the adoption of these resolutions be, and they are hereby, ratified and approved for all purposes.

Adopted and approved by the Board of Directors on the Alm day of April 2019.

FOUNDATION COMMUNITIES, INC.

Michelle Wallis, Chair

Board of Directors of Foundation Communities, Inc.

EXHIBIT A

Legal Description of Property

Lot 7, Frank Stark Subdivision, a subdivision in Travis County, Texas, according to the map or plat thereof, recorded in Volume 4, Page 199, Plat Records of Travis County, Texas.

2 – DEVELOPMENT TEAM

Team Information

Role	Info	Contact	MBE	WBE	NP
Owner	FC N Lamar Housing, LP 3036 S. 1st Street Austin, TX 78704	Walter Moreau, Executive Director (512) 610-4016 walter.moreau@foundcom.org			
Developer	Foundation Communities, Inc. 3036 S. 1st Street Austin, TX 78704	Walter Moreau, Executive Director (512) 610-4016 walter.moreau@foundcom.org			Х
Architect	Hatch + Ulland Owen Architects 1010 East 11th Street Austin, Texas 78702	Tom Hatch, Partner (512) 474-8548 tomhatch@huoarchitects.com			
Engineer	Civilitude 1210 Rosewood Ave Austin, Texas, 78702	Fayez Kazi, President (512) 761-6161 fayez@civilitude.com	Х		
Attorney	Rigby Slack Lawrence & Comerford, PLLC 6836 Austin Center Blvd., Suite 100 Austin, Texas 78731	Cathleen Slack, Partner (512) 782-2060 cslack@rigbyslack.com			
Accountant	Novogradac & Company LLC 11044 research Blvd Suite C400 Austin, TX 78759	George Littlejohn (512)3449-3211 George.littlejohn@novoco.com			
General Contractor	TBD				
Construction Lender	TBD				
Lenders	TBD				
Tax Credit Consultant	Betco Housing Lab 812 San Antonio, Suite L-14 Austin, Texas 78701	Lora Myrick, Principal (512) 785-3710 lora@betcohousinglab.com		Х	
Property Manager	Foundation Communities, Inc. 3036 S. 1st Street Austin, TX 78704	Walter Moreau, Executive Director (512) 610-4016 walter.moreau@foundcom.org			Х
Supportive Services	Foundation Communities, Inc. 3036 S. 1st Street Austin, TX 78704	Walter Moreau, Executive Director (512) 610-4016 walter.moreau@foundcom.org			Х

2 – DEVELOPMENT TEAM

Experience

Foundation Communities has over 25 years of experience contracting for and overseeing the construction and rehabilitation of affordable housing. Nine of our existing communities were new construction projects financed with tax credits with one community under construction opening in summer of 2019 and another in permitting opening summer of 2010. The remaining fourteen communities in our portfolio were purchased as existing properties and greatly improved with renovations, green spaces and playscapes, learning centers, landscaping, signage, lighting and green building features (solar panels and rain water harvesting). We have experience with the design and construction of structures that are zero lot VMU, 4-story elevator, 3-story walk up, and renovations of apartment complexes, hotels, nursing homes, and duplexes. We have a great track record of gaining neighborhood support, zoning changes, completing construction within tax credit deadlines, and achieving green certifications with AEGB, LEED, and Enterprise Green Communities.

Hatch + Ulland Owen Architects is an Austin based architectural firm focused on sustainable and socially-responsible design. Foundation Communities was been working with them for over a decade and has contracted with them to design 5 of our recent developments: M Station, Homestead Oaks, Lakeline Station, Cardinal Point, and the Jordan at Mueller. They are experienced with our model of housing plus services, commitment to sustainable building, tax credit requirements and deadlines, and city of Austin permitting, and design requirements. Founded in 1978, they have a wealth of experience with commercial and residential design, including 65 Whole Foods Markets across the country and the downtown headquarters; Threadgill's; Thundercloud Subs; Twin Oaks Branch Library; McKinney Roughs Nature Park; Mueller community homes, and most recently Antone's.

Civilitude Over the last nine years, Civilitude has provided design surveying, civil engineering, and/or construction services at 14 Foundation Communities properties, four GNDC properties, 2 LifeWorks properties, 1 Green Doors property and 1 AHA property in partnership with HACA. Their experience with TDHCA tax credit and City GO Bond funded projects, centrally located office, integrated design approach and success with permitting site plans, and exemptions through the City of Austin uniquely position Civilitude to continue to serve the vulnerable population in the Austin community.

Rigby Slack Lawrence + Comerford, PLLC is an Austin-based law firm with a focus on real estate acquisition, development, leasing, and financing. Founding partner Cathleen Slack and her team have enjoyed assisting Foundation Communities with the acquisition of real estate and development for several projects, as well as acquisition and construction financing. The firm also provides over thirty years of combined experience navigating title and survey matters for Foundation Communities.

Betco Housing Lab is a full service housing development consulting firm, established in 2011. The firm specializes in the securing of funds for the development of affordable housing via programs such as Housing Tax Credits (9% and 4%), HOME, Federal Home Loan Bank and other public funds. They have applied for and received awards throughout the state of Texas and in all metropolitan cities, such as Dallas, Houston, Ft.Worth, and San Antonio. BETCO has eight properties in its portfolio where it is the managing member or HUB partner in the General Partner.

3 - PROPERTY MANAGEMENT TEAM

Experience

Foundation Communities performs all leasing, maintenance, accounting, compliance and other property management functions for its 20 Austin properties. Foundation Communities earns property management and asset management fees that help support the overall nonprofit mission. The success of Foundation Communities' property management is demonstrated through its low vacancy (2% in 2018), high rent collection (99% in 2018), ability to keep all properties consistently performing within their operating budgets, completion of capital repairs of over \$535/unit, and a relatively high percentage of move outs going to homeownership (20% in 2017).

FC monitors portfolio health, tracks each project monthly, compares actual performance to budget assumptions, and aggregates detailed performance metrics at the portfolio level for review by the CFO. All projects are producing their targeted cash flow and reserves established by the Board. FC has a well-funded Central Reserve and robust Asset Management program to keep properties in good condition and eliminate unforeseen capital/repair expenses that would undermine FC's organizational and financial strength. Below are the resumes of our key property management personnel.

Vicki McDonald, Director of Real Estate Operations, oversees the income and assets of the FC portfolio. She has over 30 years of experience in owning and managing multifamily, office and retail developments. For 25 years, she owned and operated Vista Properties, a real estate firm specializing in the management, leasing and brokerage of income producing assets. Vicki is the link between the development team and property management as well as filling in on project management as the pipeline demands.

Desiree Golden, Director of Family Property Management, oversees 17 family properties within the FC portfolio as well as the Compliance Department. She works closely with District Managers on day to day operations along with evaluating the ongoing financial performance of each property. Desiree has over 29 years of experience in Property Management (10 years with FC) and has her CAM and CAPS designations from NAA.

Valicia Nichols, Director of Compliance, is well-versed in guidelines and regulations for FC's compliance programs, such as Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), HOME, HUD Section 8 Voucher, Housing Trust Fund, Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP), Section 811 and older programs, e.g., Affordable Housing Program (AHP). She maintains FC's good standing with compliance agencies, e.g., TDHCA (state); City of Austin; Federal Home Loan Banks of Atlanta, Dallas and San Francisco; and syndicators such as Wells Fargo, Bank of America, and Enterprise.

3 - PROPERTY MANAGEMENT TEAM

Compliance Reports

See attached

November 8, 2016

Akilah Huang Property Manager Spring Terrace 7101 N. IH-35 Austin, TX 78752

Re.:

2015 Rental Housing Development Assistance (RHDA) Monitoring Spring Terrace Apartments, 7101 N. IH-35, Austin, TX 78752

Dear Ms. Huang:

On August 17, 2016, Neighborhood Housing and Community Development (NHCD) conducted an on-site review of records for the above referenced location(s) and a physical inspection of selected units. The purpose of the monitoring was to ensure compliance with local and federal regulatory requirements set forth in the RHDA loan agreements with the Austin Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC).

The following items were reviewed during the NHCD monitoring review:

- Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan;
- Tenant selection criteria and policy;
- Annual audited financial report (2015) including management letter;
- Fair Housing logo on forms, flyers, and documents available to clients;
- Waiting Lists and Wait List Policy;
- Review of randomly selected resident files for income eligibility / recertification;
- Review of randomly selected resident files for adherence to policies;
- Insurance coverage; and
- Physical Inspections.

The above referenced project is compliant with the terms of the RHDA Loan Agreement with AHFC.

All units subject to the physical inspection conducted by TDHCA are compliant.

The following items are **CONCERNS**. **Concerns** are less serious conditions that if not addressed and if allowed to persist, may result in more extensive or frequent monitoring or elevate to a **finding**, if warranted. These conditions must be addressed as soon as possible.

 Community Rules – Inconsistency in the "Weapons" and "Carrying Handguns Onsite" policies within the document. Please revise these paragraphs and submit for review. Revised "Community Rules" received. No further action required.

Spring Terrace, Results Cont.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at 512-974-3110 or Susan.Kinel@austintexas.gov.

Regards,

Susan Kinel

Sr. Contract Compliance Specialist

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development

XC:

Tracy Moczygemba, Foundation Communities

Chase Clements, NHCD

4 – PROJECT PROPOSAL

Project Description

As the name implies, Lakeline Station Phase 2 is the second phase of Lakeline Station Apartments which opened in the fall of 2016. The original Lakeline Station, or Phase 1, was a newly constructed 4-story elevator community with 128 units. The site includes a state-of the art learning center, 2 playgrounds, a large playfield, basketball court, bbq grills, picnic tables, as well as offices for property managements, leasing, and support services. This community is in high demand with a full wait list. The location continues to be ideal for families as it is high opportunity, close to jobs, retail, and good schools.

Phase 2 will be the new construction of an estimated 120 units (subject to change as we work through design process) of affordable housing that will build on Foundation Communities' successful housing-plusservices model, proven so effective for families and individuals with low-incomes and housing instability. Phase 2 will share the learning center that is located in Phase 1, which is one of FC's larger learning centers and has additional capacity to serve more students. Although located on the same block, one parcel separates Phase 1 and Phase 2; a 3rd party has plans to develop it as a Turkish Cultural Center. We have been in communication with the owners and are hoping to work with them on a pathway between Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 2 will include its own playgrounds, sport court, bbq grills and picnic tables, and offices for property management, leasing, and support services.

 Describe the proposed tenant population, income levels, and services, if any, to be provided to or made available to residents.

Lakeline Station Phase 2 will serve low-income families with children. We are reserving 10% for families with incomes below 30% AMFI, 47% for families below 50% AMFI, and the remaining 43% for families below 60% AMFI. We will house -+/- 120 families at any given time and anticipate housing 40-60 school age kids. Every resident will have access to foundation communities' programs and services explained in General Services section.

- Indicate the number of units reserved for Housing Choice Voucher holders (Section 8).
 - Section 8 vouchers will be accepted at Lakeline Station Phase 2.
- Indicate the number of units that are or will be made accessible and adaptable for persons with mobility, sight or hearing disabilities.
 - 10% of the total units will be made accessible for persons with mobility impairments using Section 504 and Fair Housing Accessibility as guidelines. 2% of total units will be made accessible for persons with hearing and visual impairments. In addition, all ground floor units will be made adaptable to persons with mobility disabilities.
- If applicable, demonstrate the Project's compatibility with current Neighborhood Plan.
 - The site is not located within a City of Austin Neighborhood Planning Area.
- Summarize the key financials of the project, clearly indicating the total project cost, the amount
 and intended use of AHFC/NHCD funds being requested, and the amount(s) and provider(s) of
 other funding and the status of those funding commitments.

The total cost to construct Lakeline Station Phase 2 is approximately \$30,542,858. The currently anticipated sources of funds for this project include:

City of Austin, in the amount of \$8,500,000 in RHDA funds requested under the current application. This current request will be used for predevelopment, acquisition, and construction costs. We request these funds from the City to be in the form of a deferred forgivable loan with a loan term of 40 years.

Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), in the amount of approximately \$8,606,203 from 4% housing tax credits.

Mortgage – Foundation Communities is anticipating a permanent loan of \$9,324,801. FC has excellent relationships with several lenders that allow for competitive rates and pricing.

Deferred Developer Fee – Foundation Communities will defer \$1,500,000 in developer fee.

Sponsor Loan – Foundation Communities will commit an additional \$611,854 of its own funding as a placeholder for private fundraising that will be pursued as the project is developed. The FC funds will be structured as a loan that is cash flow contingent once the property is operational.

Multifamily Direct Loan Fund (MFDL) from the State, likely sourced by federal National Housing Trust Fund dollars, in the amount of \$2,000,000. The loan structure is expected to be deferred payable, with a 35 - 40 year term.

If the property is occupied by residents at the time of application submission, specify that along
with the following additional information: Include details on the type of structure (multi-family or
single-family), number and size of units in square feet.

The property is currently occupied by 1 commercial tenant and no residential tenants.

Indicate whether the project meets the requirements of the City's Vertical Mixed-Use (VMU)
 Ordinance, or is in a Planned-Unit Development (PUD) or Transit Oriented Development (TOD) or any other City of Austin density bonus program.

This site is not located within a PUD, TOD, VMU zoning area, or density bonus area.

Indicate how the project will meet S.M.A.R.T. Housing requirements.

A S.M.A.R.T. Housing application was submitted to the City of Austin demonstrating that the project meets SMART housing requirements. The site is located within 1/4 mile of a bus stop, not located within a floodplain, and not located in close proximity to a pipeline or former landfill. Although the site is located adjacent to a rail line, it is within a railway quiet zone and the design team will mitigate for noise. And of course the project will provide reasonably priced rental units for more than 5 years, and will be designed to meet accessibility and visitability requirements and AEGB standard rating.

For the purposes of this report, the subject's primary market area is generally defined as that area contained within census tracts 48491020311, 48491020318, 48491020403, 48491020404, 48491020405, 48491020406, 48491020408, 48491020409, 48491020410, 48491020511, 48491020503, 48491020506, 48491020507, 48491020508, 48491020509, 48491020510.

<u>iii. Quantify the pool of eligible tenants</u> or buyers in terms of household size, age, income, tenure, and other relevant factors.

See below for household data from 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

A - % Eligible Households (incomes \$15,000 - \$59,9999)	31.76%
B - % Renters	42.24%
C - % Eligible Tenant (A x B)	13.42%
D - Total Households in PMA	35,921
E - Eligible Tenants in PMA (C x D)	4,819

<u>iv. Analyze the competition by</u> evaluating other housing opportunities with an emphasis on other affordable rental developments or sales opportunities in the market. Identify comparable units based on location, year of construction, target population, property condition, unit mix, unit amenities, and occupancy and turnover.

See attached for 3 comps on tax credit developments close to Lakeline Phase II, one of which is the original Lakeline Station. All have waiting lists and comparable amenities, demonstrating a continued need for affordable housing in the area.

v. Assess the market demand for the planned units and determine if there is sufficient demand to rent/sell the units.

FC maintains waiting lists at all their properties, which is capped at 30 names, and maintains a portfolio wide average occupancy of 99%. FC's most recent HTC lease-ups in Austin have averaged three to five months, indicating very strong demand and ready absorption.

More importantly, the City of Austin's Affordable Housing Blueprint estimates that there is a need for the construction of 135,000 additional housing units in the City of Austin over the next decade, 60,000 of which should be affordable to households with incomes below 80% of MFI.

<u>vi. Evaluate the effective demand and the capture rate, usually expressed as a percentage (the project's units divided by the applicant pool).</u> The capture rate is the percentage of likely eligible and interested households living nearby who will need to rent units in the proposed project in order to fully occupy it. The lower this rate, the more likely a project is to succeed.

Eligible tenants in PMA	4,819
Total Proposed Units	120
Capture Rate	2.5%

<u>vii.</u> Estimate the absorption period. Plan how many units can be successfully leased or sold each month and how long it will take to achieve initial occupancy/sale of the units and stabilized occupancy for the project as a whole. Absorption should be calculated using comparable units only.

See below for a summary of Foundation Communities' recent lease-ups. We anticipate Lakeline Phase II to lease-up within 5 months.

- Cardinal Point completed in 2017 leased up 120 units in 5 months
- Bluebonnet completed in 2016 leased up 107 units in 3 months
- Lakeline Station completed in 2016 and leased up 128 units in 5 months
- Live Oak Trails completed in 2016 leased up 58 units in 3 months
- Homestead Oaks completed in December 2015 leased up 140 units in 3 months



Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Department

April 22, 2019

S.M.A.R.T. Housing Certification-Foundation Communities, Inc. –Lakeline Station Phase II – Project ID 648

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Foundation Communities, Inc. (development contact: Walter Moraeu: 512-610-4016; walter.moreau@foundcom.org) is planning to develop Lakeline Station Phase II, a 140_unit multi-family development at 13653 Rutledge Spur, Austin TX 78717. The project is subject to a 5 year affordability period after issuance of certificate of occupancy, unless project funding requirements are longer.

The applicant has submitted evidence that they have reached out to Davis Spring Homeowner's Association President but have yet to receive a response back. Foundation Communities is committed to working with the neighborhood and will address any concerns that may come up.

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development (NHCD) certifies the proposed project meets the S.M.A.R.T. Housing standards at the pre-submittal stage. Since 100% of the units will serve households at or below 60% MFI, the development will be eligible for 100% waiver of fees listed in Land Development Code, Chapter 25-1-704, as amended or other fees waived under a separate ordinance. The unit mix is as follows: 10% of the units (14 units) will serve households at or below 30% Median Family Income (MFI); 30% of the units (14 units) will serve households at or below 50% Median Family Income (MFI); and 60% of the units (184 units) will serve households at or below 60% Median Family Income (MFI). The expected fee waivers include, but are not limited to, the following fees:

AWU Capital Recovery

Fees

Building Permit Concrete Permit Electrical Permit

Mechanical Permit

Plumbing Permit

Site Plan Review Misc. Site Plan Fee Construction Inspection Subdivision Plan Review

Misc. Subdivision Fee

Zoning Verification

Land Status Determination
Building Plan Review
Parkland Dedication (by
separate ordinance)

Prior to issuance of building permits and starting construction, the developer must:

- Obtain a signed Conditional Approval from the Austin Energy Green Building Program stating that the plans and specifications for the proposed development meet the criteria for a Green Building Rating. (Contact Austin Energy Green Building: 512-482-5300 or greenbuilding@austinenergy.com).
- Submit plans demonstrating compliance with the required accessibility or visitability standards.

Before a Certificate of Occupancy will be granted, the development must:

- Pass a final inspection and obtain a signed Final Approval from the Green Building Program. (Separate from any other inspections required by the City of Austin or Austin Energy).
- Pass a final inspection to certify that the required accessibility or visitability standards have been met.
- An administrative hold will be placed on the building permit, until the following items have been completed: 1) the number of affordable units have been finalized and evidenced through a sealed letter from project architect and/or engineer, 2) a Restrictive Covenant stating the affordability requirements and terms has been filed for record at the Travis County Clerk Office.

The applicant must demonstrate compliance with S.M.A.R.T. Housing standards after the after the certificate of occupancy has been issued or repay the City of Austin, in full, the fees waived for this S.M.A.R.T. Housing certification.

Please contact me by phone 512.974.3128 or by email at Sandra.harkins@austintexas.gov if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Sandra Harkins, Project Coordinator

Neighborhood Housing and Community Development

Cc:

Rosa Gonzales, AE Mashell Smith, ORS

Ellis Morgan, NHCD

Jonathan Orenstein, AWU

4 – PROJECT PROPOSAL

MOU With ECHO

Lakeline Station Phase 2 is not at this time committing COC units.

4 – PROJECT PROPOSAL

General Services

A description of the services to be provided to residents and/or clients.

Foundation Communities will provide free, supportive service programs that will educate, support and improve health and financial standing for residents. Supportive Service programs to be offered ON-SITE at Phase 1 or Phase 2 include:

- Free Afterschool and Summer Program All children living on-site will have access to Foundation Communities' free afterschool and summer programs, which offer academic assistance, enrichment activities, fitness activities, nutrition lessons, and support services. We provide a structured, supervised environment with rewarding, hands-on educational, cultural, artistic, and recreational activities for youth ages 5-14 designed to develop important social skills and improve educational performance. FC maintains a strong relationship with nearby schools and partners with teachers to help each child succeed. We also provide free, nutritious snacks and lunches during the summer.
- Children's Home Initiative 10% of units will be set-aside for families making less than 30% of AMFI and will receive services through the Children's HOME Initiative (CHI) Program, an established FC program model that has been serving homeless families across Austin since 2003. These families are typically the most vulnerable and have an array of barriers to becoming and remaining stably housed, such as evictions and broken leases, negative credit histories, and limited income. By participating in the CHI program, these families have access to an on-site Case Manager on a weekly basis, for a 24-month period. In one-on-one sessions with the CHI Case Manager, that are both intensive and comprehensive, families will self-determine their path forward and establish unique goals and action steps toward improving their sustainability. Furthermore, each family will have access to a Career Case Manager, Parent Empowerment Specialist, and Financial Stability Advisor—all full-time positions dedicated to the CHI program. Even after the 24-month period of intensive engagement, these households will continue to have access to support services at the property on an as-needed basis to ensure ongoing stability and success.
- Adult Classes Foundation Communities believes it is important to offer "at your door" education
 opportunities to adults, especially families that may have limited access to child care outside of
 work hours that would allow for attendance at off-site programs. Actual offerings will depend on
 resident needs but may include classes in English as a Second Language, computer skills, and
 Financial Literacy.
- **Health Initiatives** A variety of programming focused on health and wellness will be offered, and tailored to the specific needs of the target population and residents. This will include access to healthy food through an on-site food pantry, healthy cooking classes, Zumba and other exercise classes, and periodic health fairs that bring a variety of providers on-site for health screenings, immunizations, and similar services.

Foundation Communities offers the following free off-site services to residents and the community at our Community Financial Centers located in North Austin at 5900 Airport Blvd and South Austin at 2600 W Stassney.

- Financial Coaching Residents will have the opportunity to meet individually with a trained volunteer on a variety of personal finance issues which may include a credit report review, creating a credit repair plan or a debt reduction plan, establishing a household budget, establishing a Safety Net Savings Account, exploring ways to reduce expenses, or setting financial goals. Financial Coaching sessions may be a single one hour session up to eight hours of individual sessions, depending on the situation.
- College Savings Trained staff are available at the Community Tax Centers and financial aid events to help students complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) to obtain grants and loans for college. We also conduct scholarship workshops and have one-to-one scholarship mentoring.
- Tax preparation Residents will be able to get their taxes prepared for free at our Community Financial Centers (CFCs). Our IRS-trained and certified volunteers prepare over 20,000 tax returns annually and ensure that clients who are eligible for credits such as the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and the Child Tax Credit (CTC) receive those benefits. The refunds for the tax returns we prepare put more than \$35 million back into the economy.

4 - PROJECT PROPOSAL

General Services

The number and types of residents/clients expected to be served annually.

Lakeline Station Phase 2 will house +/- 120 families at any given time and we anticipate serving and additional 40-60 school age kids at our learning center located at the original Lakeline Station Apartments . We are reserving 10% for families with incomes below 30% AMFI, 47% for families below 50% AMFI, and the remaining 43% for families below 60% AMFI.

4 – PROJECT PROPOSAL

General Services

Developer's experience and qualifications in providing the services to be offered

Foundation Communities, as the primary supportive service provider at Lakeline Station Phase 2, has over 25 years of experience in the provision of supportive services to its residents. Supportive services are an integral part of all Foundation Communities properties, and are included in the planning process for every new community from inception. FC is considered a national leader in the provision of service-enriched housing.

All Foundation Communities service programs are developed to meet the particular needs of residents. Each program area utilizes a Theory of Change approach to identify the particular resident outcomes that are desired, the resources that will be required and how progress towards outcomes achievement will be measured and evaluated. Foundation Communities utilizes and contributes to best practices in the fields of education, health, trauma-informed case management and financial stability. Because our programs have a long and consistent record of achieving positive resident outcomes, numerous foundations and public agencies provide funding to establish and grow our programs.

The majority of supportive services at Lakeline Station Phase 2 will be provided by Foundation Communities staff and volunteers. We do, however partner with more than fifty nonprofits and community groups to provider additional services. Some significant partnerships include: Breakthrough Austin, Caritas of Austin, Safe Place, Life Works, Travis County CPS, Communities for Recovery, and Project Transition.

4 – PROJECT PROPOSAL

General Services

Resumes of key personnel who will be actively involved in the delivery of services

Julian Huerta – Deputy Executive Director. Julian provides leadership for all Foundation Communities' resident and community services. He develops and directs education, financial stability and supportive housing programs that serve more than 30,000 working poor families and homeless adults annually. Julian brings over 25 years' experience in program development, nonprofit administration and fundraising.

Mario Cortez – Director of Family Supportive Housing. Mario has 15 years of experience working with homeless and low-income populations, and holds a Masters in Social Work. Prior to joining Foundation Communities, he spent 3 years developing the Keep Austin Housed AmeriCorps project. He Co-Chairs the Social Services Case Management Network & the Housing Stability Committee of the Basic Needs Coalition, sits on the Executive Committee of the Basic Needs Coalition, and leads planning for Stand Up and Be Counted. Mario oversees all supportive housing programs.

Marisela Montoya – Director of Education for Foundation Communities. Marisela graduated from the University of Texas with a degree in Psychology. For 17 years, she has worked overseeing and implementing programs for youth and adults, including 8 years with Austin ISD as a program director and program specialist (Community Education; At Risk Youth Programs; afterschool, teen, and adult education programs). She has been with Foundation Communities for 10 years, first as Lead Learning Center Coordinator, and now as Director of Education. She holds a certificate in Nonprofit Leadership and Management from Austin Community College and Texas Association of Nonprofit Organizations.

Erika Leos – Financial Coaching and Savings Program Manager. Erika oversees Foundation Communities' financial coaching and education programs, along with savings initiatives that help residents save money for emergencies and for acquiring assets and achieving long-term financial goals. She earned a Bachelor's of Business Administration from the University of Texas at Austin in 2002.

Emmanuel Zapata – Adult Education Coordinator. Mr. Zapata has led Foundation Communities' Adult Education program for the last six years. His focus is on providing ESL and Computer/Digital Literacy classes at FC Family Learning Centers.

Kori Hattemer – Director of Financial Programs. In this capacity, she oversees Foundation Communities' free tax preparation, college support services, one-on-one financial coaching, and money management classes. Prior to joining Foundation Communities, Kori was the Associate Director of Savings & Financial Capability at CFED. Kori received her Master of Public Affairs degree at the University of Texas, where she also completed her undergraduate degree.

Brianna McDonough—College Hub Manager. Brianna oversees effective implementation and coordination of College Hub services. College Hub services include wraparound college support, like one-on-one college coaching and planning, financial aid application assistance, scholarship administration, the Succeed program, and a two-semester humanities course called Free Minds. Brianna establishes and maintains partnerships with area high schools, colleges, universities, and community-based organizations, and she supervises and coaches College Hub team members. Brianna graduated with her M.A. in Educational Psychology from the University of Texas at Austin and has since worked as an adviser, counselor, student affairs professional, and nonprofit advocate for students of all ages.

Aaron DeLao—Director of Health Initiatives. Aaron joined Foundation Communities in 2018. He brings more than a decade of experience as a nonprofit leader. Previously, Aaron worked at CommUnity Care Health Centers and Volunteer Healthcare Clinic. He has led community needs assessments, opened new clinics within Travis County, and built collaborations across community organizations to create much-needed programming in the Public Health arena. Aaron holds a B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin, a Master's in Public Administration from the University of Texas Pan American (now Rio Grande Valley) in Edinburgh, and is a certified Health Promotor/Community Health Worker in the State of Texas.

4 – PROJECT PROPOSAL

Financial Capacity of Service Provider

Funding for the supportive services come from a combination of grants and fundraising from private foundations, corporations and individuals. This is the same method used to fund the supportive service programs at all our existing properties. Foundation Communities has strong relationships with the donor community, a well-funded Central Reserve, and maintains a healthy portfolio, with all projects producing their targeted cash flow and reserves established by the Board.

In 2018, FC raised over \$9 million to fund services at our existing 20 properties in Austin. FC hosts an annual Welcome Home lunch, which raises approximately \$1 million from individual donors to fund support services. We also have a donor base dedicated to the support of our service programs. FC will pursue service funding for Lakeline Station Phase 2 from the following past donors.

- Michael and Susan Dell Foundation
- St David's Foundation
- Rachael and Ben Vaughan Foundation
- Tomberg Foundation
- Texas State Affordable Housing Corporation
- United Way for Greater Austin
- JP Morgan Chase Foundation
- City of Austin
- Travis County
- Individual Donors

4 – PROJECT PROPOSAL

Financial Capacity of Service Provider

Budget

Sources	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Foundations, Corporations and			
Individuals	\$59,100	\$60,873	\$62,699
Property Cash Flow	\$10,000	\$10,300	\$10,609
TOTAL SOURCES	\$69,100	\$71,173	\$73,308

Uses	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
CHI Case Manager	\$46,000	\$47,380	\$48,801
Taxes and Benefits	\$9,200	\$9,476	\$9,760
Supplies/Printing	\$10,000	\$10,300	\$10,609
Training/Travel/Mileage	\$2,500	\$2,575	\$2,652
Direct Aid to Clients	\$1,400	\$1,442	\$1,485
TOTAL	\$69,100	\$71,173	\$73,308

5 – PROPERTY

Maps

See Attached maps

- City Council District
- High Opportunity Census Tract
- Tracts at risk of Displacement or Gentrification
- Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors with 0.5 mile buffer
- Proximity to Transit
- Healthy Food Access with 1 mile buffer
- 100 year Flood Plain

5 – PROPERTY

Real Estate Appraisal

See attached

Appraisal Report Page 48

Texas Appraiser Licensing and Certification Board

P.O. Box 12188 Austin, Texas 78711-2188 Certified General Real Estate Appraiser

Number: TX 1326117 G

Issued: 04/24/2018 Expires: 04/30/2020

Appraiser: HAROLD ELDON SUNDBECK

Having provided satisfactory evidence of the qualifications required by the Texas Appraiser Licensing and Certification Act, Texas Occupations Code, Chapter 1103, is authorized to use this title, Certified General Real Estate Appraiser.

Douglas E. Oldmixon Commissioner

5 – PROPERTY

Zoning Verification Letter

Zoning Verification Letter is attached



City of Austin

Founded by Congress, Republic of Texas, 1839 Planning and Zoning Department One Texas Center, 505 Barton Springs Road P.O. Box 1088, Austin, Texas 78767

April 25, 2019

Mr. Walter Moreau Foundation Communities 3036 South First Street Austin, Texas 78704

RE: Zoning Change Application for the proposed multifamily development known as Lakeline II, located at 13653 Rutledge Spur

To Whom It May Concern:

The above-referenced application filed by Foundation Communities is in process for a zoning change, for the property located at 13653 Rutledge Spur, in Austin, Travis County, Texas (City File No. C14-2019-073.SH). The zoning application is a request a change from the current CS-MU-CO zoning designation to CS-MU-CO zoning designation, to remove a conditional overlay that subjects the property to W/LO district site development standards.

The purpose of this letter is to acknowledge the receipt of a letter/release signed by the applicant that agrees to hold the City of Austin and all other parties harmless if a zoning change for this site is not received.

Sincerely,

Sherri Sirwaitis, Senior Planner

City of Austin

Planning and Zoning Department


jr/ss


ELECTRONICALLY RECORDED OFFICIAL PUBLIC RECORDS


2018068042


Pages: 8 Fee: \$45.00 08/01/2018 08:47 AM


Nancy E. Rister,County Clerk
Williamson County,Texas
























THE 13635 RUTLEDGE SPUR NEIGHBORHOOD REAL ESTATE


AVERAGE HOME VALUES


MEDIAN HOME VALUE: \$347,656

MEDIAN REAL ESTATE TAXES:

\$8,466 (2.4% effective rate)

NEIGHBORHOOD HOME PRICES





YEARS OF AVERAGE RENT NEEDED TO BUY AVERAGE HOME IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD 10 YEARS AND 8 MONTHS

AVERAGE MARKET RENT

\$

AVERAGE MARKET RENT:


9 \$1,700 / per month




GROSS RENTAL YIELD:

9.96

MEDIAN MONTHLY RENT BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS







SETTING



COASTAL



LAKEFRONT




FARMS

NEIGHBORHOOD LOOK AND FEEL












Population Density


HOUSING MARKET DETAILS

AGE OF HOMES ()






TYPES OF HOMES ()



HOME SIZE



SPECIAL PURPOSE HOUSING




3



HOMEOWNERSHIP

HOMEOWNERSHIP RATE





THE 13635 RUTLEDGE SPUR NEIGHBORHOOD DEMOGRAPHICS

136 Vital Statistics. 2 Condition Alerts found.

LIFESTYLE

Young Single Professionals 92.2% Excellent Luxury Communities 91.3% Excellent Retirement Dream Areas 68.5% Fair Family Friendly 54.1% Poor College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor				
Poor Luxury Communities Excellent Retirement Dream Areas 68.5% Fair Family Friendly 54.1% College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor	Young Single Professionals			
91.3% Excellent Retirement Dream Areas 68.5% Fair Family Friendly 54.1% Poor College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor	92.2%		Excellent	
91.3% Excellent Retirement Dream Areas 68.5% Fair ini Family Friendly 54.1% Poor College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor				
Retirement Dream Areas 68.5% Fair Family Friendly 54.1% College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor		Luxury Communit	ies	
68.5% Fair iii Family Friendly 54.1% Poor College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor	91.3%		Excellent	
68.5% Fair iii Family Friendly 54.1% Poor College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor		- 50 15 15		
Family Friendly 54.1% College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor		Retirement Dream A	reas	
54.1% Poor College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor	68.5%		Fair	
54.1% Poor College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor				
College Student Friendly 15.4% Poor	∳∳ Family Friendly			
15.4% Poor	54.1%		Poor	
15.4% Poor	College Student Friendly			
% Vacation Home Locations	15.4%		Poor	
v vacation frome Educations				
Poor				
First Time Homebuyers				
Poor				

SPECIAL CHARACTER







AGE / MARITAL STATUS

AGE

MARITAL STATUS





GENDER RATIO



47.6%

52.4%




MILITARY & COLLEGE STATUS



HOUSEHOLD TYPES

ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS







MARRIED COUPLE WITH CHILD




SINGLE PARENT WITH CHILD






EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES



COMMUTE TO WORK


AVERAGE ONE-WAY COMMUTE TIME







MEANS OF TRANSPORT

VEHICLES PER HOUSEHOLD






MIGRATION & MOBILITY




RACE & ETHNIC DIVERSITY





OCCUPATIONS






ANCESTERIES & LANGUAGES SPOKEN

ANCESTRY (TOP 20)

Mexican 12.1% U.S. or American 5.8% English 3.0% 3.0% Italian 2.0% 1.9% 1.8% South American 1.6% 1.5% Dutch 1.3% French Canadian 1.1% 1.1% 1.0% 0.9% 0.9% 0.8%

LANGUAGES SPOKEN (TOP 20)



UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

% OF RESIDENTS

0.0%



100.0%

AVERAGE INCOME

PER CAPITA INCOME





MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



EDUCATION


PERCENT WITH COLLEGE DEGREE



PERCENT WITH ADVANCE DEGREE



INCOME AND EDUCATION





THE 13635 RUTLEDGE SPUR NEIGHBORHOOD CRIME

67 Vital Statistics. 2 Condition Alerts found.

NEIGHBORHOOD CRIME DATA

TOTAL CRIME INDEX		
53		
(100 is safest)		
Safer than 53% of U.S. neighborhoods.		


NEIGHBORHOOD ANNUAL CRIMES			
	VIOLENT	PROPERTY	TOTAL
Number of Crimes	4	57	61
Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)	1.47	20.90	22.37

NEIGHBORHOOD VIOLENT CRIME

VIOLENT CRIME INDEX
71
(100 is safest)
Safer than 71% of U.S. neighborhoods.

VIOLENT CRIME INDEX BY TYPE				
MURDER INDEX	RAPE INDEX	ROBBERY INDEX	ASSAULT INDEX	
67	23	85	75	
100 is safest	100 is safest	100 is safest	100 is safest	

VIOLENT CRIME COMPARISON (PER 1,000 RESIDENTS)



MY CHANCES OF BECOMING A VICTIM OF A VIOLENT CRIME			
1 IN 682 o	1 IN 234	1 IN 228	
in this Neighborhood	in Austin	in Texas	



AUSTIN VIOLENT CRIMES

POPULATION: 950,715

	MURDER	RAPE	ROBBERY	ASSAULT
Report Total	26	840	993	2,199
Rate per 1,000	0.03	0.88	1.04	2.31

UNITED STATES VIOLENT CRIMES

POPULATION: 325,719,178


	MURDER	RAPE	ROBBERY	ASSAULT
Report Total	17,284	135,755	319,356	810,825
Rate per 1,000	0.05	0.42	0.98	2.49

NEIGHBORHOOD PROPERTY CRIME

PROPERTY CRIME INDEX		
49		
(100 is safest)		
Safer than 49% of U.S. neighborhoods.		

PROPERTY CRIME INDEX BY TYPE			
BURGLARY INDEX	THEFT INDEX	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	
89	37	96	
100 is safest	100 is safest	100 is safest	

PROPERTY CRIME COMPARISON (PER 1,000 RESIDENTS)



MY CHANCES OF BECOMING A VICTIM OF A PROPERTY CRIME			
1 IN 48	1 IN 30	1 IN 39	
in this Neighborhood	in Austin	in Texas	



AUSTIN PROPERTY CRIMES

POPULATION: 950,715


	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT
Report Total	4,414	25,288	2,090
Rate per 1,000	4.64	26.60	2.20

UNITED STATES PROPERTY CRIMES

POPULATION: 325,719,178

	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT
Report Total	1,401,840	5,519,107	773,139
Rate per 1,000	4.30	16.94	2.37

CRIME PER SQUARE MILE





THE 13635 RUTLEDGE SPUR NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

SCHOOL RATING INFORMATION

SCHOOL QUALITY

58

(100 is best)
Better than 58% of U.S. schools.

ADDRESS SCHOOL QUALITY RATING

Address-Specific School Quality Rating. Rates the quality of the K-12 public schools that serve this address. (i)

SCHOOLS THAT SERVE THIS ADDRESS *

SCHOOL DETAILS	GRADES	QUALITY RATING COMPARED TO TX	QUALITY RATING COMPARED TO NATION
Anderson Mill Elementary School			
10610 Salt Mill Hollow	PK-05	7	6
Austin, TX 78750			
Mcneil H S School			
5720 Mcneil Dr	09-12	8	7
Austin, TX 78729			
Noel Grisham Middle School			
10805 School House Ln	06-08	7	6
Austin, TX 78750			

^{*} Depending on where you live in the neighborhood, your children may attend certain schools from the above list and not others. In some cases, districts allow students to attend schools anywhere in the district. Always check with your local school department to determine which schools your children may attend based on your specific address and your child's grade-level.

NEIGHBORHOOD EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Adults In Neighborhood With College Degree Or Higher	63.5%
Children In The Neighborhood Living In Poverty (1.7%

THIS NEIGHBORHOOD IS SERVED BY 1 DISTRICT:

ROUND ROCK ISD

47,827	56	15
Students Enrolled in This District	Schools in District	Students Per Classroom



DISTRICT QUALITY COMPARED TO TEXAS 10 (10 is best) Better than 91.2% of TX school districts.



Public School Test Scores (No Child Left Behind) •



School District Enrollment By Group

ETHNIC/RACIAL GROUPS	THIS DISTRICT	THIS STATE
White (non-hispanic)	43.4%	29.2%
Black	9.0%	12.9%
Hispanic	31.8%	53.4%
Asian Or Pacific Islander	15.3%	4.1%
American Indian Or Native Of Alaska	0.4%	0.4%
ECONOMIC GROUPS	THIS DISTRICT	THIS STATE
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (27.4%	58.7%
FREE LUNCH ELIGIBLE	21.9%	52.7%
REDUCED LUNCH ELIGIBLE	5.5%	6.0%

Educational Expenditures

FOR THIS DISTRICT	PER STUDENT	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
Instructional Expenditures	\$4,845	\$226,096,770	48.6%
Support Expenditures			
Student	\$367	\$17,126,422	3.7%
Staff	\$540	\$25,199,640	5.4%
General Administration (4)	\$78	\$3,639,948	0.8%



FOR THIS DISTRICT	PER STUDENT	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
School Administration	\$441	\$20,579,706	4.4%
Operation 4	\$815	\$38,032,790	8.2%
Transportation	\$240	\$11,199,840	2.4%
Other	\$274	\$12,786,484	2.7%
Total Support 🚱	\$2,754	\$128,518,164	27.6%
Non-instructional Expenditures	\$2,372	\$110,691,752	23.8%
Total Expenditures	\$9,971	\$465,306,686	100.0%



THE 13635 RUTLEDGE SPUR TRENDS AND FORECAST


SCOUT VISION® SUMMARY

RISING STAR INDEX (i)

BLUE CHIP INDEX (i)



SCOUT VISION Neighborhood Home Value Trend and Forecast ①



SCOUT VISION® HOME VALUE TRENDS AND FORECAST

ΓIME PERIOD	TOTAL APPRECIATION	AVG. ANNUAL RATE	COMPARED TO METRO*	COMPARED TO AMERICA*
3 Year Forecast: 2019 Q1 - 2022 Q1	7.33% 🛧	2.39% 🛧	2	2
Latest Quarter: 2018 Q3 - 2018 Q4	2.05% 🛧	8.45% ^	3	7
Last 12 Months: 2017 Q4 - 2018 Q4	7.01% 🛧	7.01% 🛧	8	6
Last 2 Years: 2016 Q4 - 2018 Q4	14.86% 🛧	7.17% 🛧	6	6
Last 5 Years: 2013 Q4 - 2018 Q4	51.27% 🛧	8.63% 🛧	6	9
Last 10 Years: 2008 Q4 - 2018 Q4	70.63% 🛧	5.49% ↑	8	10
Since 2000: 2000 Q1 - 2018 Q4	163.34% 🛧	5.45% ^	9	10

^{* 10} is highest



KEY PRICE DRIVERS AT THIS LOCATION

Pros Cons

Factors likely to drive home values upward over the next few years or indicators of upward trends already underway.

- School Performance
- ♠ Income Trend

Impediments to home value appreciation over the next few years or indicators of negative trends already underway.

- Real Estate Values Nearby
- Regional Housing Market

Outlook

- Neighborhood Look & Feel
- Vacancies

SCOUT VISION® PROXIMITY INDEX

PRICE ADVANTAGE OVER SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS ①



RATINGS: 1=Strong Disadvantage 2=Disadvantage 3=Similar Price 4=Advantage 5=Strong Advantage

\$159
Neighborhood price per sqft
\$125
Average Nearby Home Price per sqft

ACCESS TO HIGH PAYING JOBS (i)



RATINGS: 1=Limited 2=Below Average 3=Average 4=Very Good 5=Excellent

JOBS WITHIN AN HOUR

WITHIN	HIGH-PAYING* JOBS
5 minutes	1035
10 minutes	13324
15 minutes	64565
20 minutes	130619
30 minutes	334407
45 minutes	391058
60 minutes	422540

*Annual salary of \$75,000 or more



SCOUT VISION® REAL ESTATE TRENDS AND FORECAST

AVG. ANNUAL HOMEOWNERSHIP TREND Over last 5 years




AVG. ANNUAL RENT PRICE TREND Over last 5 years 1



AVG. ANNUAL VACANCY TRENDS Over last 5 years



SCOUT VISION® CRIME TRENDS AND FORECAST



SCOUT VISION® EDUCATION TRENDS AND FORECAST

AVG. ANNUAL CHANGE IN COLLEGE GRADUATES Over last 5 years 3



AVG. ANNUAL CHANGE IN K-12 SCHOOL PERFORMANCE Over last 5 years





SCOUT VISION® ECONOMIC TRENDS AND FORECAST


AVG ANNUAL CHANGE IN PER CAPITA INCOME Over last 5 years 6



AVG ANNUAL CHANGE IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME Over last 5 years 6



AVG ANNUAL CHANGE IN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE Over last 5 years



SCOUT VISION® DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

DISTANCE FROM LOCATION	POPULATION 5 YEARS AGO	CURRENT POPULATION	PERCENT CHANGE
Half Mile	1,595	1,752	9.88% ^
1 Mile	3,246	4,110	∮ 26.61% ↑
3 Miles	67,413	80,200	18.97% 🛧
5 Miles	166,074	187,309	∮ 12.79% ↑
10 Miles	539,453	606,864	∮ 12.50% ↑
15 Miles	972,639	1,101,458	
25 Miles	1,514,903	1,733,924	∮ 14.46% ↑
50 Miles	2,230,442	2,535,378	∮ 13.67% ↑

SCOUT VISION® REGIONAL HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS

AUSTIN-ROUND ROCK, TX METRO AREA REGIONAL INVESTMENT POTENTIAL ①



Regional Appreciation Potential (3yr)


RATINGS: 1=Very Low 2=Low 3=Moderate 4=High 5=Very High

Current 4



HOUSING AFFORDABILITY TRENDS: AUSTIN-ROUND ROCK, TX METRO AREA $\tiny\textcircled{1}$

Years of average household income needed to buy average home



Region's Historical High

REGIONAL 1 AND 2 YEAR GROWTH TRENDS (i)

Region's Historical Low

LAST 2 YEARS	COMPARED TO NATION*	LAST 1 YEAR	COMPARED TO NATION*
5.72% 🛧	3 10	2.67% 🛧	3 10
7.72% 🛧	3 10	3.32% 🛧	9
14.58% 🛧	3 10	6.04% ^	3 10
-0.48% ❖	3	-0.03% ❖	3
27.92% 🛧	9	5.06% 🛧	8
5.44% 🛧	3 10	2.64% 🛧	3 10
-1.40% ↓	8	0.24% 🛧	5
	5.72% ↑ 7.72% ↑ 14.58% ↑ -0.48% ↓ 27.92% ↑	5.72% ↑	5.72% ↑

* 10 is highest

Disclaimer

Forecasts of potential occurrences or non-occurrences of future conditions and events are inherently uncertain. Actual results may differ materially from what is predicted in any information provided by location inc. Nothing contained in or generated by a Location Inc. Product or services is, or should be relied upon as, a promise or representation as to the future performance or prediction of real estate values. No representation is made as to the accuracy of any forecast, estimate, or projection. Location Inc. Makes no express or implied warranty and all information and content is provided



"As is" without any warranties of any kind. Location inc. Expressly disclaims any warranty of accuracy or predictability, and any warranty of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Location Inc. Further disclaims any liability for damages, loss, or injury arising out of the use this site and the data. All risks associated with using the site and the data are borne by the user at user's sole cost and expense. By using the site you agree to our <u>Terms of Use</u>.



ABOUT THE 13635 RUTLEDGE SPUR NEIGHBORHOOD

Real Estate Prices and Overview

This neighborhood's median real estate price is \$347,656, which is more expensive than 87.1% of the neighborhoods in Texas and 72.0% of the neighborhoods in the U.S.

The average rental price in this neighborhood is currently \$1,700, based on NeighborhoodScout's exclusive analysis. The average rental cost in this neighborhood is higher than 85.1% of the neighborhoods in Texas.

This is a suburban neighborhood (based on population density) located in Austin, Texas.

This neighborhood's real estate is primarily made up of small (studio to two bedroom) to medium sized (three or four bedroom) apartment complexes/high-rise apartments and single-family homes. Most of the residential real estate is occupied by a mixture of owners and renters. Many of the residences in this neighborhood are newer, built in 2000 or more recently. A number of residences were also built between 1970 and 1999.

Home and apartment vacancy rates are 9.5% in this neighborhood. NeighborhoodScout analysis shows that this rate is lower than 46.5% of the neighborhoods in the nation, approximately near the middle range for vacancies.

Notable & Unique Neighborhood Characteristics

Many things matter about a neighborhood, but the first thing most people notice is the way a neighborhood looks and its particular character. For example, one might notice whether the buildings all date from a certain time period or whether shop signs are in multiple languages. This particular neighborhood has some outstanding things about the way it looks and its way of life that are worth highlighting.

Notable & Unique: Real Estate

Homes built from 2000 through today make up a higher proportion of this neighborhood's real estate landscape than 99.9% of the neighborhoods in America. When you are driving around this neighborhood, you'll notice right away that it is one of the newest built of any, with the smell of fresh paint, and the look of young landscaping nearly everywhere you look. In fact, 95.2% of the residential real estate here is classified as newer. In fact, the concentration of newer homes here is so great that they completely dominate the landscape. In most neighborhoods, there is a mixture of ages of residential real estate, but here it is almost completely built during one time frame: 2000 through today.

Notable & Unique: Occupations

Executives, managers and professionals make up 63.9% of the workforce in this neighborhood which, according to NeighborhoodScout's exclusive analysis, is a higher proportion of such high-level people than is found in 95.0% of the neighborhoods in America. For this reason, this neighborhood really stands out as unique.

Notable & Unique: Diversity

Did you know that this neighborhood has more Belgian ancestry people living in it than nearly any neighborhood in America? It's true! In fact, 0.8% of this neighborhood's residents have Belgian ancestry.



This neighborhood is also pretty special linguistically. Significantly, 3.9% of its residents five years old and above primarily speak Tagalog, which is the first language of the Philippine region, at home. While this may seem like a small percentage, it is higher than 97.1% of the neighborhoods in America.

The Neighbors

The Neighbors: Income

How wealthy a neighborhood is, from very wealthy, to middle income, to low income is very formative with regard to the personality and character of a neighborhood. Equally important is the rate of people, particularly children, who live below the federal poverty line. In some wealthy gated communities, the areas immediately surrounding can have high rates of childhood poverty, which indicates other social issues. NeighborhoodScout's analysis reveals both aspects of income and poverty for this neighborhood.

The neighbors in this neighborhood in Austin are wealthy, making it among the 15% highest income neighborhoods in America. NeighborhoodScout's exclusive analysis reveals that this neighborhood has a higher income than 86.1% of the neighborhoods in America. In addition, 1.7% of the children seventeen and under living in this neighborhood are living below the federal poverty line, which is a lower rate of childhood poverty than is found in 83.4% of America's neighborhoods.

The Neighbors: Occupations

The old saying "you are what you eat" is true. But it is also true that you are what you do for a living. The types of occupations your neighbors have shape their character, and together as a group, their collective occupations shape the culture of a place.

In this neighborhood, 63.9% of the working population is employed in executive, management, and professional occupations. The second most important occupational group in this neighborhood is sales and service jobs, from major sales accounts, to working in fast food restaurants, with 17.2% of the residents employed. Other residents here are employed in clerical, assistant, and tech support occupations (15.4%), and 4.1% in government jobs, whether they are in local, state, or federal positions.

The Neighbors: Languages

The languages spoken by people in this neighborhood are diverse. These are tabulated as the languages people preferentially speak when they are at home with their families. The most common language spoken in this neighborhood is English, spoken by 75.5% of households. Other important languages spoken here include Spanish, Tagalog (the first language of the Philippine region), Polish and Langs. of India.

The Neighbors: Ethnicity / Ancestry

Culture is the shared learned behavior of peoples. Undeniably, different ethnicities and ancestries have different cultural traditions, and as a result, neighborhoods with concentrations of residents of one or another ethnicities or ancestries will express those cultures. It is what makes the North End in Boston so fun to visit for the Italian restaurants, bakeries, culture, and charm, and similarly, why people enjoy visiting Chinatown in San Francisco.



In this neighborhood in Austin, TX, residents most commonly identify their ethnicity or ancestry as Asian (18.2%). There are also a number of people of Mexican ancestry (12.1%), and residents who report German roots (12.0%), and some of the residents are also of Irish ancestry (7.0%), along with some English ancestry residents (5.8%), among others. In addition, 18.0% of the residents of this neighborhood were born in another country.

Getting to Work

How you get to work – car, bus, train or other means – and how much of your day it takes to do so is a large quality of life and financial issue. Especially with gasoline prices rising and expected to continue doing so, the length and means of one's commute can be a financial burden. Some neighborhoods are physically located so that many residents have to drive in their own car, others are set up so many walk to work, or can take a train, bus, or bike. The greatest number of commuters in this neighborhood spend between 15 and 30 minutes commuting one-way to work (42.9% of working residents), which is shorter than the time spent commuting to work for most Americans.

Here most residents (89.6%) drive alone in a private automobile to get to work. In addition, quite a number also carpool with coworkers, friends, or neighbors to get to work (6.9%) . In a neighborhood like this, as in most of the nation, many residents find owning a car useful for getting to work.