

## **RFQ Questions and Answers from Potential Respondents (Addendum #4)**

1. Q: Has HRHA issued revenue bonds?  
A: We have not issued any revenue bonds related to this project.
2. Q: The breakdown of the High Rise – What exactly is it with respect to relocation of disabled and elderly?  
A: Demographic information on Lincoln Park tenants is included on Exhibit A (low rise) and Exhibit B (high rise).
3. Q: HRHA has approx. 2680 S8 choice vouchers – Will vouchers be used for relocation?  
A: HRHA has 2733 vouchers but *I'm not sure that existing vouchers can be used for relocation*. We believe there may be relocation vouchers that are allocated as a result of a demolition/disposition application.
4. Q: Is it possible to provide resident demographics for LP? The question was asked whether we can release information related to income and otherwise with respect to the tenants in the Hi Rise and Low Rise buildings?  
A: Demographic information on Lincoln Park tenants is included on Exhibit A (low rise) and Exhibit B (high rise).
5. Q: Do we expect to be co-developer or do we expect to share in the developer fee?  
A: We would rank and score more highly a proposal that had HRHA as a co-developer or retaining some or all of the developer fee. We would rank lower (although not with prejudice) a proposal that said HRHA was not going to be the developer and would not have any of the developer fee.
6. Q: What is HRHA's stance on guarantees?  
A: Specific guarantees would be negotiated with respect to HUD regulations. HRHA understands that in order to obtain some of the benefits of being developer or co-developer or receiving developer fee it would have to share in the risks.
7. Q: Is it the Authority's intention to maintain the operations and management of facility post development?  
A: We will allow the master planning process to determine whether it is feasible for HRHA to retain ownership or management of property after development. In past projects however, the Authority has benefited from owning and managing rental property and believes the management of safe, decent and affordable housing to be part of its core mission.
8. Q: Has the Board expressed preference for density of housing, type of housing on site?  
A: The HRHA Board has not expressed any formal preference for the density of housing on the redeveloped Lincoln Park site. In addition, the City of Hampton has not included the Lincoln Park site in its current Master Plans and, aside from existing zoning regulations, does not have a stated preference for density. In conversations related to the Downtown Master Plan, which is adjacent to the Lincoln Park site, comments were made by City staff expressing a preference for the Lincoln Park site to be redeveloped as a largely residential site with a mixture of housing types. However, Lincoln Park was not included in the Downtown Master Plan study area and, as such, does not have a prevailing master plan that has been approved by the City of Hampton.
9. Q: Does HRHA expect the firm to provide all services related to relocation of tenants? The question is related to a better breakdown of responsibility with relocation of tenants.  
A: With respect to the actual relocation of the tenants, our expectation is the firm that we would go into partnership with would either handle relocation activities or provide for this function by out-sourcing it or subcontracting it to another firm. These activities would include, but not be limited to, transporting

tenants to different apartment complexes, researching and providing comparable rental units, answering tenant questions on moving expenses, coordinating moving expenses, bundling those services or doing them unit by unit. HRHA staff would, of course, be involved in the relocation process but not be responsible for the bulk of the necessary activities.

10. Q: Are there things that must remain on site or facilities available for whoever might be running those social programs? Are there services or programs or other partners or supportive type services that are on site now that have to remain on site?

A: There are no services on site now that absolutely have to remain on site post development. I did mention that the Community Center is staffed and active but there is no long term agreement with the Boys and Girls Club that would restrict development. Other organizations provide services on the Lincoln Park site. We consider these organizations to be stakeholders and hope that they will be involved in the master planning process.

11. Q: Do you know if the Boys and Girls Club has done an assessment of what they would like to see there?

A: I can't speak for the Boys and Girls Club but, based on my understanding of their mission and local activities, they would welcome any opportunity to partner on a future development or at another site somewhere in the City of Hampton. As I said previously, there are several programs that are active and ongoing but there are no promises that have been made that would preclude you from redevelopment.

12. Q: Are there agreements with the City? Is there anything in place that would preclude us or anything with the City that would preclude some type of long-term land lease where you would have flexibility to use that in the development?

A: No, I am not aware of anything that is currently in place.

13. Q: To what extent is the City involved, has to be involved or would want to be involved?

A: The City generally supports redevelopment on the Lincoln Park site but, as I mentioned previously, there is no document that the City has approved or passed that provided for a plan or guidelines for what should be on the site.

14. Q: What type of physical needs, demands or issues do we know about and could we make public; and what do we foresee would happen in the future? Has the Housing Authority had a public facilities study done relative to off-site improvements? Do we have to search for or has the City studied or HA already studied this area for issues? What do we know already?

A: After speaking with City staff I confirmed that a physical needs study would be performed only after a plan for development is created. City staff further remarked that, if the density of the redeveloped project were the same or lower than what is currently at Lincoln Park, there is no reason to believe that offsite improvements would be required.

15. Q: Is there any policy guidance from your commissioners or city regarding the replacement of the public housing units? It doesn't sound like you have a one-for-one replacement requirement?

A: We do acknowledge and understand that HUD may request or require one-for-one replacement of public housing units. We would also welcome one-for-one replacement as it serves the Authority's goal of providing safe, decent and affordable housing. However, there is no additional local requirement or policy requiring one-for-one replacement on the Lincoln Park site over and above federal regulations.

16. Q: Is there a minimum threshold or do you have an obligation to re-house those residents who want to return to the site?

A: I would view the minimum threshold to be replacement of the existing 275 affordable housing units in the city of Hampton. We would expect some preference to be given to existing tenants to return to the

site but, depending on the results of the master planning process and HUD approvals, all tenants may not be able to return to the site.

17. Q: Is there a tenant association?

A: Yes there is a resident council for the development.

18. Q: Have you done HUD mixed finance development before that included public housing units with tax credit units?

A: Yes HRHA has done that fairly recently.

19. Q: What is the urgency for which you want to move forward with this effort?

A: In the RFQ (Section 5 - Required Submission/Evaluation Factors) we ask for a timeline for development and we are leaving it to the respondents to propose how fast we can go. I won't describe a specific timeline but I can say that HRHA will favor a shorter timeline.

20. Q: Shorter timeline – Do you have a reason why? Is this a property that has been dragging on in that neighborhood? Why would HRHA favor a shorter timeline rather than longer timeline?

A: During the recent history of this development we have had several calls for redevelopment, conversations with resident councils, residents and with other stakeholders about redeveloping this property. Those conversations date back several years and, in my opinion, there is no reason to delay redevelopment. We will not favor an unrealistic timeline, but we do favor a shorter timeline.

21. Q: What is expected or what would we like to see on item #4 which is 15 points in RFQ that we allocated for Section 3? Pass, current experience or something else?

A: This question refers to the Section 3 item in the evaluation factors where a maximum of 15 points are allocated. We expect a Section 3 firm to get the full 15 points. If a firm claims to be, and can certify itself as, a Section 3 firm then all of the points would be allocated. Some portion of the 15 points would be allocated for a firm that may not be classified or meet the criteria to be a Section 3 firm but has made significant effort towards furthering HUD's Section 3 goals. These efforts may include donations to public housing training or jobs programs, creating or maintaining your own jobs training program, hiring a portion of Section 3 residents, subcontracting with other Section 3, etc.

22. Q: Do you want a Section 3 Plan in the application as well?

A: We do not require a full Section 3 plan but I would encourage everyone to include whatever in their history is significant and be clear about what you expect to continue in the future.

23. Q: What has the most recent turnover been with the LP development?

A: Annual turnover, dating back to 2008, is:

Projected 2011 based on 1/1/11-10/31/11 = 83; 55 Low Rise; 28 High Rise

2010 = 82 total; 49 Low Rise; 33 High Rise

2009 = 51 total; 25 Low Rise; 26 High Rise

2008 = 66 total; 38 Low Rise; 28 High Rise.

24. Q: Are you carrying a waiting list? Do you know how many people are on the waiting lists?

A: Yes. The waiting list for the high rise is 581 total applicants: 173 Disabled, 18 Elderly, 18 Family (2 people in household and does not include elderly or disabled). The waiting list for the low rise is 583 total applicants: 79 Disabled, 4 Elderly, 489 Family (this number does not include families that are considered elderly or disabled).

25. Q: Has the City mentioned interest related to tax or tax exemption for parcels? Has the City or have we had conversations with the City where they promised or suggested they would forgo taxes or abate taxes for a period of time for redeveloped property? Will City forego taxes or abate?
- A: No there are no promises that have been made; and no agreement with the City on abatement of taxes.
26. Q: Could you elaborate on the experience of the HRHA relative to managing LIHTC apartments. Specifically, how many units does your staff currently manage and are these units located within several different apartment locations?
- A: HRHA, through its affiliates and instrumentalities, manages tax credit units on three sites in Hampton: Shell Gardens (48 units), Monterey (40 units) and Old Point (27 units). HRHA is currently designated by VHDA as a Certified Property Management Agent.
27. Q: Will the Lincoln Park Redevelopment Project include any of the items above - specifically any aluminum bleachers or benches for an athletic field?
- A: We do not know whether aluminum bleachers or athletic equipment will be included in the redevelopment project.
28. Q: On page 4 of the RFQ, #4 states that we would receive 15 points for Evidence of Section 3 business status. Does this mean only businesses that are Section 3 businesses would count for those points, or would it count if there was a Section 3 business on our team? Does the HRHA have a list of prequalified Section 3 businesses for hire?
- A: Please refer to the answer given above regarding scoring for the Section 3 evaluation factor. In addition, HRHA does not currently maintain a list of Section 3 businesses for hire.
29. Q: I have a question as to the scope of Development and Construction activities as set forth in item # 5 (page 3 of 6) of the October 6th RFQ. It would appear that the responsibilities include many pre-development responsibilities (i.e. oversight land engineering plan development and permitting as well as house design development and permitting, land acquisition and zoning), but no construction activities as such. Is this correct? If construction activity is contemplated, who would be responsible for demolition?
- A: Item # 5 includes and Development and Construction activities and provides for hiring of contractor(s) for specific construction activities such as demolition.
30. Q: I also have a question as to the scope of item # 3 – Funding Applications. Is the intent of the RFQ merely to evaluate alternative forms of financing or is the expectation that once an agreement is reached as to the most appropriate vehicles are identified the selected party would assume responsibility for pursuing the financing including the preparation of all of the required applications?
- A: Item # 3 is intended to assess the qualifications of a firm with respect to its ability to research and recommend sources of financing and pursue those sources as appropriate based on the master planning recommendations.
31. Q: Also, you indicated that an audio recording of the meeting could be placed on the website. Will this still be done?
- A: The questions and answers from the site meeting on October 20, 2011 are included on this document in lieu of a recording.

Lincoln Park Low Rise - Demographics

As of: October 03, 2011

Resident Economic Demographics

Community - Lincoln Park

Household Size	AMI	Household Income Range		# of Hshlds w/in Income Range	# of Hshlds with a Hndcp Resident	# of Hshlds with a Senior Resident	# of All Household Residents in Age Range				Gender		Race					Ethnicity	
											Females	Males	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino
							0 - 17	18 - 54	55 - 61	62+									
1	0%-30%	0	11,460	7	2	0	0	6	1	0	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
	31%-50%	11,461	19,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	51%-60%	19,101	22,920	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61%-80%	22,921	30,560	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	81%-100%	30,561	38,200	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	100%+	38,201		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0%-30%	0	13,095	30	7	0	23	36	1	0	28	2	3	27	0	0	0	1	29
	31%-50%	13,096	21,825	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	51%-60%	21,826	26,190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61%-80%	26,191	34,920	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	81%-100%	34,921	43,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100%+	43,651		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0%-30%	0	14,730	33	7	0	60	37	2	0	31	2	0	33	0	0	0	0	33
	31%-50%	14,731	24,550	4	2	0	5	6	1	0	4	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	3
	51%-60%	24,551	29,460	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	61%-80%	29,461	39,280	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	81%-100%	39,281	49,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100%+	49,101		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0%-30%	0	16,365	42	9	1	116	51	0	1	41	1	3	38	0	0	1	1	41
	31%-50%	16,366	27,275	8	3	0	18	14	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
	51%-60%	27,276	32,730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61%-80%	32,731	43,640	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	81%-100%	43,641	54,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100%+	54,551		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0%-30%	0	17,685	8	2	0	28	12	0	0	8	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	8
	31%-50%	17,686	29,475	3	0	0	11	4	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
	51%-60%	29,476	35,370	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61%-80%	35,371	47,160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	81%-100%	47,161	58,950	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100%+	58,951		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Hampton Redevelopment and Housing Authority

As of: October 03, 2011

Resident Economic Demographics

Community - Lincoln Park

Household Size	AMI	Household Income Range		# of Hshlds w/in Income Range	# of Hshlds with a Handcp Resident	# of Hshlds with a Senior Resident	# of All Household Residents in Age Range				Gender		Race					Ethnicity			
											Females	Males	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino		
6	0%-30%	0	18,990	8	1	0	36	12	0	0	6	2	0	7	0	0	1	0	8		
	31%-50%	18,991	31,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	51%-60%	31,651	37,980	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	61%-80%	37,981	50,640	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	81%-100%	50,641	63,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	100%+	63,301		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
7	0%-30%	0	20,295	4	3	0	22	6	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4		
	31%-50%	20,296	33,825	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	51%-60%	33,826	40,590	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	61%-80%	40,591	54,120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	81%-100%	54,121	67,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	100%+	67,651		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
8	0%-30%	0	21,615	1	0	0	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		
	31%-50%	21,616	36,025	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	51%-60%	36,026	43,230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	61%-80%	43,231	57,640	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	81%-100%	57,641	72,050	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	100%+	72,051		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
9	0%-30%	0	23,344	1	0	0	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		
	31%-50%	23,345	38,907	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	51%-60%	38,908	46,688	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	61%-80%	46,689	62,251	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	81%-100%	62,252	77,814	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	100%+	77,815		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Total Households Evaluated					155																
Total Households with a Handicap Resident					37	23.9%															
Total Households with a Senior Resident					1	0.6%															
Total Residents by Each Age Range					Total -	541	342 63.2%	193 35.7%	5 0.9%	1 0.2%											
Totals for Gender/Race/Ethnicity					Total # Used for Gender/Race/Ethnicity Pct Calcs-					155	147 94.8%	8 5.2%	7 4.5%	144 92.9%	2 1.3%	0 0.0%	2 1.3%	3 1.9%	152 98.1%		
# of Res Eligible for Senior Housing (55+)															6	0.2%					
CSS Caseload # (18 - 61)															198	36.6%					
<b>SUMMARY of Households by AMI</b>					0%-30%	31%-50%	51%-60%	61%-80%	81%-100%	100%+	<b>Total Households Evaluated</b>										
Quantity					134	17	1	2	1	0	155										
Percentage					86.45%	10.97%	0.65%	1.29%	0.65%	0.00%	100%										

Lincoln Park High Rise - Demographics

As of: October 03, 2011

Resident Economic Demographics

Community - Lincoln Towers

Household Size	AMI	Household Income Range		# of Hshlds w/in Income Range	# of Hshlds with a Hndcp Resident	# of Hshlds with a Senior Resident	# of All Household Residents in Age Range				Gender		Race					Ethnicity	
											Females	Males	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino
							0 - 17	18 - 54	55 - 61	62+									
1	0%-30%	0	11,460	84	47	8	0	63	13	8	44	40	8	76	0	0	0	1	83
	31%-50%	11,461	19,100	10	7	2	0	5	3	2	4	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	10
	51%-60%	19,101	22,920	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61%-80%	22,921	30,560	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
	81%-100%	30,561	38,200	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	100%+	38,201		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
2	0%-30%	0	13,095	6	2	0	1	11	0	0	6	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
	31%-50%	13,096	21,825	2	2	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	51%-60%	21,826	26,190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61%-80%	26,191	34,920	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	81%-100%	34,921	43,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100%+	43,651		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0%-30%	0	14,730	2	1	0	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	31%-50%	14,731	24,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	51%-60%	24,551	29,460	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61%-80%	29,461	39,280	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	81%-100%	39,281	49,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100%+	49,101		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0%-30%	0	16,365	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	31%-50%	16,366	27,275	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	51%-60%	27,276	32,730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61%-80%	32,731	43,640	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	81%-100%	43,641	54,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100%+	54,551		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0%-30%	0	17,685	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	31%-50%	17,686	29,475	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	51%-60%	29,476	35,370	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61%-80%	35,371	47,160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	81%-100%	47,161	58,950	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100%+	58,951		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Hampton Redevelopment and Housing Authority

As of: October 03, 2011

Resident Economic Demographics

Community - Lincoln Towers

Household Size	AMI	Household Income Range		# of Hshlds w/in Income Range	# of Hshlds with a Hndcp Resident	# of Hshlds with a Senior Resident	# of All Household Residents in Age Range				Gender		Race					Ethnicity		
											Females	Males	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino	
							0 - 17	18 - 54	55 - 61	62+										
6	0%-30%	0	18,990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	31%-50%	18,991	31,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	51%-60%	31,651	37,980	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	61%-80%	37,981	50,640	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	81%-100%	50,641	63,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	100%+	63,301		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7	0%-30%	0	20,295	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	31%-50%	20,296	33,825	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	51%-60%	33,826	40,590	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	61%-80%	40,591	54,120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	81%-100%	54,121	67,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	100%+	67,651		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	0%-30%	0	21,615	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	31%-50%	21,616	36,025	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	51%-60%	36,026	43,230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	61%-80%	43,231	57,640	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	81%-100%	57,641	72,050	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	100%+	72,051		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	0%-30%	0	23,344	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	31%-50%	23,345	38,907	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	51%-60%	38,908	46,688	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	61%-80%	46,689	62,251	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	81%-100%	62,252	77,814	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	100%+	77,815		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Households Evaluated					108															
Total Households with a Handicap Resident					60	55.6%														
Total Households with a Senior Resident					12	11.1%														
Total Residents by Each Age Range					Total -	120	4 3.3%	88 73.3%	16 13.3%	12 10.0%										
Totals for Gender/Race/Ethnicity					Total # Used for Gender/Race/Ethnicity Pct Calcs-					108	60 55.6%	48 44.4%	12 11.1%	96 88.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.9%	107 99.1%	
# of Res Eligible for Senior Housing (55+)								28	10.0%											
CSS Caseload # (18 - 61)							104	86.7%												
<b>SUMMARY of Households by AMI</b>					0%-30%	31%-50%	51%-60%	61%-80%	81%-100%	100%+	<b>Total Households Evaluated</b>									
Quantity					92	12	0	2	1	1	108									
Percentage					85.19%	11.11%	0.00%	1.85%	0.93%	0.93%	100%									