



# City of Albuquerque Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency

## Addendum #4

### Answers to Questions for the El Vado-Casa Grande Site RFP

Date: May 30, 2014

---

The City has received two separate sets of questions on May 23<sup>rd</sup> and will provide answers to them separately, but within this addendum. The second set of questions will follow directly below this first set.

1. Question: *Is there an ALTA or other Site Surveys available to Proposers in CAD format?*

Answer: No, the survey is a pdf format.

2. Question: *Where the property abuts Central Avenue (Hwy 66)), can new curb cuts be made to either enter or exit the site?*

Answer: The proposals will be evaluated as a whole project. If additional ingress/egress curb-cuts are required for the purposes of providing proper alignment with drive aisles, then the City is open to proposals that include these curb-cuts. However, the bid should also show that other existing curb-cuts will be eliminated. Attention to pedestrianism and traffic safety is important when evaluating curb-cut relocations.

3. Question: *Can the planned Cul-de-Sac at the intersection of New York and Central Avenue be eliminated to allow for another street-ending solution that could increase the usability of the Site?*

Answer: The cul-de-sac is currently being designed. The vacation of New York Avenue at the intersection of Central Avenue implies that there will be no movement of vehicular traffic from Central Avenue to New York Avenue. If the bidder can show another street ending solution that does not allow vehicular access to the neighborhood in the proposal other than the cul-de-sac and maintains a bicycle/pedestrian easement between New York Avenue and Central Avenue, then it may be considered by the City.

4. Question: *Can the vacation of New York Avenue be delayed to allow for the selected Developer to propose its development plan?*

Answer: The vacation of New York Avenue has already been approved by the City Council, and the replat of the site, including this vacation, has been approved by the Development Review Board (DRB).

5. Question: *Can the re-plat of the parcels into one large parcel be delayed to allow the selected Developer to propose its development Plan? Allowing for more than one tax lot could provide valuable flexibility in financing the overall project.*

Answer: As mentioned in the previous answer, the replat has been approved by the DRB and recorded with the County Clerk. However, the City is not opposed to the selected developer subdividing this lot into logical parcels. The City will work with the selected developer to obtain the best possible solutions for access to the site and optimal utilization of the land.

6. Question: *Would parking be permitted in the easement on the vacated New York Avenue as long as pedestrians and bicycles can still have a path dedicated for them?*

Answer: The City would not be opposed to parking within the easement as long as the pedestrian/bike path is always separated from vehicles. The path must be a dedicated direct route from the neighborhood to the Central Avenue right-of-way without any temporary or permanent obstacles.

The second set of questions and answers follows below:

1. Question: *Is there any chance of the City not closing off NY Ave. with the cul-de-sac and leaving that access point open to Central if a proposed project needs its for parking/site circulation purposes?*

Answer: New York Avenue will be terminated with a cul-de-sac on the south side of the site; there will be no thru traffic from Central Avenue to the neighborhood. Access to the site from Central Avenue may be from the existing New York Avenue, but will not continue into the neighborhood. A pedestrian/bike path shall be maintained along the easement without vehicular conflicts, but the successful proposer can help decide the exact location of this path.

2. Question: *Does the 40 page limitation include tab and cover pages?*

Answer: The following items are excluded from the 40 page limitation: title/cover page, table of contents, tab pages, resumes, and financial documentation required in Sections IV.E.1, IV.E.4, and IV.E.5. (Please see Addendum #5)

3. Question: *Are we restricted to a certain font size on the narrative information that will be provided in the proposal?*

Answer: No, there is not a required font size. The bidder may utilize whatever font and size desired, but please use judgment; if the font is unreadable, the Ad Hoc Selection Committee may not be able to score the proposal correctly.

4. Question: *Do you want resumes for the development team or just a brief summary on a team members history/experience/so forth? If resumes are required, will they be counted towards the 40 page limitation?*

Answer: Providing resumes or a summary of the team members in the proposal is up to each proposing entity. However, as stated in a previous answer, resumes are not to be included in the 40-page limitation. If the proposing entity desires to include a brief summary of the principal team members, this text will count towards the 40 page limitation.

5. Question: *Do we have to provide documentation for obtaining a variance/zone change if the project we are proposing is multifamily rental? I believe the current zoning allows that by right.*

Answer: A variance or zone change should be mentioned in the proposal as a requirement for the project to proceed. The Ad Hoc Selection Committee will use its discretion when determining if the proposed variance or zone change is achievable and may deduct points if it does not appear to be readily achievable. Obtaining either a variance or a zone change before the project is awarded is not asked for and not possible as the successful bidder does not have control of the site yet.

6. Question: *Will the City entertain donating the sites to the successful developer/proposer in lieu of paying the fair market value?*

Answer: The City is interested in the site becoming a catalytic development project that will bring renewed prosperity and vitality to the area and create energy for other projects to move forward in the area. As mentioned in the RFP, the Metropolitan Redevelopment Code allows the Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency of the City to accept Fair Value, rather than Fair Market Value, for the site as long as the site is in a Metropolitan Redevelopment Area, has an adopted Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan, and provides community and economic benefits for the area as described in the Metropolitan Redevelopment Code.

7. Question: *Would our organizational audited financials be included in the 40 page limitation?*

Answer: As stated above, financial documentation required in Sections IV.E.1, IV.E.4, and IV.E.5 will not be considered as a part of the 40-page limitation. (Please see Addendum #5)

8. Question: *Do you want the sources and uses information to show exactly what source pays for what use/cost or can it be more general (ie., separate tables for development costs, construction sources, & permanent sources)?*

Answer: The sources and uses information does not need to be so detailed that it shows what source pays for what use.

9. Question: *Can a 15 year cashflow be provided, rather than the 10 year stated in the RFP?*

Answer: Yes.