

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS
Request for Qualifications
Development Partner for HOP VI/CNI
Application 2010 Funding Round
RFQ No. 8091-0-2010/MO
Addendum #1

The following questions have been received regarding the above-referenced RFQ. The questions and answers are below:

Question #1

From the language in the RFQ we have intuited this would be a developer led team since the federal funding sources are not known and you seek to implement using any and all financial sources with the “development partner.” We are being approached by teams who have done successful HOPE VI applications but are architect led with supporting funding experts. In your opinion is either approach viable, or are you really seeking a developer partner with some “skin in the game” for the application as well as the Master Development Agreement, too?

Answer #1:

While the CDA has successfully completed three (3) Low-Income Housing Tax Credit projects and one (1) New Markets Tax Credit project, this is the first time the CDA has applied for a HOPE VI grant.

As a result, the CDA is looking for a development partner with demonstrated successful experience in HOPE VI. The CDA believes that a developer led team would make the CDA’s application stronger.

Question #2

The RFQ calls for procuring a “development partner.” It is not clear from the RFQ whether the CDA is looking to procure:

- a) A developer to manage the HOPE VI/CNI application process, and then to have the developer develop and own the redevelopment,
- b) A developer to form partnership with the City of Madison in both development and ownership, i.e., that is a partnership structure in which the CDA is in the ownership structure of the redevelopment, or
- c) A developer to manage the HOPE VI application process and the implementation of the HOPE VI grant for a fee as a consultant to the CDA.

We specifically ask this because the contract for purchase of services attached as Appendix C is more consistent with a consultant approach than a developer/owner or partnership with the CDA.

A Master Development Agreement would be a more typical document to evidence the relationship between a developer and a government agency in this type of situation. Please clarify.

Answer #2:

This question is similar to question #1. Among (a), (b), or (c), the CDA is looking for a partnership more closely allied with (b). Exactly how the partnership will be configured will be a part of the negotiations.

Correct, a Master Development Agreement would be the more preferred document. Some of the elements within the contract for purchase of services may be in the Master Development Agreement.

Question #3:

In the submission requirements on pages 6 and 7, questions 5 and 7 seem to cover similar ground. Both seem to be asking to provide a statement of understanding of the Scope of Services. Did you intend to have this overlap? Is it acceptable to interpret question 5 as a question regarding the understanding of Scope of Services and question 7 as a question regarding understanding of project concept?

Answer #3:

In order to cut down on the responses, question 7 can be eliminated. Please focus your response regarding understanding of Scope of Services and project concept to question 5. We apologize for any confusion.