

The following questions were received in response to the Okeechobee Transit Site RFP. Miami-Dade County is providing the following answers:

Q: Confirm environmental clearance and Davis-Bacon wages are required.

A: Yes, these items are required.

Q: Why would the developer have to go through environmental clearance to develop the site? Are there any HUD funds contemplated for this project?

A: An environmental clearance will be required, because federal subsidies may be involved in the financing of this project.

Q: Do Davis Bacon or Responsible Wages apply to this project?

A: Davis-Bacon Labor Requirements are applicable to this project, and they supersede the Responsible Wages Ordinance.

Q: What is driving the HUD requirements – Project Based Vouchers (PBV) other HUD funding?

A: The successful proposer may seek and receive Section 8 Project-Based Vouchers, and other HUD funding sources such as Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program funds for this project, as well as state funding including Documentary Surtax and SHIP Program funds. If that is the case, then the associated requirements will apply.

Q: The Exhibit “A” documents in the RFP are typically applied to public housing developments. Why were they included in this RFP?

A: These forms are not required, and are for informational purposes only. Note: the land was acquired with federal resources.

Q: Exhibit A – HUD Form 500300 Mixed-Finance Rental Term Sheet, HUD 51915 Agreement between Owner & Design Professional. Are these documents supposed to be completed and submitted with the response or is it just for information?

A: These forms are not required, and are for informational purposes only.

Q: Proposal is for a development comprised of Section 8, Low Income Housing Tax Credits, and market rate rental units at or below 140% area median income (AMI). At least 98 units should be developed for the elderly, ages 62 and older. How are the Section 8 vouchers being provided?

A: Proposers may opt to apply for Section 8 Project-Based Vouchers for this project. With the exception of the required 98 units for the elderly, the unit mix is left to the discretion of the proposer. Market rate units are unrestricted.

Q: Is there a project-based Section 8 contract contemplated for this site? If so, how many units will be included?

A: Proposers may opt to seek as many Section 8 Project-Based Vouchers as available and allowed per HUD regulations in 24 CFR 983. The basis for the unit mix is left to the discretion of the proposer.

Q: How many Section 8 vouchers will be made available and what rents can we assume? This is needed in order to provide the County a feasible financial plan and estimate of proceeds.

A: Proposers may opt to seek as many Section 8 Project-Based Vouchers as available and allowed per HUD regulations in 24 CFR 983. With the exception of the required 98 units for the

elderly, the unit mix is left to the discretion of the proposer. Rental costs are left to the discretion of the proposer.

Q: Will there be Project-based Vouchers on this site? If so, which assumptions should we use?

A: Proposers may opt to seek as many Section 8 Project-Based Vouchers as available and allowed per HUD regulations in 24 CFR 983. With the exception of the required 98 units for the elderly, the unit mix is left to the discretion of the proposer. Rental costs are left to the discretion of the proposer.

Q: Is there a unit mix the County would prefer?

A: With the exception of the required 98 units for the elderly, the unit mix is left to the discretion of the proposer.

Q: Should we base it on market feasibility or SURTAX RFA scoring criteria?

A: The basis for the unit mix is left to the discretion of the proposer; and is not related to the Surtax Request for Applications scoring criteria.

Q: Will the County allow for seniors 55 years of age and older?

A: The basis for the unit mix is left to the discretion of the proposer. The State of Florida and U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provide the following senior housing qualification criteria: All occupants are 62 and older; HUD has found the housing was specifically designed for housing elderly people; or 80 percent of the units have at least one tenant over the age of 55, as per HUD. Senior housing includes apartment buildings and complexes.

Q: Extremely Low Income (ELI) – Page 4: The ELI AMI noted is 30% or below. The SURTAX gap RFA is at 33% AMI. Please confirm the ELI AMI for this RFP.

A: Extremely low-income (ELI) is defined as those families earning no more than 30% of the area median income (AMI) applicable to this project.

Q: Attachment Forms listed on page 2: Would you please distribute these forms or let us know where they can be found?

A: The attachment forms are being provided to proposers, and are available at PHCD's website: <http://www.miamidade.gov/Housing/>.

Q: Pre-Qualification Certification – page 4: Is the intent that this certification be required post selection from the third parties - architect, engineer, surveyor etc.?

A: No, this certification is required at the time of submission of proposals. All firms must have obtained the Pre-Qualification Certification from Miami-Dade County as described in the "Definitions" section of this RFP.

Q: Proposal Guarantee Deposit – page 10: What is the amount of the deposit required?

A: The amount of the deposit required is as follows: All proposals must be accompanied by a negotiable bid guarantee which shall not be less than one percent (1%) of the amount of the award.

Q: In regard to the proposal guarantee deposit, how do you define "the award"? Is it \$5 million of GOB funds?

A: The award is defined as the \$5 million dollars in available General Obligation Bond (GOB) funds. Thus, the dollar amount of the proposal guarantee deposit is 1% of \$5 million, or \$50,000.

Q: Section 2.1 - page 23: 4<sup>th</sup> line on the page states "...create an attractive and affordable supportive housing development..." What is the County's intent for adding the word supportive to the description?

A: The inclusion of supportive amenities or facilities in the development plan is left to the discretion of the proposer.

Q: Timeline – page 24: The County's goal is to have the Okeechobee Transit project proceed as expeditiously as possible, in order to complete, and have available for occupancy, all infrastructure and housing rental units by 2018. This does not correspond with the Milestone Deadlines on page 31 which provide for 1,050 days (approximately 35 months or 3 years 2019).

A: You are correct. The completion date is approximately 35 months or 3 years, 2019. However, see Addendum # 3 for a revised timeline.

Q: Would completion by 2020 be a more realistic timeframe?

A: Miami-Dade County intends for the development to be completed by 2019. Developers with a successful track record for timely completion of projects are encouraged to apply.

Q: When does the County expect to select and approve a developer?

A: Miami-Dade County intends to provide evaluation committee scores of proposals by the end of 2016, and a future Board of County Commission (BCC) agenda item recommending a successful proposer will be submitted to the BCC in early 2017.

Q: The timeline doesn't account for any gap subsidy applications.

A: Proposers seeking gap subsidies are not precluded from applying for additional funds. However, Miami-Dade County wants the development to be completed by 2019. Developers with a successful track record for timely completion of projects are encouraged to apply.

Q: Proposal requirements – page 24: Items 1 (lighting), 2 (signage plans) and 6 (detailed survey) seem to be post selection requirements, please confirm if they are required with the proposal.

A: Yes, the above listed items are part of a list of items required as part of the proposal; please refer to Pages 24 and 25.

Q: Clarify requirements on Section 3.2 Part 5 - page 34: g. Additionally, proposers shall provide rates for the team members associated with completion of the conceptual design. What is meant by rates, is it applicable to this RFP?

A: It is left to the discretion of the proposer to determine budgeted compensation rates for team members associated with completion of the conceptual design.

Q: Clarify requirements on Section 3.2 Part 5 - page 34: I. Provide a project schedule – Is this the same as item b. on page 33? If not, please differentiate?

A: Item b. on Page 33 is similar to Item I. on Page 34. Both items require the proposer to provide a project schedule identifying specific key tasks and duration. In addition, Item I. on Page 34 requires proposers to indicate timing for start-up of operation, which may include providing staff and furnishings to the site.

Q: Clarify requirements on Section 3.2 Part 5 - page 34: m. Identify if Proposer's proposed plan meets the requirements of the Scope of Services – Is this the same as item a. on page 33? If not, please differentiate?

A: Item m. on Page 34 is not the same as Item a. on Page 33. Item a. on Page 33 requires proposers to provide a detailed narrative outlining their approach with graphic representations of the conceptual plan, and requires additional items as stated. Item m. on Page 34 requires proposers to respond in one of three ways: to identify if the proposed plan meets the requirements of the Scope of Services; or to identify if the proposed plan will meet the requirements of the Scope of Services with modifications and explain how; or to identify if the proposed plan cannot provide the requirements of the Scope of Services and explain why.

Q: Clarify requirements on Section 3.2 Part 5 - page 34: p. Provide proof of experience with affordable housing financing – Is this a repetition of the documents being provided under Minimum Qualification Requirements on page 32? If not, please differentiate?

A: The minimum qualification requirements on page 32 are the same as those restated on page 34, Section 3.2 Part 5p. As long as the proposer provides all information required, there is no need to respond twice. Proposals that do not provide the requested documentation shall be deemed non-responsive, and will not be scored or ranked by the Selection Committee.

Q: Section 3 - Appendix B - page 7, Bid Requirements Package Request, Section 3 Business Preference Claim Form, Economic Opportunity & Affirmative Marketing Plan, Contractor/subcontractor Estimated Project Work Force Breakdown - Are all these documents required to be completed and submitted with the proposal or post selection?

A: Yes, these documents are required to be completed and submitted with the proposal.

Q: Aviation Sub-element, Port of Miami River (starts on page 174): Are these relevant to this project, if so please explain?

A: The entire Transportation Element from the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) is included in the RFP for reference.

Q: Are there any third party reports the County can share, (i.e., environmental report, traffic study, market feasibility)?

A: The Environmental Review Record will be posted on our website. Due to the cone of silence applicable to this RFP, proposers are not free to call other County departments to request information.

Q: The RFP requires responders to prepare a Development Plan. This process may be facilitated through discussions and due diligence with County Staff including but not limited to members of the Planning, Zoning, Public Works, Fire, and WASD. Please confirm whether bidders may communicate with staff persons from these departments as part of their due diligence.

A: Due to the cone of silence applicable to this RFP, proposers are not free to call other County departments to request information.

Q: We would like to request that the RFP deadline be extended a few weeks. There is a SAIL funding application due to Florida Housing that week and we feel as though the County would get more varied responses if the deadline is extended.

A: Miami-Dade County extended the due date for proposals to Monday, October 31, 2016. Proposers should regularly check PHCD's website at: [www.miamidade.gov/housing](http://www.miamidade.gov/housing) for information updates regarding this Request for Proposals.

Q: Are you able to provide the included survey as a CAD file? If not, are we able to gain access to the site to survey the site ourselves? How soon can we do that?

A: Yes, the attached survey CAD drawings will be provided via electronic mail to the list of all potential proposers. Additionally, the site is accessible during daylight hours.

Q: Please define “substantial commercial space.” How much Square Footage would you like to see? What type of commercial? Big box?

A: The plan, design, and type of the substantial commercial space is left to the discretion of the proposer. Miami-Dade County would encourage developers to analyze market conditions, by conducting a market analysis to ensure the viability of future commercial space. Proposers should determine the best use for the commercial space, supported by market evidence. Proposers may provide supporting documentation and a description of the commercial space as part of the design concept report required in Section 2.4, item 1. B. 2. on page 25.

Q: What’s the exiting transit ridership at this station?

A: In June, 2015, there were a total of 32,495 monthly boardings at Okeechobee Metrorail Station. In June, 2016, there were a total of 34,923 monthly boardings at Okeechobee Metrorail Station; a percentage change increase of 7.5%.

Q: What’s the average occupancy of the existing parking garage?

A: As of June, 2016, the average occupancy of the existing parking garage at Okeechobee Metrorail Station is 351 spaces. The number of actual available parking spaces is 1,398.

Q: Will we be required to replace the existing surface parking spaces? If so, by how many?

A: The Development Plan must comply with parking requirements as provided in Chapter 98 – Division 32 Okeechobee Rapid Transit Zone and must provide a kiss-and-ride in close proximity to the transit station.

Q: There is a substantial parking garage north of the property that is underutilized. Can we utilize parking in this structure to meet the Okeechobee Rapid Transit Zone parking requirement?

A: There is an existing parking garage to the north of Okeechobee Metrorail Station; however its primary purpose is for use by transit patrons. Miami-Dade County will consider a shared parking agreement with the existing structure, or will consider renting parking to the successful proposer.

Q: Would the county consider a shared parking agreement with the existing structure?

A: Miami-Dade County will consider a shared parking agreement with the existing structure, or will consider renting parking to the successful proposer.

Q: Chapter 98, Division 32 of Hialeah’s City Code requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit and 0.75 parking spaces per age-restricted dwelling unit. The CDMP provides that rapid transit zones should be developed in accordance with urban center requirements. The County’s standard parking requirements for multifamily uses in urban centers is: 1.0 space per 1-bedroom unit; 1.5 spaces per 2-bedroom unit; 1.75 spaces per 3+ bedroom units; and 0.5 spaces per age-restricted unit. Please confirm that applicable parking requirement.

A: The current applicable minimum parking requirement is the Miami-Dade County requirement of two (2) parking spaces per dwelling unit or 0.75 parking spaces per dwelling unit for housing for the elderly. However, Miami-Dade County is willing to consider seeking an administrative zoning variance, through the Rapid Transit Development Impact Committee, to allow a reduced parking requirement at the site.

Q: Do we need to upgrade anything in the existing station? If so, what? Or do you have an approximate cost of those improvements?

A: Proposers can propose improvements to the existing station, to create a fully integrated housing, commercial and transit-oriented development with a covered walkway connection. The development cost estimate and budget are left to the discretion of the proposer.

Q: I was following up on the project “Mixed-Use Housing and Commercial Transit-oriented Development of the Okeechobee Transit Site.” What is the cost estimate/budget?

A: The development cost estimate and budget are left to the discretion of the proposer.

Q: Current Density of 125 units per acre – page 23: The City of Hialeah Zoning Code shows the site is zoned at 30 units per acre.

A: The Okeechobee Rapid Transit Zone Master Plan Development Standards were modified on April 15, 2016. The maximum density shall be 125 units per gross acre of the site.

Q: Please confirm the density units per acre. If the density is not currently 125 units per acre, has the County initiated a change in zoning to 125 units per acre and if so what is the estimated time for approval?

A: The Okeechobee Rapid Transit Zone Master Plan Development Standards were modified on April 15, 2016. The maximum density shall be 125 units per gross acre of the site.

Q: What other zoning changes should we assume: Parking requirements, height restrictions, setbacks?

A: The Okeechobee Rapid Transit Zone Master Plan Development Standards were modified on April 15, 2016. The maximum building height shall be 15 stories.

Q: Please confirm the maximum permissible height. Chapter 98, Division 32 of Hialeah’s City Code allows a maximum height of nine stories.

A: The maximum building height shall be 15 stories.

Q: The density is described as 125 units per acre in the RFP, but Chapter 98, Division 32 of the Okeechobee Rapid Transit Zone describes density as 30 units per acre. Which is correct?

A: The Okeechobee Rapid Transit Zone Master Plan Development Standards were modified on April 15, 2016. The maximum density shall be 125 units per gross acre of the site.

Q: Section 2.1 of the RFP requests that responders provide a “Development Plan of the site that complies with Chapter 98 – Division 32 Okeechobee Rapid Transit Zone of the City of Hialeah’s Code of Ordinances.” Section 2.1 also specifies that the “current density is 125 units per acre”, which is consistent with the County’s CDMP. See CDMP p. I-48. Chapter 98, Division 32 of Hialeah’s Code states that the maximum density is 30 units per acre. Please confirm that proposals should develop up to 125 units per acre.

A: The Okeechobee Rapid Transit Zone Master Plan Development Standards were modified on April 15, 2016. The maximum density shall be 125 units per gross acre of the site.

Q: The County’s CDMP provides that “all future rapid transit station sites and their surroundings shall, at a minimum, be developed in accordance with the Community Center policies.” Those policies specify the average Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for Community Centers is “**greater** than 1.5 in the Code.” See CDMP p. I-48, emphasis added. Hialeah’s City Code lists the *maximum* FAR as 1.5. Achieving a density of 125 units per acre on a 3.492 acre property is practically impossible within an FAR of 1.5. Please confirm if the applicable maximum FAR is 1.5 or greater than 1.5. If greater, what FAR should we assume.

A: [The applicable average Floor Area Ratio is greater than 1.5 in the core, as provided on page I-48 of the Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan.](#)

Q: Section 2.1 of the RFP states that the subject folio “is a total of 11.859 acres owned by Miami-Dade County” but that only “the southern 3.492 acres” is subject to the RFP. Given the unified ownership of the property, may Development Plans submitted in response to the RFP contemplate the transfer of development potential (*i.e.*, floor area and density) from the northern part of the subject property to the southern?

A: [Miami-Dade County will consider proposals that contemplate the transfer of development potential from the northern part of the property to the southern part of the property.](#)

Q: Chapter 33C of the County Code requires some rapid transit development to comply with the Metrorail Compendium of Design Criteria. Will Development Plans submitted pursuant to this RFP be required to comply with those design criteria?

A: [The Compendium of Design Criteria provides design criteria for development of equipment, fixtures and amenities within the Metrorail station. Proposals that include development of equipment, fixtures or amenities within the Metrorail station will be required to comply with the Compendium of Design Criteria.](#)

Q: In the event of a conflict between the requirements of the County CDMP, County Code Chapter 33C, the Metrorail Compendium of Design Criteria, and the Hialeah City Code, which regulation controls?

A: [Miami-Dade County requirements are applicable to the site.](#)

Q: Would you consider CBOs as a small/minority firm? If not, would you consider adding this experience to scoring item B?

A: [The board of directors’ structure of a community-based organization may or may not qualify as a small firm or minority-owned firm. At this time, Miami-Dade County is not considering adding this experience to scoring item B.](#)