

# City of Albuquerque Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency



## Central & Alcazar RFP #01-2023 ADDENDUM #2: Responses to Formal Inquiries 4, 5, and 6

---

### Formal Inquiry #4

Received: August 11, 2023  
Posted: August 15, 2023

**Question Received:** We are finding that the sections referenced in the submission content do not correspond to what is being referenced.

For example,

"iii. **Threshold Criteria.** Describe how the Project meets all of the Threshold Criteria in Section C. Please provide a narrative response to each criterion in the order listed in this RFP."

*When we go to Section C, it is C. Property Information. We believe the correct section is E. Threshold Criteria.*

"iv. **Evaluation Criteria.** Describe how the Project meets all of the Evaluation Criteria described in Section D. Please provide a narrative response to each criterion in the order listed in this RFP. "

*When we go to section D, it is D. Form of Development Assistance. We believe the correct section is F. Evaluation Criteria.*

Could you please confirm that we are referencing the correct sections?

**Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency Response:** You are correct, this was an error in the RFP. For "iii. Threshold Criteria" on page 6, the cross-referenced section should have been E. For "iv. Evaluation Criteria" on page 6, the cross-referenced section should have been F.

---

### Formal Inquiry #5

Received: August 11, 2023  
Posted: August 15, 2023

**Question Received:** Please confirm that we will only have site control once the RFP is awarded. Can we just indicate as such on our narrative?

**Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency Response:** This was an error in the RFP. Awardees do **not** need to provide proof of site control, as the City owns the subject Property. Section G(vi),

Site Control is hereby struck from the RFP. Therefore, proposers also do not need to provide site control documentation briefly referenced in section G(a).

---

**Formal Inquiry #6**

Received: August 11, 2023

Posted: August 15, 2023

**Question Received:** “Economic Impact - Affordable Housing. At least 60% of units are affordable to households <80% AMI & project is being funded and monitored for compliance by governmental entity other than MRA.”

What type of documentation is the MRA seeking from MFA and FCS if those application cycles are not yet open and therefore, we have not yet applied? Would a grid showing how many units are <80% serve as documentation for the 60% threshold?

**Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency Response:**

First, a correction to the AMI affordability threshold: The affordability threshold should be *at or below 80% ( $\leq$ 80%) of the Area Median Income.*

To demonstrate % of units affordable to  $\leq$ 80% AMI, please provide a chart that provides a schedule of unit types (ex: studio, 1br, 2br); number of units by type; # of units affordable per unit type proposed by AMI; and total % affordable. See below for an example chart.

For funding and compliance, describe the anticipated affordable housing funding/financing sources; list which government agency is responsible for monitoring and compliance post-construction; and describe (briefly) how these entities monitor the project for affordability compliance post-construction.

If a Proposer seeks to earn points under this affordability criteria, and is successful in their proposal, they will be required to provide affordable housing at the thresholds and numbers of units listed in the Proposal as a part of the Development Agreement

**Example of an acceptable schedule:**

	Total units	# of units affordable to 60% AMI	# of units affordable to 80% AMI	# of units at market rate	Total % of units affordable at or below 80% AMI
Studio	15	5	5	5	66%
1 Bedroom	10	5	2	3	70%
2 Bedroom	10	3	5	2	80%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>71%</b>