

**ADDENDUM
TO
BOROUGH OF ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS & PROPOSALS FOR
A QUALIFIED DEVELOPER FOR HUDSON TERRACE MUNICIPAL SITE**

NOVEMBER 13, 2020

TO: RESPONDENTS SUBMITTING NOTICE OF INTENT TO RESPOND TO RFQ/P

This **Addendum** is being issued on behalf of the Borough of Englewood Cliffs (the “Borough”) to response to questions that have been raised regarding the Borough’s Request for Qualifications and Proposals for a Qualified Developer for Hudson Terrace Municipal Site.

1. Will the Borough consider a 65-year ground lease? This is typically required of LIHTC investors.

RESPONSE: We will consider a 65 year ground lease if credible evidence is indicated suggesting that this would improve the competitiveness of the 9% application, however, as the LIHTC compliance period for the initial investors is only 15 years, it’s not clear to us that extending the land lease term beyond 45 years would be advantageous to the application.

2. Will the Borough consider more than 13% very low-income units, but no more than 20%?

RESPONSE: Yes, we will consider this. However, raising the percentage of very low-income units above 13% may not improve the competitive position of the application, and may marginally reduce net income, thereby potentially-reducing loan amount. The Borough’s overall standard for evaluating such changes to the project will be the impact of the changes on the competitiveness of the application as scored by HMFA.

3. Will the Borough allow a non-revenue superintendent’s unit in addition to the maximum number of revenue units? For example, 65 LIHTC units plus super’s unit = 66 units.

RESPONSE: Yes, we will consider this. However, we would be concerned that the additional unit would add to project cost but not generate revenue, and thus may adversely impact the achievement of the lowest possible tax credit amount per bedroom in a tie-breaker scenario.

4. Are there any restrictive covenants attached to the properties which would preclude the proposed residential development?

RESPONSE: As noted on page 2 of the RFP. “Regarding Municipal Site B, as identified on the attached Site Maps, the Borough will take appropriate steps to eliminate the easement identified

as Easement 3 (sheet on 1 of 4) prior to LIHTC application filing. The Borough is not aware of any other restrictive covenants attached to the properties which would preclude the development.”

5. Will the Borough allow the demolition of structures and relocation of utilities to be completed by the developer?

RESPONSE: *Yes, it will consider this.*

6. Can we obtain relevant site information (including the Harbor Consultants Inc. survey plans provided) in CAD format?

RESPONSE: *The Boundary & Topographic Survey is being prepared by the Borough Engineer's Office and is not yet completed. It will be shared with all respondents upon completion. The Exhibits that were attached to the RFP are based upon tax map and GIS data only. These Exhibits can be provided in an autocadd format.*

7. In accordance with Section 1.7 of the October 22, 2020 RFQ/P, we had a question that we wanted to pose to the group. In preparing our architectural drawings, we wanted to see if the Borough had a preference as to architectural style. We have observed that the some of the newer and proposed developments in the Borough have a more modern look. 800 Sylvan and the new LG facility are what come to mind. Simply put, does the Borough have a preference as to traditional, modern or some other architectural style? If you could kindly let me know we would be happy to tailor our architectural package accordingly.

RESPONSE: *The Borough does not have a particular architectural or design style it prefers for the project. We encourage respondents to send us examples of recent project designs which they have built and we will review these as part of our overall evaluation of proposals.*

8. The survey provided isn't formatted correctly and, as such, is not able to be scaled accurately. Is there another survey of the property available?

RESPONSE: *The Borough is in the process of obtaining a Boundary & Topographic Survey that will be provided to the Developer, however this Survey is not anticipated to be completed prior to the proposal due date. Autocadd drawings of the Exhibits prepared by Harbor Consultants can be provided, however these Exhibits are only based on tax maps and should not be considered an accurate dimensional drawing.*

9. If the Borough wishes to have the developer transfer through a land lease will they consider a 99 year lease. Tax credit investors generally do not like shorter lease periods.

RESPONSE: *We will consider a longer term for the ground lease if credible evidence is indicated suggesting that this would improve the competitiveness of the 9% application; however, the LIHTC compliance period for the initial investors is only 15 years. It is not clear to us that extending the term of the land lease well beyond 454 years would be advantageous to the application.*

10. Will the Borough accept representative architecture vs. drawn renderings for various

options provided. Generally, we like to present stylistic options and then after discussion present elevation that fit with the Borough's vision for the property.

RESPONSE: *Yes, the Borough will accept representative architecture illustrating designs and elevations, of recent projects built, in lieu of new design sketches.*

11. Reference section- it is unclear if you are looking for written letter references to be included or just contact information for the people/groups we will use as reference. Please clarify.

RESPONSE: *Contacts of references will be sufficient. Please include email addresses and multiple phone numbers if available. However, to the extent you have written references available, please include them as well.*

12. Can the Borough provide a copy of their final settlement agreement?

RESPONSE: *Yes, the Borough will arrange to provide that separately if requested.*

13. For the one "original" submission, will you accept digitally signed documents vs. binding of an original inked signature document?

RESPONSE: *Yes, digital signatures will be accepted to reduce the sizes of the electronic documents.*

14. Can the Borough confirm they have sufficient allocation with the Bergen County UA for the additional (residential) sewer flow from the project area?

RESPONSE: *See second paragraph on page 2 of the RFQ/RFP dated October 22, 2020.*

15. Can the Borough confirm the existing sewer system has sufficient conveyance capacity for the additional (residential) sewer flow from the project area?

RESPONSE: *See second paragraph on page 2 of the RFQ/RFP dated October 22, 2020.*

16. Can you please provide a complete copy of the survey for lots A & B?

RESPONSE: *The Boundary & Topographic Survey is being prepared by the Borough Engineer's Office and is not yet completed. It will be shared with all respondents upon completion. The Exhibits that were attached to the RFP are based upon tax map and GIS data only.*

17. There is reference in the RFP to the possibility of providing 5 special needs units. NJHMFA will require the provision of 5 homeless units for the project to be competitive for tax credits, are you referring to additional special needs' units beyond the required 5?

RESPONSE: *No, if 5 units for homeless are included, we will not require any special needs units.*

18. There is reference in the RFP to a shared parking study is this available for review?

RESPONSE: *The study is being prepared. The Borough can provide the study once completed.*