



# MIAMIBEACH

**City of Miami Beach**, 1700 Convention Center Drive, Miami Beach, Florida 33139, [www.miamibeachfl.gov](http://www.miamibeachfl.gov)  
PROCUREMENT DIVISION  
Tel: 305-673-7490, Fax: 786-394-4007

March 15, 2012

RE: ADDENDUM NO. 2 TO REQUEST FOR PROSPOSALS (RFP) NO. 14-11/12, FOR PUBLIC-PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT IN MIAMI BEACH ON NORTH LINCOLN LANE, BETWEEN ALTON ROAD AND MERIDIAN AVENUE, INCLUDING CITY-OWNED PARKING LOT #25 ON 17TH STREET AND LENOX AVENUE, PARKING LOT #26 ON NORTH LINCOLN LANE, BETWEEN LENOX AVENUE AND MICHIGAN AVENUE, AND PARKING LOT #27 ON NORTH LINCOLN LANE BETWEEN JEFFERSON AVENUE AND MERIDIAN AVENUE (the RFP).

The following questions, and the City's response thereto, are forwarded for your information:

Question #1:

*"Page 18, Section 5: Will the City be evaluating each lot concept individually or all the lot concepts in a proposal together, as a whole, for scoring purposes?"*

Answer to Q#1:

Each lot concept will be evaluated individually.

If the SAME Proposer team elects to submit multiple lot concepts and, provided that the other required Proposal submittals do not materially change as a result of the submittal of the multiple concepts, then multiple lot concepts may be submitted pursuant to a single Proposal. Notwithstanding, the Proposal submittal should identify each lot concept separately (For example, Option 1—Parking Lot #25; Option 2—Parking Lot #26; Option 3—Parking Lot #27, etc.).

If, however, a Proposer elects to submit multiple lot concepts but, in doing so, the structure of the Proposing entity or Proposal team is DIFFERENT from concept to concept, or the submittal of multiple concepts materially causes other required Proposal submittals to also change or vary from concept to concept, then in that case the City shall require that each lot concept be submitted as a SEPARATE Proposal.

Question #2:

*"Page 18, Section 5: The RFP Evaluation Criteria awards a maximum of 15 points for: **Proposals which involve "privately-owned property(ies)" that leverage the publicly owned parking lots resulting in maximum public benefit.** Would the City kindly confirm that it is the RFP's intent that (a) such "privately-owned property(ies)" must share a lot line with one of the North Lincoln Lane City-owned parking lots, and (b) the development of the privately-owned property must be physically connected with the proposed development of the publicly owned lot, in order to qualify for the 15 points under this criterion? If not, will the City grant a preference in scoring for proposals that satisfy the foregoing two criteria?"*

Answer to Q#2:

There is no requirement in the RFP that the privately-owned property(ies) must be physically connected with the publicly-owned lot(s). If offering privately-owned property(ies), Proposers should describe how privately-owned property(ies) would be integrated into, or made a part of, the proposed project. The Evaluation Committee, at its sole option and discretion, will allocate *up to* 15 points.

Question #3:

*“Page 18, Section 5: The RFP Evaluation Criteria awards a maximum of 20 points for: **Financial strength, as evidenced by audited financial statements (as amended by addendum)**. Since Proposers for this RFP will likely be newly formed entities, will the City accept financial statements from the proposing entity’s equity owner that has principal financial responsibility for the project?”*

Answer to Q#3:

The City will accept CPA reviewed/audited financial statements from the proposing entity’s equity owner.

Question #4:

*“Page 15, Section IV (Minimum Submittal Requirements): Would the City kindly clarify how a proposer should submit concepts for each individual lot so that each concept can be scored individually? May a proposer submit one proposal with one concept for each of Lot 25, Lot 26 and Lot 27, and have each concept scored separately? Or should a Proposer submit a separate proposal for each lot?”*

Answer to Q#4:

Please see answer to Question #1.

Question #5:

*“If the City will consider an increase in the permitted FAR for the project for one or all lots that are subject to the RFP (or any additional privately contributed land) utilizing a transferable development rights concept?”*

Answer to Q#5:

No, there will be no increase in the permitted FAR.

Question #6:

*“Is the City requiring an environmental audit and what is to be included in the audit? Is the City doing one audit or various audits?”*

Answer to Q#6:

The City is not preparing an environmental audit. Depending on the proposed development project, an environmental audit may be required as part of the project review and approval process.

Question #7:

*“May a development proposal be submitted with alternative development concepts?”*

Answer to Q#7:

See Answer to Q#1.

Question #8:

*“Whether the development rights are strictly bound by the CD-3, GU and surrounding (including privately owned) zoning classifications?”*

Answer to Q#8:

Yes.

Question #9:

*“If the Evaluation Committee has been appointed by the City Manager and if we may obtain a list of Committee members?”*

Answer to Q#9:

The Evaluation Committee has not been appointed yet. Once this list is finalized, it will be made available to the public. It is important to note that the City’s Cone of Silence Ordinance requirements apply to the members of the Evaluation Committee.

Question #10:

*“What type of traffic study should be submitted and what should be included?”*

Answer to Q#10:

A traffic study is not required to be submitted as part of the Proposal submittals. However, a traffic analysis may be required depending on the proposed development project as part of the project review and approval process.

Question #11:

*“Please elaborate on the definition of references and partners under Section IV of the RFP (page 15 of 45) and what should be included?”*

Answer to Q#11:

For purposes of answering the above, and for purposes of clarifying the City’s intent under the RFP as to “References,” the language in Section IV.2.c) of the RFP is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:

References: List at least five (5) of the most relevant or comparable development projects completed by the Proposer (or by one of the associated KEY Proposal team members) during the past five (5) years. For each project, please provide the following information:

- 1) The individual or entity for whom/which the development project was completed (i.e. the contracting entity or “owner”). Include CURRENT information as to a contact person for the individual or firm, and that contact person’s company title, address, e-mail, and telephone #;
- 2) the assigned project personnel;
- 3) scope of development project;
- 4) dollar value of the project;
- 5) summary of how proposing entity or team member(s) delivered services; and
- 6) terms of project agreement.

Question #12:

*"Please elaborate on the definitions of the Qualifications of the Proposer and Associated Proposal Team Members/Management Team and Key Personnel under Section IV of the RFP (page 15 of 45) and what should be included?"*

Answer to Q#12:

The term "Qualifications of Proposer" refers to the experience and qualifications of the Proposing entity. If the Proposing entity is being structured as a joint venture or other business entity (such as an LLC), the qualifications and experience of each of the partners or members should be submitted.

The term "Associated Proposal Team Members" is intended to refer to the KEY members (which can be individuals or entities) of the Proposal team and can include, but not be limited to, a lead architect, a general contractor, an equity or other financial partner, etc. The term is intended to provide the Evaluation and the city with a description of who the KEY members of the Proposal team will be (i.e., in other words, who are the individuals or entities that the Proposer has assembled for the proposed development, and what are their qualifications and experience?).

The terms "Management Team" and "Key Personnel" shall refer to the individual-- who may be employees of and/or retained as independent contractors consultants by—the Proposer AND the Associated Team Members (i.e. in other words, who are the individual key players that will be spearheading the proposed development project on behalf of the Proposer and Associated Proposal Team Members, and what are their individual qualifications and experience?).

Question #13:

*"Would the City please confirm that the 54,000 square foot lot size for parking lot No. 27 (Section III, Paragraph C, Page 13) corresponds with the following legal description:*

*Lots 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15, Block 36, less the south 20 feet thereof, according to the Amended Plat of Golf Course Subdivision of the Alton Beach Realty Company recorded in Plat Book 6, at Page 26, Public Records of Dade County, Florida."*

Answer to Q#13:

Yes, this is the legal description.

Proposers are reminded to please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum as part of their proposal submission.

Thank you,



Gus Lopez, CPPO  
Procurement Director

F:\PURC\\$\ALL\GUS\RFP\RFP-14-11-12 Parking Lots\Addendums\AddendumNo.2.docx