

## ADDENDUM NUMBER 2

August 20, 2021

**Bid No. RFP 2021-SA1**

**Request for Proposals - Small Acre Multifamily Rental Single-Family Ownership  
Bench**

**Housing Authority Prince George's County  
9200 Basil Court, Suite 500  
Largo, MD 20744**

---

---

Receipt of this Addendum is to be acknowledged by the Respondent by signing, dating, and submitting with the solicitation. Failure to do so may render the quote non-responsive.

The following revisions, clarifications, additions, and/or deletions are included in this Addendum No. 2 to the subject RFP and are to be fully incorporated into each Respondent's submission for work solicited therein.

Respondent acknowledges receipt of Addendum: \_\_\_\_\_  
Respondent's Signature Date

---

**RFI – Submitted Questions received from Respondents with Response.**

**QUESTION 1:**

Who owns the parcels/plots other than HAPGC?

---

**The Concourse Group/HAPGC Response:**

- All of the parcels included in the Solicitation are owned by HAPGC;
- To the extent Respondents are interested in viewing ownership information of parcels that are adjacent to those owned by HAPGC, Respondents may do so on PGAtlas.com, the County's Real Estate GIS mapping application.

---

**QUESTION 2:**

What are the full dimensions of each parcel/plot?

---

**The Concourse Group/HAPGC Response:**

- Respondents are responsible for conducting their own due diligence;
- Respondents are encouraged to view available parcel information on PGAtlas.com, the County's Real Estate GIS mapping application, for details concerning parcel dimensions.

---

**QUESTION 3:**



Will the road curve?

---

**The Concourse Group/HAPGC Response:**

- Section 5 of the County’s East Riverdale-Beacon Heights Sector Plan calls for the extension of 64th Avenue along existing public Rights of Way with connections to Roanoke Avenue, Sheridan Street, and Tuckerman Avenue as shown in the 64th Avenue Extension Exhibit in Exhibit A of the Solicitation;
- Respondents’ conceptual site plans must meet the requirements set forth in Section 3 of the Solicitation and should depict the planned extension of 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue in a manner that conforms with Section 5 of the Sector Plan.

---

**QUESTION 4:**

What are the Affordability Restrictions? How will they be restricted and/or structured?

---

**The Concourse Group/HAPGC Response:**

- Respondents are responsible for proposing designated affordability levels, based on the ranges set forth in Appendix F of the Solicitation, for each unit type included their development program;
- The affordability requirements will be memorialized in restrictive covenants that are recorded and run with the deed for each parcel and will be binding upon the Respondent and all future owners of the Property.

---

**QUESTION 5:**

Is Community approval needed?

---

**The Concourse Group/HAPGC Response:**

- HAPGC will solicit and incorporate community feedback into their final evaluation of the Respondent proposals;
- The selected Respondent will be responsible for navigating all required County zoning and subdivision plan approval processes – Respondents are encouraged to coordinate with the County’s Planning Department in order to prepare a detailed schedule depicting the expected receipt of final subdivision approvals (as applicable), building permits, unit deliveries, and final Certificates of Occupancy as described on page 25 of the Solicitation.

---

**QUESTION 6:**

Is this a Tax Credit Redevelopment?

---

**The Concourse Group/HAPGC Response:**



- Respondents may elect to propose either fee-simple or rental affordable housing and are responsible for preparing capital structures that are executable and meet HAPGC's financial goals as enumerated in the Solicitation;
- Respondents may elect to propose the use of Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) for the project, however, LIHTC use is not a stipulated Solicitation requirement.

---

**QUESTION 7:**

What if there is only interest in Parcels 1-4?

---

**The Concourse Group/HAPGC Response:**

- HAPGC invites respondents to submit proposals for the development of all six sites. Respondents should be prepared to explain their rationale for excluding specific development parcels from their development program.

---

**QUESTION 8:**

Who is responsible for Utilities?

---

**The Concourse Group/HAPGC Response:**

- Respondents are responsible the provision of utility infrastructure to each Development Parcel and are encouraged to conduct their own due diligence with utility providers as referenced in the Solicitation.

---

\*\*\*\*\* END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2 \*\*\*\*\*

PROCUREMENT

