



County of San Diego – Addendum 7

QUESTION – Regarding the ground lease, would you consider a lump sum payment up front and de minimis annual payments thereafter?

COUNTY ANSWER – No, the property is expected to provide a stream of revenue for the term of the lease.

QUESTION Does above ground parking counts against your FAR? Also, does the FAR from the county garage land transfer to parcels B/C?

COUNTY ANSWER – Developer would be responsible for determining FAR ratios for their proposed project. The FAR from County garage land does not transfer to parcels B/C.

QUESTION Are the requirements in the RFQ that a respondent must meet pass/fail, or will the county assess on an individual basis and may allow some to move to the RFP process even though they may not meet 100% of the stated qualifications, but meet the majority? We have received this question on a few different items, including:

-developer resume requirements, most notably past experience.

-having a full team already assembled for an RFQ: for many developers, especially the most qualified, it is not normal to have an equity partner, architect, GC, and the other members of the development team already identified at this point. As an example, many developers have several sources of capital, not just one, while equity groups often won't commit to projects this early in the process.

COUNTY ANSWER Section 5.0 Evaluation Criteria of the RFSQ addresses this question.

Pursuant to section 4.10 (d) "Required information includes: Any letters of interest or commitment letters from potential lenders or equity partners."



QUESTION 4.5.1.A.1. requires *At least three (3) projects where the lead developer was primarily responsible for the development of the project of similar nature to that which is proposed in the SOQs*; and question 4.5.1.A.2. requires *At least one (1) of the three (3) projects listed in Section 4.5.1 above, the development value must be over \$25 million*. Our development firm has successfully completed (2) Class-A projects in the last 10 years for a cumulative development value of \$130 million, the first project was \$45 million and the second project was \$85 million. Both of these previously completed projects are immediately adjacent to this Cedar/Kettner Site, the site conditions are very similar, and the project we plan to build would be very similar to the project we completed 2 years ago. I respectfully request that (2) Class-A projects with a cumulative development value over \$120 million be acceptable qualifications in lieu of the (3) requested in original RFSQ.

COUNTY ANSWER – RFSQ is revised in Addendum 8.

QUESTION 4.5.1.A.3. requires *The development of one (1) LEED certified (or international equivalent) project of similar nature to that which is proposed in the SOQs*. Both our Architect and General Contractor have successfully completed multiple LEED certified projects in the last 10 years. Additionally, should the County require construction a LEED building then our development team would be happy to take on the challenge. Our past Class-A projects strongly support our ability to meet the needs of both the County and the surrounding community, I respectfully request that this requirement be waived for the purpose of this RFSQ.

COUNTY ANSWER – The requirement for previous LEED experience remains unchanged.

QUESTION 5.1.2.2. requires *At least one (1) of the projects meeting the requirements of 2.a (above) is a public-private partnership which was a design-build-finance, design-build-finance-maintain, and/or design-build-finance-operate-maintain and/or other forms of public-private partnership in excess of \$25 million of non-recourse debt and equity*. Our firm has enough cash in the bank so that we do not require any financing for this project. I respectfully request that this requirement be waived if a firm can immediately demonstrate enough liquid assets to build the required Class-A project.

COUNTY ANSWER – Demonstration of liquid assets does not substitute for prior public-private partnership experience.