

<u>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</u>			Page of Page(s) 1	
1. Amendment/ <u>Modification</u> No. A00001	2. Effective Date See Block 15c	3. Requisition/Purchase Order No.	4. Project No. (if applicable)	
5. ISSUED BY Housing Authority of the City of El Paso, Texas Procurement Department 5300 E. Paisano Dr. El Paso, TX 79905-2931 Mr. Juan Pulido, Procurement Manager		6. ADMINISTERED BY (if other than Item 5) Housing Authority of the City of El Paso, Texas Public Housing Department 5300 E. Paisano Dr. El Paso, TX 79905-2931		
7. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street Name, County, State & Zip Code)		8a. Amendment of Solicitation No. RAD 17-R-0021		
		8b. Dated (see item 10)		
		9a. Modification of Contract No.		
		9b. Dated (see item 12)		
10. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATION				
The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 13. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is: <input type="checkbox"/> is extended <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 7 & 14, and returning _____ copy (ies) of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which <u>includes</u> a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such a change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.				
11. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATE (if required) PHA				
12. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACT IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT NO. DESCRIBED IN ITEM 13.				
<input type="checkbox"/>	A. This change order is issued pursuant to (Specify Authority) The changes set forth in Item 13 are made in the Contract No. in Item 9a.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. The above numbered contract is modified to reflect the administrative changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc). Set forth in Item 13 pursuant to the authority of FAR 43.103 (b).			
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. This supplemental agreement is entered into pursuant to the authority of: MUTUAL AGREEMENT OF BOTH PARTIES			
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)			
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return <u>ALL</u> copies to the issuing office.				
13. Description of <u>amendment/modification</u> : Amendment No. A00001. Attendance to pre-proposal conference, Q&A's, <i>Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the documents referenced in Item 8a. or 9a., remains unchanged and in full force and effect.</i>				
14a. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		15a. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) Gerald Cichon, Chief Executive Officer		
14b. OFFEROR/CONTRACTOR _____ (Signature of Authorized Person)	14c. Date Signed	15b. _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	15c. Date Signed	
APPROVED AS TO FORM: _____ HACEP Legal Counsel		DATE: _____ HACEP Form 001		

DATE: May 3, 2017 @ 2:00 P.M.

SUBJECT: Pre-Proposal Conference; RAD 17-R-0021 Developer Services II

Chronology

I. Schedule of Events

A meeting was held Wednesday, May 3, 2017 in reference to the above-mentioned subject.

Meeting began at 2:00 P.M.

Location: Conference Room 217

Attendees: **See Attachment A**

II. Minutes of the Meeting

Ms. Lourdes Gomez continued the Pre-Proposal agenda

1. INTRODUCTION

- Taping of the Meeting
- Introduction of Staff
- Purpose of the Meeting

2. INTENT OF THE ACQUISITION

- Description of the acquisition – Methodology – Competitive Proposal Process that will use several criteria to evaluate the proposals.
- Evaluation Criteria
- Contract Type
- Terms and Conditions
- Proposal Closing Date/Time; May 19, 2017 at 2:00 P.M. local time
- Attachments to be submitted (bank letter, etc.)
- Electronic Signatures; new method of signing contracts; opportunity to opt out

3. STATEMENT OF WORK

4. NOTICE OF INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO POTENTIAL OFFERORS – Deadline to submit questions in writing is May 8, 2017 at 5:00 P.M.

5. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. *Question:* [REDACTED]; know amendment came out that HACEP has three developments at the “at risk” round this year for the 2017 tax credits and HACEP will be capped out at two, is there going to be any priority given to these particular ones in the RFP or has there been a priority level established?

Response: We have three but this RFP only covers two. Blue Flame already has a developer coming with it so this is why it was left out. We are competing for the other two, and whether or not we do Blue Flame determines on these two. So the answer is that we (HACEP) has not decided which ones are going to be picked. *The questions was; we have three applications for TDHCA and we can only do two, which ones are we going to do? Response: We have not made the ultimate decision yet, we have a developer on one of those projects which is Blue Flame, if we do this one only one of the other two developments will be picked.*

2. *Question:* These are new construction projects, both of them, but it is believed to be using units that were in past RFPs?

Response: Correct. [REDACTED] made comment that under perhaps different financing 4% vs. 9%.

3. *Question:* Is there a preference in the beginning for scoring if the developer has already been awarded the 4% financing mechanism?

Response: No, if you recall on the RFP there was a clause that the agency had the flexibility of removing or exchanging any of the units in the various groups and that is what we are doing at this time in order to be able to meet HUD's timeline.

4. *Question:* With regard to the two 2017 9% deals in the RFP, I know one is under review but the other shows as not being reviewed anymore, is that being converted?

Response: That is the TDHCA application process, we are still going through all the due diligence with the agency, we either have certain documents and things are being reviewed for each one of the applications and depending on how each of them vets we will decide at the end which two we will proceed with.

Comment per Mr. Tom Deloye: So to be clear to the group, Blue Flame is under review, Pellicano has commenced, and Medano Heights has not commenced. Pursuant to Martha's comments, the TDHCA that is their status, it is not our (HACEP) status, both of these 9%ers are alive and we hope that they are awarded, TDHCA has not started the review process on Medano Heights.

5. *Question:* Both applications 2017 9% log that was just released two days ago, both applications are in the at-risk set aside obviously. One seems to have scored very well, sitting in second place and currently under review but the second application that has the status of "N" typically indicates that the department is suspending review because either the deal is not going to score, which is unusual because this particular deal is within scoring range, I am curious if you got a notification stating that there was an issue with the application and that is the reason they are suspending review?

Response: Nothing has been received from the state at this point. As Mr. Deloye mentioned earlier, as far as the Housing Authority is concerned that application is still alive and maybe TDHCA is taking a stand that you can only get two and are going with the two top scoring but ultimately we as the developer have the right to at the end decide which ones we are going to go with pending on the outcome of all three of them. All three are in the running for the money.

6. *Question:* On the Pellicano place/development the sources in using the state money indicates that you put in a provision for direct loan match, I noticed it was capitalized without it and it was not the dollar amount. Can you explain why that was in the sources and uses statement, was that sort of a place holder in the event the tax credit market went to a heck in a hand basket or were there other things that might play out?

Response: That is correct we are just trying to get in the market and the way it is, we are just trying to make sure that the deal is as solid as possible for TDHCA purposes.

Comment: Mr. Tom Deloye made note that there might be reason to amend the RFP in the near term by swapping out Exhibit E and Exhibit F, the reason being it is our best understanding that to move forward through financing, the financing and capital partners will likely readily accept the A102 and A201 and B108s as opposed to our version of those agreements which are included as Exhibit E and F so if there is a revision which there likely will be, you'll likely see an explanation towards this end.

Meeting concluded.



HACEP
PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

ATTACHMENT A

SOLICITATION NO: RAD 17-R-0021; Developer Services II

DATE: May 3, 2017

NAME OF ATTENDEE	COMPANY NAME OR HACEP DEPARTMENT	PHONE NUMBER	FAX NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
Martha E Gomez	Development	(915) 849-3545	N/A	mgomez@hacep.org
Laura Coariz	Procurement	(915) 849-3785	N/A	lgomez@hacep.org
REBECCA MARTINEZ	PROCUREMENT	(915) 849-3809	(915) 849-3868	rmartinez@hacep.org
Juan Pulido	" "	(915) 849-3695		jpulido@hacep.org

PAGE 1 OF 2



HACEP
PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

ATTACHMENT A

SOLICITATION NO: RAD 17-R-0021; Developer Services II

DATE: May 3, 2017

NAME OF ATTENDEE	COMPANY NAME OR HACEP DEPARTMENT	PHONE NUMBER	FAX NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
Lynn Wilson	Franklin	2106942223	2106942225	lynn@franklindev.net
Edoardo Rocha	HACEP			erocha@hacp.org
Srinivas Bussare	HACEP			
Tom Deloye	HACEP			tdeloye@hacp.org

PAGE 2 of 2