

**Questions Regarding the RFP to Produce an Addendum to the
2014 Regional Analysis of Impediments**

[Responses are in red below]

1. When several entities are forming a team to conduct this project: Would it be best for the FHIC if the proposal were to simply specify the lead entity with which FHIC would contract and treat the other partners/team members as subcontractors?

Specifying a lead entity would work well to coordinate the work and have clear communication.

2. Of all the entities involved in this – FHIC, RAI Advisory Committee, the 7 counties and 8 cities —which entity has the final word on what is accepted? In other words, who will be the ultimate “decider” among the plethora of groups involved?

The FHIC is the ultimate decision-maker as the entitlement community members have the legal obligation to submit the report to HUD.

3. Which entity will the consultants work with directly while producing the AI addendum? What are the “go to” entities during production of the AI addendum?

The consultant(s) will primarily work with a designated point person for the FHIC and a sub-committee of the FHIC. Some communication will be necessary with MHP and the RAI Advisory Committee.

4. Just to be sure: It sounds like you want the addendum to analyze the issues and present the data for the 7 counties and the 8 cities. But you are *not* looking for data and analysis of the other cities within the 7 counties. Is that correct?

In addition to the seven counties and eight cities names, we would also want analysis of 9 additional cities that are sub-recipients of CDBG funds.

Organization Name	Program Type	County
Anoka County	CDBG entitlement	Anoka
Coon Rapids city	CDBG entitlement	Anoka
Blaine city	CDBG subrecipient city	Anoka
Dakota County	CDBG entitlement	Dakota
Eagan city	CDBG subrecipient	Dakota

	city	
Burnsville city	CDBG subrecipient city	Dakota
Lakeville city	CDBG subrecipient city	Dakota
Apple Valley city	CDBG subrecipient city	Dakota
Hennepin County	CDBG entitlement	Hennepin
Bloomington city	CDBG entitlement	Hennepin
Eden Prairie city	CDBG entitlement	Hennepin
Minneapolis city	CDBG entitlement	Hennepin
Minnetonka city	CDBG entitlement	Hennepin
Plymouth city	CDBG entitlement	Hennepin
Brooklyn Center	CDBG subrecipient city	Hennepin
Brooklyn Park city	CDBG subrecipient city	Hennepin
Crystal	CDBG subrecipient city	Hennepin
Hopkins	CDBG subrecipient city	Hennepin
Maple Grove city	CDBG subrecipient city	Hennepin
Edina city	CDBG subrecipient city	Hennepin

New Hope	CDBG subrecipient city	Hennepin
St. Louis Park city	CDBG subrecipient city	Hennepin
Richfield	CDBG subrecipient city	Hennepin
Ramsey County	CDBG entitlement	Ramsey
St. Paul city	CDBG entitlement	Ramsey
Washington County	CDBG entitlement	Washington
Woodbury city	CDBG entitlement	Washington
Scott County	Metro county	Scott
Carver County	Metro county	Carver

5. Time Frame:

As professional city planners, the AICP Code of Professional Responsibility prohibits us from accepting an assignment that we knowingly cannot complete in the time allocated. So we have to ask whether we can submit a proposal that, in our experience, allows for a more realistic time frame?

Explanation: Given HUD’s experience with Westchester County, we are pretty confident that HUD would want to allow adequate time and funding to do this addendum correctly. And we would imagine that the FHIC and other entities involved do *not* wish to fall into the same trap that Westchester County has since 2007 – 9 rejected AIs, in large part due to allowing inadequate time to conduct each AI and allocating inadequate funds to conduct them.

Realistic time frame: It will likely take eight to nine months to produce a competent first draft of this demanding addendum. It will take any consultant about a month to just get a handle on exactly what needs to be done and what data are available. Even with the Metropolitan Council providing significant amounts of data, it will take the consultant three or four months to sift through all the data, reorganize it as needed for the addendum, and make sense of it as well as gather additional necessary data. It will take another two months to analyze the data and another

two to three months to finish writing the first draft. Consequently, we have to ask the question posed immediately above.

Thank you for this assessment of the time frame. May 15 is the date established by the Voluntary Compliance Agreements with Minneapolis and Saint Paul. Even if HUD allows us to push back the date, delays in CDBG funding would result. Unless the consensus among all bidders is the timeline must be pushed back, we need to work within the timeline.

Data:

It appears that a core focus of the addendum is on housing discrimination and the resultant integration/segregation housing discrimination produces. The AI pretty much skipped over these issues. The Metro Council's insightful publication *Choice, Place and Opportunity: An Equity Assessment of the Twin Cities Region* relies on several indices to "measure" the extent of racial and Hispanic national origin integration/segregation. May an applicant go beyond the gross measures of these indices to report more precisely on housing discrimination and its impact on housing integration/segregation – at the census tract level within each county and each of the 8 cities, as well at the jurisdictional level?

Yes.

6. What is the total number of census tracts in the 7 subject counties and 8 subject cities?

The research would need to be conducted by the consultant

7. We are rather curious as to how you expect a consultant to "track the location and numbers of lost affordable units, both subsidized and unsubsidized." (in "A"). What informational and data resources do you have available to do this?

"The Space Between: Realities and Possibilities in Preserving Unsubsidized Affordable Rental Housing," (http://www.fhfund.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Space_Between_Final_June-2013.pdf) provides an analysis of the data.

There are a variety of other sources such as the Metropolitan Council data and the Comprehensive housing Assessment Survey (CHAS) (https://www.huduser.gov/portal/ushmc/regional_state.html?stateid=27), to name a couple.

8. The first page of the RFP calls for addressing "Policies and regulatory tools (including zoning ordinances and local land use policies)." What is meant by "local and use policies?" Generally speaking a jurisdiction's land use policies are codified as its zoning ordinance (sometimes a "Development Code" that combines zoning and subdivision regulations). Does "land use policies" as used in the RFP refer to

the zoning codes or something broader – and if broader, exactly what? Do you expect the consultant to also review all 15 subdivision ordinances?

Land use policies can be found in each jurisdiction’s Comprehensive plan. Zoning code is a regulatory tool for enforcing land use policies.

It is not the expectation that the consultant(s) would need to review every subdivision ordinance, but that the consultant(s) would have a list of potential language that could trigger barriers to fair housing (i.e. occupancy, lot size, etc.).

9. The RFP (“B.”) calls for the consultant to “review local policies throughout FHIC member jurisdictions, including cities within FHIC member counties, that may undermine affirmative efforts including but not necessarily limited to financial assistance preferences...” By “cities within FHIC member counties,” do you mean just the 8 entitlement jurisdictions or *all* cities within the 7 counties. And if you mean all cities, how many of them are there? This has a significant impact on the cost and time needed to produce the addendum.

In addition to the seven counties and eight cities names, we would also want analysis of cities that are sub-recipients of CDBG funds (9 additional cities).

10. “C” Community Engagement:

We’re trying to figure out exactly what the chosen consultant’s role is here. It sounds like the entities listed at the beginning of this section will be doing the community engagement work – namely they will engage directly with the public. It sounds like the chosen consultant is not expected to actually participate in the specific programs here – except to work with the HUD Technical Assistance Partner to prepare presentations and materials for the community engagement events, and will provide additional content as needed. And then it sounds like the consultant will compile all the data, information, and responses from the work that the entities are doing under “Community Engagement.” Is that an accurate description of responsibilities? If not, could you please explain what is?

Yes. That is an accurate description of the consultant’s role with respect to the Community Engagement process.

11. Is the AI Addendum to be inclusive of the 7 counties and 8 cities in the metro region?

- a. Will the consultant complete the data analysis, policy review, community outreach and recommendations for all 15 jurisdictions or for a subset of the jurisdictions?

The Addendum is to be inclusive of the 7 counties and 8 cities listed in the RFP, as well as 9 additional cities that are sub-recipients of CDBG dollars.

Priority should be given to the eight cities and five counties that are entitlement jurisdictions as well as the cities where there is a concentration of one race or national origin. The consultant is not responsible for community outreach other than the limited role described in the RFP. Recommendations will be for the 13 entitlement jurisdictions and 2 additional metro counties (Scott and Carver).

12. In the RFP, page 1, paragraph 3, the first sentence reads: *The selected consultant will be asked to consider and address comments about the scope of the consultant's work received from the Regional AI Advisory Committee, housing and civil rights advocates, developers, and others.*

- b. Does this mean the consultant will be required to explain their proposed scope as part of the consultant selection process?

To clarify this sentence, these entities may have comments and questions as the consultant's work unfolds. These entities would not determine the scope of work; the scope of work has already been established by the RFP. The questions, comments, and/or feedback would most likely occur in connection with the community engagement information process.

- c. When is this expected to occur? And how long is it expected to take?

Comments and questions may occur intermittently as the work unfolds.

13. The RFP states that the Addendum to the 2014 AI is required to “*be informed by AFFH Assessment Tool, the HUD AFFH Data and Mapping Tool, and the AFFH Rule Guidebook...*”.

- d. Does this mean the consultant should prepare the AI Addendum using the AFH Assessment Tool? Or, to simply follow the outline of the AFH Assessment Tool?

The following sections of the AFH Assessment tool should guide the analysis for the AI Addendum:

V. Fair Housing Analysis

A. Demographic Summary

B. General Issues

i. Segregation/Integration

ii. Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)

iv. Disproportionate Housing Needs

C. Publicly Supported Housing Analysis

- e. How much of the AFH Assessment Tool and its components is the consultant to include in the AI Addendum? The AFH Assessment Tool requires jurisdictions to review all local and state policies that have/could have contributed to patterns of segregation. For the seven counties and eight cities involved in this RFP, this will require a significant amount of document identification, collection, review and analysis, the work for which will be reflected in an appropriately scaled budget. If this is not what is desired, what policies should be the primary focus of the Addendum?

We would look to the consultant to assist in identifying the parameters of the analysis and data collection to be consistent with the scope of the Analysis of Impediments. Because this is an addendum the full AFH Assessment Tool would not apply. Please see the answer above [“be informed by AFH assessment too”] for the specific areas we would want to be addresses. The focus should be on housing programs and policies as well as land use policies. Review of policies should be guided by list of language most likely to create barriers.

14. In the RFP, page 3, there is the statement: *“Issues and recommendations raised during the 2014 AI comment period should be summarized and considered in connection with the local policy review.”*

- f. The attachment to the RFP (Comments on the 2014 AI) is very extensive but extremely informative. Is the consultant required to summarize all the comments and include as recommendations in the Addendum all the policy issues raised in the comments?

We would like the consultant to create a brief summary highlighting themes of the comments to the 2014 AI.

15. The RFP requires that the Draft AI Addendum be submitted by 01/31/17, and the Final AI Addendum be submitted by 04/03/17.

- g. What does FHIC plan for the months of February and March in 2017?

February 2017: Community Comment Review Period of Draft AI Addendum. These comments would inform revision of the Draft AI Addendum.

March 2017: City Briefings

Revision of AI Addendum can occur concurrently with the city briefings.

- h. Also, once the Final AI Addendum is provided by 04/03/17, will the participating jurisdictions use the time until 05/15/17 to obtain local approvals? If so, to what extent will the consultant be expected to participate in this step (e.g., attend each meeting where action will be taken on the Final AI Addendum)?

Yes the time after the Final AI will be to obtain local approvals. The consultant is not expected to participate in the final approvals. The FHIC may need to contact the consultant to answer a specific question about the AI Addendum, and the FHIC would pass along that answer to the officials.

16. In order to estimate an appropriate budget for the Community Engagement element, do you anticipate that the consultant will be required to attend and participate in/facilitate the meetings and other initiatives, or will the consultant be providing technical assistance in the preparation of the initiatives and the summarizing of the participation achieved?

Consultant will be providing technical assistance in preparation of information sessions and summarizing the participation and responses gathered.

i. If the consultant is expected to be in attendance at the Community Engagement initiatives, for whatever reason, how many meetings or other locational activities are planned?

No. The consultant is not expected to attend the community engagement session.

j. Also, will the Community Engagement initiatives be coordinated with the consultant's project schedule?

Community Engagement will take place September through early December 2016. A timely report/summary of each community engagements session will be provided to the consultant after each session.

17. Can the proposal submission deadline be extended beyond August 10 in order to allow proposers sufficient time to include new information learned from the responses into their proposals?

Because of the tight timeline, we are unable to extend the deadline unless no consultants are able to provide bids.

18. What documents do you require for this RFP? (Ex. Resumes? Articles of Incorporation? Etc.)

RFP Submission Requirements

The following identifies the minimal requirements that should be included in the response to the Fair Housing Implementation Council's request for proposals. Please submit the response electronically to Denise Beigbeder at Denise.Beigbeder@CO.RAMSEY.MN.US.

1. Cover/transmittal letter including interest in undertaking this project
2. General Statement of Qualifications/Organizational Background
3. Key Personnel-Capability and Experience of project leadership; technical and management proficiency
4. Scope of Work and Deliverables

5. Timeline
6. Anticipated Fee Structure, including schedule of hourly rates for personnel working directly on the project
7. References