

# 2211 Douglas – Applicant Questions and Answers

## Design and Development Flexibility

### **Are developers required to utilize the designs by Alley Poyner Macchietto Architecture (APMA) that were presented with the RFP?**

No, the designs presented in the RFP were illustrative examples of possibilities for the site. The selected developer is not required to use these designs.

### **If developers do not partner with APMA, are they still able to utilize one of the three designs presented?**

Yes. These designs are the property of Front Porch Investments. APMA developed them to provide direction and inspiration for developers. APMA would welcome the selected developer utilizing the designs, even if they do not serve as the project architect.

### **Would a high-rise be an acceptable solution for the site?**

Yes, a high-rise is an acceptable solution. While the APMA designs focus on wood-frame construction for affordability, developers are encouraged to propose alternative building types, including taller structures, as long as they align with site feasibility, financial viability, and community needs.

---

## Site Control and Development Timeline

### **Will site control be provided by the May deadline?**

Site control will be provided in time for the closing deadline of **June 30, 2025**. While we are unable to extend this deadline, we are committed to facilitating a smooth process and, if possible, closing sooner.

### **When is the expected timeline for construction to start?**

There is no hard deadline for construction to start. Developers should include a proposed construction timeline in their submissions.

### **Is there a specific start date requirement for the project?**

While it would be ideal to activate the land soon, this should be balanced with mission alignment and financial viability. The certainty of project completion is more important than an immediate start date.

---

## Affordability and Housing Mix

### Is there a preference for a mix of AMI levels?

While we encourage a mix of AMI levels, developers should assess and justify their proposed income mix based on community needs.

- A minimum of **51% of units must be set aside for households earning 80% AMI or below**, in compliance with CDBG funding requirements.
- The remaining units can be designated as workforce housing, market rate, or subsidized, depending on what developers determine to be most viable.

### If there are changes needed for the program (funding), is there flexibility to update the Land Use Restriction Agreement (LURA)?

We are open to discussions regarding LURA terms, provided that long-term affordability remains assured.

- The **site will be transferred at no cost**.
- While some project details may be updated over time, at least **51% of units must remain at or below 80% AMI** to comply with CDBG restrictions.

### Is there flexibility to revisit the LURA and commitments to affordability if the developer finds it limiting after application rounds?

Yes, we are flexible on the terms of the LURA as long as long-term affordability is maintained.

---

## Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Compliance

### Will a copy of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) agreement be available before the RFP closing date?

Yes. The City of Omaha has provided a copy of the **CDBG contract**, linked here.

### Does the CDBG funding come with any restrictions?

Yes. Since the transfer will be considered a new use, the **5-year CDBG compliance period will restart upon completion of construction.**

### **Are there any requirements for construction with CDBG funding at the site?**

Due to the use of CDBG funds, developers will likely need to **comply with Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act.** Additional details regarding compliance will be shared upon receipt from HUD.

### **Is there a CDBG contract or related documentation to CDBG-acquisition financing and related restrictions available?**

Yes, a copy of the agreement is linked above. Additional key details include:

- CDBG-CV funds were used for site acquisition.
- The site was used as a non-congregate shelter and will **transition to affordable housing.**
- At least **51% of all units must serve households at 80% AMI or below.**
- **5-year commitment/affordability period** for CDBG funds.

### **Besides affordability, are there any environmental, design, or construction considerations that must be met due to the former use of CDBG funds?**

Yes, compliance with **HUD Section 3** will likely be required due to CDBG funding. Additional information will be provided upon receipt.

---

## **Environmental Reviews & Site Conditions**

### **Have any environmental impact surveys been completed for the site?**

No, no environmental impact surveys have been completed.

### **For the CDBG-CV, has a Phase I or NEPA Review been conducted, and can the environmental review be provided?**

Yes, an environmental review was completed in November 2021, determining that the project was an EXEMPT activity under Section 58.34(a)(12) (meaning no mitigation was required).

However, due to the change of use, **a new environmental review is currently underway and is expected to be approved within the next 60 days.** The property transfer **cannot** be finalized until HUD approves this new review.

### **Are there any Deeds of Trust or similar liens against the property?**

To the best of our knowledge, there are no existing liens against the property apart from the CDBG contract. Applicants are encouraged to conduct their own due diligence.

---

## Project Financing & Cost Considerations

### **Is there a current appraisal available illustrating the value of the land?**

The land has previously been valued at **\$2.5–\$3.0 million** for insurance purposes. An updated appraisal is currently in process.

### **Would any claw-back rights be held by Front Porch Investments?**

Front Porch Investments does not intend to own or operate the property. Our goal is to transfer the site to a developer with the capacity to complete the project, whether or not Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) are used. While we **do not anticipate** imposing claw-back rights, project feasibility and compliance with affordability commitments will be key considerations in the selection process.

### **Can the June 30th closing timeline be extended to allow for other federal funding sources to perform environmental reviews?**

No, we are **unable to extend the deadline past June 30, 2025**. Together is unable to hold the property beyond that date.

---

## Other Site-Specific Considerations

### **Are there any quotes available detailing the cost of demolition and asbestos abatement?**

No, we have not obtained cost estimates for demolition or asbestos abatement. These costs **will be the responsibility of the selected developer** and should be factored into project budgeting.

### **How will different parking solutions impact the design?**

Several parking lots and structures are located adjacent to the site, though most are privately owned. Developers may explore **lease agreements or shared parking arrangements**. The Omaha Rapid Bus Transit (ORBT) has multiple stops near the site, providing transit accessibility that could reduce parking demand.

**Do developers need to provide a project-specific market study to include with their RFP submission?**

No, a market study **is not required** due to the short timeframe for proposal submissions.

---

This document is intended to provide clarity on key aspects of the **2211 Douglas RFP**. We encourage developers to carefully review all materials and submit proposals that align with the mission, financial feasibility, and long-term community impact goals of the site.

For further inquiries, please reach out to [frontporch@omahafoundation.org](mailto:frontporch@omahafoundation.org).