



City of Minot National Disaster Resilience

Technical Review Committee

Resilience Neighborhood Affordable Single Family Housing Program Request for Proposal Review

The City of Minot Office of the City Clerk received two project proposals in response to the RFP by the closing date. One proposal was received for the Prairie Pointe Subdivision offered by Skyport Developers, LLC. The second proposal was received for Ramstad Heights offered by Silverleaf Capital Group.

In accordance with the review process outlined in the "Residential Lots for the Resilient Neighborhood Affordable Single Family Housing Program RFP", the City of Minot NDR Technical Review Committee met on January 16, 2018 to discuss the two submittals received by the City of Minot in response to the above referenced RFP. The review committee evaluated each of the proposals received for completeness and reviewed the submittals based on the evaluation criteria included in the RFP. The review committee requested additional guidance from the City's Engineer and from the City Planning Department staff prior to the meeting.

The review committee appreciated the level of effort made in both proposals, a significant volume of information was provided.

After careful review of the materials submitted in the two proposals received, the City NDR Technical Review Committee recommended that both proposals be rejected based on the following:

- 1) Prior to the review committee meeting, the City Engineering and Planning staff were asked to review the public utilities that had previously been installed to serve the 35 lots offered in each of the sites submitted in the 2 responses to the RFP. The RFP states, "The lots to be offered must have all necessary public utilities (water, wastewater, natural gas, and electric) currently installed to the property line of each of the lots being offered." As a result of the reviews, it was determined that all the necessary public utilities were not completed and additional utility construction was required to serve the single family lots offered in each of the proposals.
- 2) The evaluation criteria included in the RFP stated the best offer price for purchase of the proposed property would be determined based on: average of the actual offer price to purchase each lot; the acreage of the residential lots included in the proposal; the

availability of public utilities to each of the lots; and lot access to a public street. The Ramstad Heights proposal offered a lower wholesale price on the lots that did not include approved or pending special assessment as required in the RFP and 23% of the lots included in this proposal were smaller than the minimum allowable lot size. The Prairie Pointe proposal offered higher priced lots. Both proposals lacked all of the required public utilities and some of the streets in the proposed subdivision were not completed. The committee was not able to find the required surety document to the city in the Ramstad heights proposal that would cover the full cost of completing the streets if construction was not completed within the schedule included in a final agreement for the project. The committee concluded neither proposal provided the lowest and best offer price for the purchase of the lots.

- 3) The RFP states “the lots must have the proper residential zoning in place”. Information provided in each of the proposals indicates that the current zoning for both properties is R4, which is not the proper residential zoning for this type of single family development according to the Minot Planning Department. Both proposals submitted proposed to change the zoning on the property included in the RFP response to R1S and have been in various stages of the process to seek the change, therefore the proper zoning was not in place when the proposals were submitted.
- 4) In one of the proposals there was no information provided to address hazardous materials on the site.
- 5) The Ramstad Heights proposal provided a map with two notes, one stating “all wetlands within the site have been mucked and filled” there was no signed engineering document as required in the RFP. A letter from the regional ACEC dated Aug. 6, 2011 lacked a copy of the map referenced in the letter that would have enabled reviewers to determine if the 38 wetlands reference in the letter were on the property submitted in the proposal or on other adjoining property owned by the same owner.

The City NDR Technical Committee recommended reissuing the RFP taking into account current housing market data that members of the committee monitor regularly.