

Questions and Answers from Pre-Bid Conference of December 16, 2010 for Invitation to Bid No. 032-LL10 – Commercial Leasing of Parking Facilities (“ITB”)

1. **Question:**

How did the District arrive at the \$33,000 minimum annual bid amount?

Answer:

The School Board, at its meeting of November 24, 2010, established this amount as the minimal acceptable fixed annual lease rate, in lieu of the District leasing the facility to an outside entity, with the District receiving 60% of gross revenue, net of taxes, surcharges, and all operating expenses.

2. **Question:**

What is MPA’s gross revenue and operating expenses with respect to its use and operation of the Parking Lot?

Answer:

MPA’s gross revenue for the 12-month period of November, 2009 through October, 2010 was \$47,819. The District does not have information on MPA’s operating expenses.

3. **Question:**

Have any improvements been made to the Parking Lot in the last 12-month period?

Answer:

No.

4. **Question:**

How can the Lessee identify District staff vehicles within the Parking Lot?

Answer:

Given the sometime uncertain schedule of District staff, there may, on rare occasion, be one or two cars in the Parking Lot after normal working hours. As such, if there is a vehicle within the Parking Lot at the time Lessee’s period of use commences, the assumption must be made that such vehicle belongs

to a District staff member, and as such, such vehicle may remain parked in the Parking Lot, without charge or penalty.

5. **Question:**

Does the District have any historical information on events at the Arsht Center?

Answer:

We have no archival information as to when events were held at any of the Arsht Center venues. Prospectively, information is available on the Arsht Center web site indicating upcoming events over the next several months.

6. **Question:**

Since any improvements required as a pre-condition to licensing are Lessee's responsibility, would the District be willing to amortize the cost of such improvements over a three-year period?

Answer:

Given that any such improvements would be done strictly to meet local jurisdictional requirements for issuance of operating permits, and not to meet District operational needs, the District would not be able to amortize the cost of such improvements.

7. **Question:**

If the District does not grant Lessee the renewal options provided under the lease agreement, would the District reimburse the Lessee for the unamortized portion of the improvements made to the Parking Lot?

Answer:

Given the answer to number 6 above, the District would not be in a position to reimburse the Lessee for the unamortized portion of the improvements.

8. **Question:**

Is the Lessee responsible for lighting/utilities relating to the Parking Lot?

Answer:

No, the Parking Lot has security lighting, which the District provides and maintains.

9. **Question:**

Is there any history of MPA securing licensing for use of the Parking Lot?

Answer:

We do not have this information.