Odenton MARC Station RFQ
Questions Submitted by 12/20/2024

1. **Has a version of this solicitation for the development of any of the MDOT parcels been issued previously? If so, do you know what happened?**

   MDOT had previously issued an RFP in the early 2000s and entered into an agreement with a development team to advance TOD at the site. Unfortunately, the project did not proceed as intended as a result of unfavorable market conditions plus the challenge of the development team being held responsible for delivering a commuter parking garage. Securing financing for the garage proved to be difficult, hence the reason the commitment by Anne Arundel County to advance the parking garage is pivotal for progress at the site.

2. **What, if anything, might cause this solicitation to not go forward?**

   If MDOT were to receive zero complete responses to this Request for Qualifications, or all of the complete submission packages received fail to meet the requirements provided by MDOT as it seeks a joint development partner, the agency retains the option of declaring this stage of the process as unsatisfactory and unable to proceed to the Request for Proposals (RFP) stage of the process for the Odenton MARC Station development opportunity.

3. **Do you know if the anticipated transit garage on the County land will have ground floor retail?**

   Per the most current intentions and design of the commuter garage to be delivered by Anne Arundel County, the program for the garage does include a single retail space (approximately 2,744 sf) within the facility that would be managed by a future Operator of the garage. The actual use and tenant have not been determined at this time.

4. **Pursuant to the MOU between MDOT and DCHD, has there been any development funds earmarked for housing associated with the development of MARC transit line stations?**

   Development funds have not been earmarked at this time as a result of the recently executed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU between MDOT and DHCD). The MOU is a declaration of a commitment by both parties to collaborate around housing elements associated with TOD in a manner that prioritizes housing and the tools available through DHCD to aid in closing the state's housing unit shortage. By way of the MOU, the prioritization of TOD through joint development efforts with MDOT presents a unique opportunity for developers to garner support for partnership projects.

5. **What is the timeline interval for developing the other stations along the Penn line?**

   A timeline including formal sequencing for the development opportunity at other MARC stations along the Penn Line has not been determined at this time. Per the results of the Penn Line TOD Study that was released in October 2024 there were two stations deemed the priority stations for the most immediate activity: Odenton and Bowie State University. Several other stations in the study were classified as having near-term and long-term potential based upon other conditions that need to be satisfied in order to become ready to support TOD activity, including a public solicitation for a joint development partner.

6. **Based on the introduction of the RFQ during the site visit, it appears that MDOT may expect that at least some responses will propose LIHTC development; however, the bulk of the development is contemplated as market rate housing. We believe some LIHTC experienced developers may plan to partner with a "lead" Developer and supplement their response to the RFQ. First, is this an approach that MDOT would expect to see? Alternatively, would MDOT expect the LIHTC experienced developer to apply separately and then try to pair up with a developer later?**

    MDOT does prefer to see the full team at the time of submission and encourages partnering. If a team anticipates adding to their team at a later point this should be properly noted within the submission package. Be advised that the acceptance of a later addition would be at MDOT's discretion.

    As part of the submission package review process, MDOT may inquire about elements of a team that may necessitate further details and/or explanation for the evaluation committee to properly score a team. Questions posed to a respondent could include a request for more information about the team's experience for any proposed use, if it's not evident within the background provided on the team presented to the agency.

7. **If a respondent will be submitting qualifications as part of a development team, we are curious if MDOT would have concerns if a niche developer is part of multiple development teams with different lead developers?**

    MDOT is not opposed to niche developers being present on multiple development teams. The primary concern for MDOT is that any team shortlisted at the conclusion of this RFQ process would remain intact through the RFP process as well.