



1112 Manatee Avenue West
Bradenton, Florida 34205
charles.meador@mymanatee.org

Solicitation Addendum

Addendum Number: 2
Solicitation Number: 24-001
Solicitation Title: Sale and Development of All the Property at
1707 Lena Road, Bradenton, Florida 34211
Addendum Date: February 1, 2024
Contact: Charles Meador, Property Acquisition Division Manager

Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) Number 24-001 is amended as set forth herein. Responses to questions posed by prospective bidders are provided below. This Addendum is hereby incorporated in and made a part of ITN Number 24-001.

Warehouse Questions:

1. The warehouse spec'd, do you know if the plan is for the county to lease it from us and we build it, buy that land and it build it or it's open ended?
2. With regards to the 100,000 to 200,000 square foot warehouse to be potentially built by the Proposer, is this to be done at the Proposer's expense or will they be reimbursed by the County?
3. If done at the Proposer's expense, will there be a lease paid to the Proposer?
4. What does the county intend to use the warehouse for?
5. Where would the county like to have this located on the 160 acre parcel?
6. Will the county lease or own the land?
7. What is the anticipated timing of when this needs to be built?
8. Does the county have funds available to pay for the cost of the warehouse or is the county proposing the purchaser pay for the warehouse?
9. Is it the intent of the County to purchase the constructed warehouse(s) from the winning bidder at an already pre-determined set price?
10. Is it the intent of the County to lease the structures and/or the land from the winning bidder?
11. Does the county intend to make this a raw expenditure for the winning bidder?

Answer: Options can be negotiated with the selected Proposer(s) during the negotiations prior to purchase.

Question: These restrictions, that are required to be released from Musgrave Real Estate Holdings, Limited Partnership, are they public record in an ordinance I imagine?

Answer: Several of the restrictions coincide with the Cooperative Agreement regarding Central County Complex that was an exhibit to the Contract for Sale and Purchase in 2020.

Question: If the county is required to and fails to obtain a Release of Restrictions , what protections for the winning bidder will be in place to protect their investment such as all due diligence expenditures, engineering consultant fees, legal fees, etc.?

Answer: The County is offering no “protections”.

Question: The Musgrave site on the frontage rd, are there plans for that yet? Anything that can be shared?

Answer: The Property Acquisition Division is unaware of any plans.

Question: Does the 11ac floodplain compensation and 7ac stormwater pond satisfy the corresponding floodplain compensation and stormwater requirements for the entire project including the east-west access road, widening of Lena Road, the obligation to Musgrave property (“MREH Property”), and the 160 acre parcel itself? If not, are there any known estimates for the additional stormwater and floodplain compensation that will be required?

Answer: No. The Addendum shows the needs for Lena Road in addition to what was initially included from the base ITN.

Question: Does the county have recently obtained bids from contractors for use in estimating the costs of constructing the facilities, etc. by the winning bidder?

Answer: The Property Acquisition Division is unaware of any bids.

Question: On attachment E, the potential property restriction C, can this be clarified?

Answer: Item C is the Floodplain compensation necessary for the land adjacent to the property in the ITN. In the agreement to initially purchase, the floodplain compensation for this site was included to be provided on the land identified in the ITN for sale.

Question: On attachment E, the potential property restriction G, a twelve-month timeline seems to be tight, does the county have the road designed, engineered, and permitted such that the purchase could break ground immediately after closing?

Answer: There is currently a designed and permitted roadway with utilities running along the northern property line of said property.

Question: Is the Access Road fully permitted at this time?

Answer: Yes.

Question: If the complete construction and certification of the Access Road, through no fault of the winning bidder, were not to be completed within 12 months of the real estate closing, what ramifications would the winning bidder be forced to manage?

Answer: Options can be negotiated with the selected Proposer(s) during the negotiations prior to purchase.

Question: If the Access Road is not fully permitted at time of contract execution, will the county allow an extension of the real estate closing date to coincide 30 days after permit issue date?

Answer: Options can be negotiated with the selected Proposer(s) during the negotiations prior to purchase.

Question: Does the county have a willingness to grant an easement to extend the east-west access road onto the county owned parcel (Parcel ID: 567110051) such that the access road will have connectivity to the lighted intersection SR 64 (Schoolhouse Drive)?

Answer: Options can be negotiated with the selected Proposer(s) during the negotiations prior to purchase.

Question: Is there no mechanism or plans to provide a cost sharing platform for both the winning bidder and the owners of “MREH” Property”?

Answer: No.

Question: If during the due diligence phase, it is discovered that major environmental obstacles to development are determined to exist which force the winning bidder to require additional time needed for additional studies, etc. will the county allow an extension of the due diligence phase?

Answer: Options can be negotiated with the selected Proposer(s) during the negotiations prior to purchase.

Question: Is the county paying a buyer broker fee, or is this something my buyer has to pay?

Answer: The County will not pay any broker fees.

END OF ADDENDUM

AUTHORIZED FOR RELEASE