



**MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**ADDENDUM NO. 1**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE  
EXCHANGE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT  
PROPERTY**

**Real Property Located at  
3320 Gilman Road, El Monte, CA 91732  
Known as the Former Madrid Middle School Site**

**Dated: July 21, 2023**

To: All Current and Prospective Respondents

## **I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

The Mountain View School District has sought proposals (“Proposals”) from qualified parties (“Respondents”) who are interested in acquiring approximately 19.42 acres (860,688 square feet) of improved land located at 3320 Gilman Road, El Monte, CA 91732, known as Madrid Middle School as further described in the District’s Request for Proposals (“RFP”) dated May 19, 2023 (“District Property”).

Proposals were originally due on June 30, 2023. Due to the large number of Proposals received and continued interest and inquiries from current and prospective Respondents, with this Addendum No. 1, the District provides the following information related to the RFP and the Property, and also provides notice of additional time to submit, or modify or supplement, Proposals.

## **II. RFQ QUESTIONS**

The District has received the following questions, and hereby responds to each as follows (and which questions and responses will take the place of the process set forth in Section VIII of the RFP):

### **Question #1:**

Is there any pricing guidance?

### **District Response to Question #1:**

At this time there is no formal asking price. The District understands that this will be a fully marketed bid process and that the market will determine the ultimate land per square foot price and Property exchange value.

### **Question #2:**

May the successful Respondent purchase the site outright?

### **District Response to Question #2:**

Yes. As noted in the RFP, the District has the ability to acquire one or more exchange properties with others (third parties) post-closing. Respondents may identify potential properties to be exchanged for the Property; however, Respondents may also structure Proposals similar to a purchase proposal wherein the potential properties to be exchanged for the District Property shall be identified by the Respondent and the District at a later date, or whereby the District may place the exchange funds (the value of the Property) in a separate trust account to be utilized by the District after the closing on the Property, in connection with the acquisition by the District of one or more properties owned by one or more third parties in order to complete the exchange process.

**Question #3:**

Will a Respondent be disqualified if it does not have a specific investment property identified?

**District Response to Question #3:**

No. See District Response to Question #2 above.

**Question #4:**

Will the closing be delayed if the District does not identify suitable exchange properties in time?

**District Response to Question #4:**

No. The District has the ability to acquire exchange properties with other parties post-closing. See District Response to Question #2 above.

**Question #5:**

What are the District's exchange parameters?

**District Response to Question #5:**

The District has not published its exchange requirements, other than noting its Response to Question #2 above and the information provided in the RFP.

**Question #6:**

Will the District consider exchanging into a real estate investment fund?

**District Response to Question #6:**

Structuring a transaction in this particular manner would seemingly require the District to follow an alternative process, which may or may not be of interest to the District's Governing Board. The District is willing to look at specific Proposals and determine what possible alternatives may exist. That said, it seems unlikely that such a transaction would ultimately work. As noted in the RFP, the District is seeking one or more properties that can be utilized by the District, or will be used by other parties in order to provide an ongoing revenue source to the District. The District envisions owning these properties, and not merely receiving funds from an investment fund.

**Question #7:**

Will the District consider a long-term ground lease?

**District Response to Question #7:**

Structuring a transaction in this particular manner would require the District to follow an alternative process, which may or may not be of interest to the District's Governing Board. The District is willing to look at specific Proposals and determine what possible alternatives may exist.

**Question #8:**

Will the District consider a joint venture?

**District Response to Question #8:**

See District Response to Question #7 above.

**Question #9:**

What are the Cities' positions on use/entitlements?

**District Response to Question #9:**

Only the respective Cities can answer this question, and any statement herein or under the RFP in general must be clarified and confirmed by any and all Respondents directly. That said, without making any statements which can be relied upon, and without assuming any duty to investigate, the District generally notes that both Cities have expressed strong initial support for the GPA/zone change to industrial as well as a high cube distribution use. The City of El Monte indicated it may take 12-18 months to amend its General Plan and zoning classifications, and has also informally indicated its willingness to allow City of Industry to be the lead agency for the entitlement process. The City of Industry is in the process of amending its General Plan designation for the Property to Industrial, and anticipates completing that process by the end of the year.

**Question #10:**

Will the Respondent be allowed time to entitle the Property in both Cities prior to closing?

**District Response to Question #10:**

Yes.

**Question #11:**

Does the District intend to vacate the office building prior to close of escrow?

**District Response to Question #11:**

Yes, that is the intent. It is possible that the successful Respondent and District may negotiate alternative timeframes or even leaseback scenarios.

**Question #12:**

There are many old easements affecting the Property. Does the District have a property survey?

**District Response to Question #12:**

No. Not at this time. Respondents are directed to the RFP information regarding due diligence review of the Property.

**Question #13:**

Is there a historical rent roll for the billboard lease?

**District Response to Question #13:**

The District confirms that it receives approximately \$170,000 from this property use, which amount increases by \$10,000 every five (5) years.

**Question #14:**

Will the Respondent be allowed to delay submitting its \$25,000 cashier's and financial qualifications until it is chosen?

**District Response to Question #14:**

The \$25,000 cashier's check must be provided by all Respondents, unless the District's Governing Board waives this requirement; therefore, all Respondents are urged to submit with a cashier's check. However, in the event a Respondent feels it cannot submit the cashier's check with its Proposal by the new Proposal Deadline (*i.e.*, for some internal reason), Respondents are asked to state the reason for this delayed cashier's check submission, confirm that the Respondent will submit the cashier's check immediately should its Proposal be selected by the District's Governing Board, and the Governing Board can review this information and determine whether or not to waive the timely receipt of the cashier's check as is otherwise required pursuant to the RFP information. Also, please see the new deadlines for Proposals and information related to cashier's checks noted below in Section III of this Addendum No. 1.

**Question #15:**

Will the Amigos Park Agreement be terminated prior to close of escrow?

**District Response to Question #15:**

Yes, that is the intent. It is possible that the successful Respondent and District may negotiate alternative timeframes for such termination, or other possible scenarios regarding this Agreement.

**Question #16:**

What is the process/timing for choosing a Respondent/Proposal?

**District Response to Question #16:**

The District is not under any statutory timeframe or deadline for selecting a Respondent or particular Proposal. Current plans include discussing the price and terms of received Proposals during the closed session of the District's August 10, 2023 Board Meeting. Pursuant to applicable law, this discussion is not available for attendance by any Respondent. Please see below in Section III for further information.

### III. EXTENDED DEADLINES

As noted in Section I above, Proposals were originally due on June 30, 2023 pursuant to the terms of the RFP. Many Proposals have been received by the initial deadline, and there has been great interest and continued inquiries concerning the Property. The District has, therefore, elected to provide this Addendum No. 1 information related to the RFP and the Property, and to provide additional time to submit, or modify or supplement, Proposals.

It is hereby confirmed that with this Addendum No. 1, the District the new **Proposal Deadline is 4:00 P.M. (Pacific Standard Time) on Monday, August 7, 2023.**

For those Respondents which have already provided a Proposal, there is no requirement to provide any duplicate or additional Proposal, and such initial Proposals will remain “as-received” by the District. However, the District will also allow all such prior-received Proposals to be modified or supplemented by respective Respondents, if so desired. All Proposals (either new Proposals or any modified/supplemented Proposals) must be received by this new Proposal Deadline of 4:00 P.M. (Pacific Standard Time) on Monday, August 7, 2023.

Additionally, please note that all Proposals submitted must be accompanied by a cashier’s check for Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars \$25,000 payable to Mountain View School District (per Section III(3) of the RFP). This Addendum No. 1 also confirms that the District will allow any and all Proposals submitted by the original Proposal Deadline which did not include the cashier’s check to be supplemented before the new Proposal Deadline by delivering the applicable cashier’s check on or before the new Proposal Deadline along with simple instructions identifying the cashier’s check as being associated with the previously submitted Proposal. Additionally, as noted in the District’s Response to Question #14 above, this confirms that in the event a Respondent feels it cannot submit the cashier’s check with its Proposal by the new Proposal Deadline (*i.e.*, for some internal reason), Respondents are asked to state the reason for this delayed cashier’s check submission, confirm that the Respondent will submit the cashier’s check immediately should its Proposal be selected by the District’s Governing Board, and the Governing Board can review this information and determine whether or not to waive the timely receipt of the cashier’s check as is otherwise required pursuant to the RFP information.

Finally, please note that the District strongly encourages Respondents to each seriously consider their best Proposal price and terms offer. Response to the initial RFP was numerous and robust, and interest continues to mount. While the Governing Board of the District will have many Proposals to consider and from which to choose, more time and consideration will naturally be given to the strongest Proposals received by the new Proposal Deadline, and it is anticipated that the District will continue further negotiations with the best Proposal’s Respondent, or perhaps a select few.

Unless explicitly stated herein, all other terms, conditions, and requirements of the RFQ are in full force and effect and shall remain unchanged. In case of conflict between the RFP and this Addendum No. 1, this Addendum No. 1 shall govern.

The District reserves the right to issue additional addenda pursuant to the process set forth in the RFP as deemed necessary by the District. However, unless and until any such subsequent addenda are issued, the RFP and this Addendum No. 1 shall constitute the entire and complete RFP.

The District thanks you for your interest, and looks forward to reviewing received Proposals, and also to receiving new, or modified or supplemented, Proposals.