



855 E. Laurel Drive - RFQ

Addendum

Tuesday, May 24, 2022

General Comment: The County and City recognize that this is a complicated project especially because of its location on County owned land. For this reason, it was determined that a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) as opposed to a Request for Proposals (RFP) was the appropriate process for the subject property. The purpose of the RFQ process is to identify the most qualified developer with the best overall concept. The County and City understand that once a developer is selected additional work is needed to refine the concept into a final design. Therefore, it is understood that proposals will be conceptual in nature and will require further coordination with the County and City. Likewise, many of the questions below cannot be fully answered at this early stage but will be worked through with the selected developer as the design is finalized.

Addendum and related exhibits can be found at: <https://www.cityofsalinas.org/our-city-services/community-development/housing-and-community-development-division/rfps-public-notice>

Zoning

- 1) The proposed project site is currently zoned Public/Semi-Public/Open Space.
 - a. What is the City's plan to amend the General Plan and/or change the zoning to allow for multi-family residential development?
Response: Most of the available property is zoned Public/Semi-Public, which allows multifamily with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Therefore, it is unnecessary to change the zoning for a multi-family development. Despite that the City is currently working on updating the General Plan and Zoning Code and a proposal could include different development assumptions for later phases of the project. Proposed development standards could be considered for the General Plan Update expected to be completed in 2024.
 - b. Will the site need to be rezoned to Medium Density Residential?
Response: If the proposed multifamily dwelling is located on the Public/Semipublic (PS) section of the project site, then per Zoning Code Section 37-30.390, Table 37-30.170, it

can be processed through the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process and the site would not need to be redesignated to Residential Medium Density in the General Plan and rezoned to Residential Medium Density. Per Zoning Code Section 37-30.390, Table 37-30.170, all residential development shall comply with the Residential Medium Density (R-M-2.9) Development Regulations and R-M Design Standards. Density and development regulations can be further modified through the State's Density Bonus Law.

- c. What would that timing look like?

Response: The timing for a CUP depends on the scope of the proposed project. Usually, a CUP takes four to six months from the time of a complete submittal. In addition, this project may need environmental review pursuant to CEQA. There is an exemption under CEQA for infill housing projects under five acres. A project would be evaluated to determine eligibility for this exemption.

- d. Will the City/County be the lead or does the developer need to do this?

Response: As stated above, it is not anticipated that a General Plan Amendment or zone change will be needed. Both the County and City also have some flexibility on zoning related to land owned or leased by the jurisdiction. The concept of the overall development and qualifications of the developer are more important in the selection than adhering strictly to the regulations of existing zoning. In addition, State Density Bonus Law could be part of a concept, which provides for a lot more flexibility on development regulations and design standards.

- 2) Are there any agricultural setbacks which affect the parcel (in other words, are Laurel Street and the skate park sufficient to meet the setback requirement)?

Response: While the setbacks for residential on Public/Semi Public Zoning point to the development regulations of the R-M-2.9 development regulations. Setback restrictions can be less restrictive through State Density Bonus Law. The concept should consider reasonable setbacks given the adjacent uses versus the strict requirements in code.

Site Access

- 1) To provide a secondary entry to the project site, could our road and parking area connect to the driveway immediately north of the SHARE Center? See image below.



Response: Yes, that could be a possibility. However, there should be sufficient trip generation to justify a secondary access point on E. Laurel Drive. The project would need to demonstrate that there is a capacity, operational or safety need to warrant a second entrance. Any new access on E. Laurel Dr which could have a safety impact will need to be evaluated as part of the CEQA process. Given the speeds, volume, and collision history it is probable any new access will require traffic controls.

- 2) What is the width/number of lanes on Veterans Way?

Response: Veteran's Way is 76' wide at the intersection with E. Laurel Drive and it narrows down to 30'. Veteran's Way is a 2-way street. Veterans Way is not a City street, and unless there is a new network connection there is no public benefit dedicating this road to the City. It should remain private and therefore the width and number of lanes is not a traffic operation concern other than at the intersection on Laurel Dr.

- 3) Would Veterans Way need to be widened?

Response: Veteran's Way is a County driveway, and it provides access to County facilities, and it is not a publicly maintained road. Future use and maintenance will need to be negotiated as part of the future multifamily affordable housing project.

- 4) If Access Point #2 is used, will there be an easement given through the skate park or will there be a lot line adjustment for this?

Response: Maybe. Future potential easements and/or lot line adjustments will need to be negotiated as part of the future multifamily affordable housing project.

- 5) Can the City/County provide fire access standards (require hammer head turns)/drive aisle widths for a two-level structure?

Response: Yes, please see Exhibit A, which contains the fire access standards requested.

Site Infrastructure

- 1) Figure 4 and the civil drawing included as Attachment C do not seem to show the same easement area for the high-voltage power lines.

- a. Can we assume the civil drawings are the correct source? We should not propose any buildings within the 40' easement?

Response: The SHARE Center project was not impacted by the proximity to power lines; therefore, the County did not dive into the requirements. City staff requested the building setbacks from the high-voltage power lines from PG&E and the City is still waiting for the information. Based upon California guidance regarding high tension power lines, please assume there is a 40' easement (20' feet on each side) and do not include any buildings within this area.

- b. Are there additional clearance requirements on top of this 40' easement?

Response: We still are awaiting PG&E response, but for proposes of this RFQ just assume the 40'.

- c. What are set back requirements for projects with High Power Overhead Lines?

Response: Please see the response to question 1a under this section.

- 2) What are the storm water detention requirements for the site?

Response: The City will oversee land use for the project, which will require a preliminary stormwater control plan to address the storm water detention requirements for the project. For more information, please contact the Development Engineering Division within the City's Public Works Department at (831) 758-7251. For further details on the City's stormwater development standards, please click on the below link.

[Stormwater Development Standards - Downloadable Documents | City of Salinas](#)

- 3) Is there an easement needed for infrastructure hookups on Veterans Way which is a private county drive/street?

Response: Utility access is available and infrastructure hookups are available. Design and location of future easements and infrastructure will be determined and discussed after a developer is selected.

- 4) Should we assume that the existing swale/stormwater basin has capacity for new affordable housing units?

Response: The selected developer would need to evaluate the capacity of the existing swale/stormwater along with the impacts of the future project and modify the existing swale/stormwater basin as needed with County approval. The requested schematic site plans under this RFQ should remain at a high-level overview.

- 5) Is there an existing Mitigation Measure in place for the existing Earthen Swale?

Response: Maybe. The earthen swale should be evaluated in the final design phase of the project to ensure the development is consistent with the required mitigation measures. The requested schematic site plans under this RFQ should remain at a high-level overview.

- 6) Will Storm Water Drainage be required to be designed for existing basin, or would another Storm Water Basin would need to be designed for the proposed project site?

Response: The proposed development should consider all storm water detention strategies. All water should remain on site. The existing, modified and/or additional water basin should integrate and accommodate the needs of both projects, the SHARE Center, and the new proposed multifamily affordable housing development. Water retention must meet the City and County's requirements.

Project Funding

1. Are other soft funds available, other than the land, from the City & County?

Response: Yes, soft cost funds are available. The City currently has approximately \$500,000 that could be allocated towards some of the soft cost expenditures of this proposed project. Within your proposal, please include how much funds you will need for the design and development of this project.

The County of Monterey may also have funds available towards the soft cost activities of this future project.

2. Would the 7 million in fiscal years funding available go to the development or to different developments within the city?

Response: The currently proposed multifamily affordable housing project at 855 E. Laurel Drive is a City and County priority. The current 7 million dollars available as gap financing from the multiple City of Salinas' funding sources (HOME, ARPA, and HSA) are competitive funds. The selected development team could potentially pursue/request the currently available funds from the City for this project.

3. Would the 7M funds be for combined fiscal years, if so, how many? Or are the funds available per fiscal year and if so, how many years?

Response: The City's HUD HOME funds are from two different fiscal years, FY 2021-22, and FY 2022-23. The Housing Successor Agency funds are funds from multiple fiscal years up to FY 2021-22 and the ARPA funds are from FY 2021-22. HUD HOME funds must be committed within two years and spent within 5 years. ARPA funds would have to be committed by 2024 and spent by 2026. Housing Successor Agency Funds have no commitment or expenditure deadlines.

4. Are Vouchers going to be available or is there any potential for vouchers? If so, how many?

Response: The selected developer will have to engage the Housing Authority of the County of Monterey to figure out the availability and quantity of available Project Based Vouchers within the County of Monterey. Tenant Based Vouchers may be available and are sometimes going underutilized.

5. What is the density bonus? 100% Affordable? What are the percentages?

Response: The City of Salinas follows the State regarding the Density Bonus laws. Multifamily affordable developments could be given up to an 80% Hyper Density Bonus. As an added incentive and on top of what the State's Density Bonus Law allows, the City of Salinas can grant senior affordable developments up to an 100% Density Bonus. The developer could also request up to three project concessions.

6. Per item C of the Expected Terms and Conditions of the project and since the funding is for shovel ready projects, how would the City collaborate in obtaining the Available 7 million funding?

Response: This project is a City and County priority. The City and County will collaborate with the selected developer to finalize the design of the future affordable housing development so that the project could pursue all possible funding streams currently available at the local, state, and federal levels. Both jurisdictions have a history of collaborating with affordable housing developers to secure resources for construction.

7. Are there immediate funds the City/County have available to be awarded for the developer to use to start the following process: appraisals, building fees and permits, impact fees, and architecture and engineering?

Response: The City currently has approximately \$500,000 that could be utilized towards some of the soft cost expenditures for the design and development of this project. Within your proposal, please indicate how much money you will need for soft cost activities of this project.

Project Structuring

1. Would the City and County be okay with a 2 phased project?

Response: Yes, the City and County are open to the possibility of having an affordable multifamily housing development with multiple phases.

2. Will the City/County keep the balance of the 9.14-acre lot that is not required for the affordable housing as only about 5 acres is developable?

Response: The developers can utilize the entire 9.14 acres of the site. The 5 acres was just a reference to the part of the site that is developable ready. The remaining space within the site can be utilized to meet parking, open space, and/or other project requirements. However, projects over 5 acres will not be eligible for the CEQA exemption for infill housing and will require a more extensive CEQA review.

You may include a concept in your proposal for the additional area that was mentioned by the County as available during the site visit on May 20, 2020. Please see the below map for further details on the additional area that was part of the site visit discussion. Please keep this concept as a separate option in your proposal as we may not be able to consider it as part of the overall scoring.

Because the add area was not included in the original RFQ, **only concepts for the original area will be scored**. However, the County is willing to further negotiate with the selected for this property and understanding a concept early on will facilitate refining the overall design.



3. Is the project Entitled?

Response: No, the project is not currently entitled. The City and County are looking for a qualified development team to take the site, and design and develop a multifamily affordable housing project. Depending on the proposal, the entitlement process could be streamlined.

4. What Housing Type is the project? Low Family Income, Special Needs, Family, Senior, Homeless, and what are the percentages?

Response: The City and County are looking for a multifamily affordable housing project geared towards very low and low-income families, yet the City and County are open to other ideas given that is highly possible that this project will be developed in multiple phases.

5. What type of encumbering land terms is the County proposing?

Response: In the RFQ, the County is proposing a 55-year ground lease. The County is open to the idea of longer ground lease agreements. Within the proposals, developers should discuss what is the ideal ground lease term for their projects.

6. With the project's site being near the SHARE center – will any supportive services or community space be shared between the SHARE Center and the proposed development?

Response: The City and County are open to suggestions and creative ideas around shared spaces between the SHARE Center and the future multifamily affordable housing project.

7. Are there specific amenities the City/County would like included in the proposed development?

Response: Development teams should consider open space, playground areas, community rooms, laundry areas among other amenities geared towards multifamily developments. The City and County are open to creative ideas around amenities to be provided along with the proposed project.

8. Are there specific amenities the City/County would not like to be included in the proposed development?

Response: The City and County does not have a specific limitation on the amenities to be provided within the project.

RFQ Clarifications

- 1) Is there any formula for higher points for greater affordability?
Response: As stated in the RFQ, affordable multifamily housing projects that provide greater affordability will be awarded higher points in the selection process. There is no specific formula for higher points. Proposals will be evaluated in relation to all submittals and those with greater affordability will be given higher points under the “Proposed Conceptual Development” category.
- 2) Any extra points for extremely low or restricting a small percentage of units for the homeless?
Response: No extra points, all proposals will be evaluated following the 100-point criteria highlighted in the RFQ. As stated previously, proposals with greater affordability will be given higher points under the “Proposed Conceptual Development” category.
- 3) What does “description of incentives provided” on page 7, Item B mean? Are these allowable asks under density bonus or something else?
Response: The “description of incentives provided” was referring to the incentives or concessions that the development team could request from the City through the Density Bonus Program to increase the density of the proposed project and/or make the proposed project more feasible. Through the Density Bonus Program, developers could request up to three project concessions.
- 4) Given that a conceptual plan has been requested as part of the RFQ, would you consider changing the deadline to 6/13/ or 6/20?
Response: The RFQ deadline will be extended to **Friday, June 24th by 5 pm** to allow development teams more time to craft their proposals.

Technical Documentation Requested

- 1) Prelim including backup and maps regarding exceptions and easements.
Response: Yes, please see Exhibit B (multiple files).
- 2) Topo – clean without anything else – file emailed to share with architect; and
Response: Yes, please see Exhibit C – (Multiple DWG files).
- 3) Drainage and Utility Plan – file emailed to share with architect.
Response: Yes, please see Exhibit C - (Multiple DWG files).
- 4) Is the City/County going to provide any 3rd party due diligence reports (A.L.T.A or soils)?
Response: See easement records, site background, utilities as-builts, Phase I, phase II, soils, various other reports. See Exhibit D (Multiple files).