

# Riverview Road & 54<sup>th</sup> Street East

---

## RFP Informational Meeting Questions & Answers

**1. Q: Could you address the various affordability levels outlined in the RFP document?**

A: There are 2 separate and equally significant affordability levels addressed in the RFP document: the first deals with the potential sources of public funds used to acquire the site possibly being Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. Use of CDBG funds requires that 51% of the housing units being sold initially affordable to and occupied by households at or below 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI). The second affordability levels relate the City's Affordable Housing Policy requirement that all City financially assisted housing projects of 10 units or more shall have at least 20% of the units affordable at or below 50% of Area Median Income (AMI). Units that meet the 20% at 50% AMI requirement can be counted toward meeting a portion of the 51% at 80% AMI requirement.

**2. Q: How would proposals with 100% affordable units be viewed by the Committee?**

A: CPED encourages applications reflecting a mixed-income structure; however, the RFP evaluation criteria does not award points based on the mix of income-restricted and market-rate units.

**3. Q: Could you expand on the total number of units desired within the proposed development?**

A: The RFP document specifies that 40 – 50 units are desired; however, based on the overall feasibility of the proposed development, the developer should specify what they feel in their experience would be the best mix and number of units in the development; however, the local station area plan and zoning will dictate the allowable number of units based on the local building and zoning code. Developers should use these disciplines to determine the actual number of units in their development proposal.

**4. Q: Please address Evaluation Criteria #4: The extent to which the proposal addresses the parking needs of the development and the surrounding community.**

A: Developments are expected to be self-contained with respect to their parking requirements. There is no expectation that any proposed development needs to address any additional existing unmet parking needs outside of the development.

Developers should take into consideration the various parking needs of the proposed development as well as the surrounding community to make certain that the proposed developments specific parking needs do not adversely impact and overflow into the adjacent community causing parking shortages for the existing residents in the immediate area. Developers should be advised that no parking is allowed along 54<sup>th</sup> Street East.

**5. Q: *Please address Evaluation Criteria #6: Extent to which the project can move forward on a timetable that coordinates with other development in the area.***

A: Almost all dates and timelines contained within the text of the RFP and in the Informational Meeting are best estimates and are subject to change.

Developers should make themselves familiar with automobile, bicycle and pedestrian traffic patterns and needs of the immediate area and the proposed development, traffic patterns and the needs of the residents in the immediate area and the proposed developments adjacent, within or along the Hiawatha Corridor and how those developments might impact automobile, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, and access/egress from the immediate area. The developer must be sensitive to the needs of other developments in the area and committed to work with other developers, contractors, and City Public Works staff to stage traffic, deliveries, and overall flows into and out of the development site.

In its review of proposals, the RFP Review Committee wishes to see evidence on the part of respondents that they are aware of and sensitive to the status and timeline of existing area developments. This does not necessarily mean that development timelines on area projects will not overlap. The Committee wishes to see signs of developer's due diligence - knowledge of other area developments and a willingness to work with the City and neighborhood to minimize disruption as much as possible in a neighborhood that has already seen significant development activity.

**6. Q: *Is the City willing to take Parcels 1P and 2P into condemnation?***

A: The City has no plans to use eminent domain to expand the development area.

**7. Q: *What are the use constraints on the Yardville area of the development site?***

A: The City currently holds an expired 'use deed" granted by the MN Dept. of Revenue (1949) which allowed the City to construct a street within the Right-of-Way. The use deed only allowed the City to use the area as a public street. Any other use requires that the City deed the land back to the State and re-apply to pass-through the site to a development entity for the fair market value.

As such, the availability of any portion of this property for any other purpose cannot, at this time, be guaranteed. Moreover, we expect that any such proposed property transfer would result in any associated purchase and holding costs be passed on to the developer, subject to a CPED fair reuse value appraisal. The value in such an appraisal would be based on the size of the proposed property transfer and its proposed end use.

**8. Q: *Who would cover the cost of rerouting traffic along 54<sup>th</sup> Street East?***

A: Developers proposing a rerouting of Riverview Road and/or 54<sup>th</sup> Street East will be expected to propose sources of financing. The identified sources and costs of any such proposed rerouting would be expected to be an integral part of the development proposal and, like the other project sources and uses, be evaluated with regard to feasibility. Developers may, as appropriate, identify potential public sources of funds (e.g. the Metropolitan Council's Livable Communities Demonstration Account program, tax increment financing) as part of the financing to achieve such improvements.

**~Please check back frequently as these questions may be updated for further clarification.~**