

Request for Proposals

RFP 2014.10.23

Redevelopment of Garages 1 and 4

DRAFT ADDENDUM No. ____

Issue Date: _____, 2015

In order to provide clarity, this and prior addenda are incorporated in a restated RFP.

In addition to the development concept called for in Section II.B and D of the RFP, the following alternate options may be proposed so that there will be three alternate options:

- Proposers may propose to acquire and develop both sites with each to contain 500 public parking spaces as well as private development.
- Proposers may propose to acquire and develop only one site which would contain 500 public parking spaces as well as private development.

Under any of the three alternate options, the two projects shall be staged so that the new public parking on one site must be completed before possession and construction may commence on the second site.

Under either of the two new alternate options, proposers may propose either Garage 1 or Garage 4 to be the first project. However, it is the City's strong preference that Garage 1 be the first site to be developed, given the substandard condition of that garage.

Under any of the three alternate options, the public parking garage on the Garage 4 site will be expected to have a mid-block paseo from the garage to the Miracle Mile. Proposers are not required to evidence site control of Miracle Mile property as part of their Stage 1 RFP submittal.

Under any of the three alternate options, the requirement for the Garage 1 site to include ground floor space with a clear height of 20 – 22 feet is eliminated.

Under any of the three alternate options entailing development of the Garage 1 site,, the City shall have the option to own or rent, at a rent and terms to be determined later in the RFP process or negotiation, all or a portion of the ground floor commercial shell space in the Garage 1 development.

Under any of the three alternate options, electric car charging stations are required to be included in the public parking facilities in the Garage 1 and Garage 4 sites.

Under either of the two new alternate options, proposals may only be for a long term (99 year) ground lease, not a sale.

Section II.D.3 of the RFP regarding Lease or Sale of Garage 4 Site under the original development option specified in the RFP is amended so that the City's preference for a land lease as opposed to a sale is characterized as a strong preference.

The City will consider proposals by which the Developer will operate the public parking provided that the public parking is offered at City Rates, as they may change from time to time, honor merchant validated parking, allocate parking between transient and permit as determined by the City on an annual basis, and adhere to standards of operation and signage to be further specified later in the RFP process and negotiated with the selected Proposer(s).

If and to the extent necessary to make the development feasible, the City will consider proposals by which the Developer will retain all or a portion of public parking revenues (while adhering to the requirements in the preceding paragraph). If retainage of public parking revenues is proposed, the City prefers some form of participation arrangement by which revenues would be shared between the Developer and the City.

Historic revenues from the garages are attached to this addendum.

Notwithstanding anything in the RFP, the City does not intend to provide capital gap subsidy or financing for the project.

Proposers may submit proposals with alternate options for any of the above development or transaction elements that are presented as options (as opposed to requirements). For example, a proposal could include one option calling for development of the Garage 4 site first and an alternate option calling for Garage 1 site to be developed first.

Section III of the RFP is amended as follows:

The City will evaluate the relative merits of proposals relative to each other as well as relative to alternate means of fulfilling its objectives such as the City funding and constructing a public parking facility on the Garage 1 site.

The following weighting is anticipated to be applied to the evaluation criteria for Stage II proposals:

- Capability of the Proposer and Development Team – Assuming adequacy of qualifications, relative qualifications and capacity will be considered a comparative criteria with a weighting of 20%
- Likelihood of Feasibility – 20%
- Financial Return to the City –15%
- Enhancement of the Public Parking Supply in a Cost Effective Manner –25%
- Contribute to the Vitality, Amenity, and Economic Activity of and in the CBD – 20%

The above criteria are further amended as follows:

Enhancement of the Public Parking Supply in a Cost Effective Manner is amended to include "Also considered will be the timing and surety of replacement of Garage 1 public parking facility."

Contribute to the Vitality, Amenity, and Economic Activity of and in the CBD is amended to include "the inclusion of green initiatives, providing green and sustainable components and initiatives beyond what is required and/or that are unique solutions."

The submittal date and schedule are amended as follows: *{INSERT}*

A new Exhibit H – Historic Public Parking Revenues has been added to the RFP.