

Questions and Answers

Q1) **Is any developer at an advantage or disadvantage in this RFP? This type of response requires a lot of coordination and expense; we don't want to go further if the City has already made the decision.**

A) All responses will be scored according to the priorities identified in the RFP. I imagine that at least one proposal would include the neighboring commercial parcel, but ALL proposals will be given equal consideration.

Q2) **How would the City prefer to have the public parking component structured? Long term lease to private bond, outright purchase, assigned interest?**

A) The City & Edina HRA are open to a variety of financial structures. Several different structures have been successfully implemented.

The historic approach is full public ownership of land and facility with shared responsibilities for maintenance expenses. At 50th and France, the maintenance and operating costs are assessed to the benefitting property owners each year. In the Grandview District, the City owns the parking ramp while Jerry's Enterprises is fully responsible for maintenance and operating expenses. Under this arrangement, their customers and employees have preferred (but not exclusive) access. In other City facilities, we have created condominiums where each party has clear responsibilities and where both parties have shared responsibilities.

The more recent model has flipped the relationship. At Edinborough and Centennial Lakes for example, the ramps are privately owned (and privately maintained) with a permanent easement for public use. These projects were supported with Tax Increment Financing where new property tax dollars were used to pay for the ramps.

The City is open to a variety of approaches depending on the scope of each proposal.

Q3) Please elaborate on stormwater requirements? Does the 3930 site need to accommodate updated stormwater requirements for the adjoining (North) ramp as well?

A) The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District will require parcels with new lot coverage to abide by their standard requirements. It is not the City's intention to retroactively construct storm water improvements for parcels that are grandfathered. For example, a new building on the 3930 parcel will need to meet the new storm water requirements. Alternatively, a new level on top of the existing North Ramp, for example, does not require new storm water features.

Q4) Can any required Park Dedication fees be put toward beatification and developing vegetative screening along the exterior of the ramp? Does part of this want to be carried over to the ramp to the south?

A) Park Dedication Fees are only required when a parcel is subdivided; for example when a parcel is redeveloped to include new condominium units. The City is not anticipating any significant park dedication fees with this project. It is unlikely that any park dedication fees will be waived.

Q5) Would it be Ok to include the former dry cleaning site (3944) and a concept for the 3925 surface parking lot in this proposal? I assume we're dealing with the same general decision making body, but wanted to confirm since it was included in the RFP but not specifically called out.

A) The focus of this RFP is the vacant 3930 parcel. Various parties have inquired about including other City-owned properties. The City and Edina HRA are interested in the creativity of the development community. One point of caution regarding the 3944 (former dry cleaning site): there is likely some residual contamination on this property and the existing driveway may need to be retained for deliveries and utility access.

Q6) Does the City have as-built plans of the ramp available? Has a code review of the ramp been completed, including measuring the travel distances?

A) Construction drawings for the 1997 North Ramp addition and 1976 Center Ramp are now posted on the City's website. No code review has been completed by the City. With any addition to the North Ramp, it should be assumed that a new stairway is included on the 3930 parcel.

Q7) Has the City put any thought into traffic control along West 49 ½ St? Part of the reason retailers have been reluctant to go to this part of the street has been the flow of traffic. Additional parking along 49th via a bump out curb or speed bumps would really help to attract high quality tenants.

A) The City supports effective traffic calming features. Due to the narrow width of 49-1/2 Street, it is unlikely that on-street parking will be feasible. Alternatively, wider sidewalks, strategically placed bump outs, and well-marked crosswalks with pedestrian LED lights are preferred. The City will not consider speed bumps on the public street.

Updated September 7, 2016