

Addendum #2

West End Development Request for Proposals

This addendum responds to the following 15 questions:

1. “Will the City consider a proposal that satisfies the public parking requirement through a mechanical, automated, or valet-assisted parking system instead of a conventional self-park ramp, provided the proposal addresses capacity, user experience, ADA access, fire/life safety, operations, maintenance, and long-term serviceability?”

Response: Yes.

2. “Is the parking space count a fixed minimum requirement, or will the city evaluate alternatives that provide a different number of physical parking spaces if the proposal delivers equal or greater public benefit through increased housing, lower cost, improved land use, reduced carbon impact, and efficient parking operations?”

Response: No, the City is open to evaluating alternative counts.

3. “Will the City consider parking throughput, turnover, retrieval time, and managed valet operations as part of the parking evaluation, rather than evaluating only the raw number of stalls?”

Response: Yes, as long as public parking is affordable to the general parking public.

4. “How will the City weigh tradeoffs among parking count, housing quantity, targeted/attainable housing, land-value compensation, sustainability, public revenue sharing, design quality, and long-term operating cost?”

Response: Refer to the Evaluation Rubric, Exhibit 7 of the RFP.

5. “Will the City consider compensation for the land through a combination of purchase price, taxes, ground lease, long-term revenue sharing, equity participation, or other public-private partnership structure?”

Response: Yes.

6. “Would a professionally operated premium public valet model be acceptable if it remains open to the public, provides clear pricing, meets required operating hours, and offers defined service standards such as average retrieval time and peak/event staffing plans?”

Response: Yes, taking into account the goals identified in the Evaluation Rubric, found in Exhibit 7 of the RFP.

7. “Will the City give evaluation credit for an all-electric mechanical parking system that reduces or eliminates the need for vehicle circulation ramps, conventional garage lighting levels, ventilation demand, and vehicle idling inside the structure?”

Response: Refer to the Evaluation Rubric, Exhibit 7 of the RFP.

8. “Will the City give evaluation credit to proposals that use a smaller parking footprint to create additional targeted or attainable housing units beyond the conventional garage concept?”

Response: Refer to the Evaluation Rubric, Exhibit 7 of the RFP.

9. “Would the City consider an alternative structure in which the City retains ownership of the West End property and constructs the required public parking using an automated parking system that requires approximately 40% less land area than a conventional ramped parking deck? This approach could preserve a larger portion of the site for additional housing development by a private developer, while allowing the City to retain ownership of the land and long-term parking revenue.

“Under this structure, the City could substantially reduce the upfront cost of the parking solution. As part of Elevated Parking Corporation’s commitment to establishing its first P3 project and using it as a model for future municipal projects, EPC would be willing to reduce its standard system pricing from approximately \$26,000 per space to \$17,000 per space. Of that amount, \$2,000 per space would be contributed back as long-term equity participation, resulting in an effective net equipment cost of approximately \$15,000 per space for the City’s parking solution.

“Would the City be open to evaluating this type of alternative ownership and development structure as an option to selling the land or requiring a conventional parking deck, particularly if it results in lower public parking costs, retained City parking revenue, and increased housing capacity on the site?”

Response: Yes to both questions.

10. At the May 1, 2026, pre-bid meeting, the City was asked about the timing of the public engagement referred to in the RFP.

Response: At least one public meeting, jointly hosted by the City and the chosen developer, is envisioned to take place after the developer is selected.

11. At the May 1, 2026, pre-bid meeting, the City was asked about design and the appetite for innovative design versus traditional design.

Response: Standards in the City’s zoning ordinance apply. Beyond that, the public engagement meeting will provide an opportunity to get feedback on design.

12. At the May 1, 2026, pre-bid meeting, the City was asked about flexibility in applying the City's Building Electrification Policy.

Response: If a respondent wants to propose a portion of their project powered by something other than electricity, they should propose it both ways, showing the tradeoff(s) of fully complying with the Policy.

13. At the May 1, 2026 pre-bid meeting, the City was asked if there are any current discussions regarding the integration with City Departments on infrastructure improvements in the alley or projects such as utilities (stormwater, light & power, etc.)

Response: The developer should include replacing the old 8" clay sanitary sewer in the alley between Pine and Union St with a new 12" PVC main. Otherwise, there may need to be coordination with other City utilities improvements.

14. At the May 1, 2026 pre-bid meeting, the City was asked if interviews would be conducted

Response: The City's Design Team will determine whether they would like to interview finalists. These interviews, if needed, will take place on June 30, 2026.

15. The City was asked if it would consider bonding for the public parking portion of the project.

Response: The City has not discussed bonding for this project yet. If the bidder requires this consideration, they must state it in their proposals.