

# Memo



**To:** Parties Interested in the Affordable Housing RFP

**From:** Jeff Flory – Community Development Director

**Date:** April 2, 2024

**Re:** RFP Requests for Clarification

---

The following Questions were submitted for clarification of the Affordable Housing RFP. The responses are in red.

1. Please confirm the proposal deadline. **The RFP Deadline is Saturday, April 13, 2023.**
2. Is an extension/later due date possible? **Not at this time.**
3. Is there a page count requirement for the proposal? **There is no page count requirement.**
4. What is meant by “comprehensive landscape plan”? Is that a site plan showing the building footprint, parking, and general site layout? **The plan should be shown within a site plan that shows where landscaping will be added for appearance. Specific landscape materials or plantings are not required. Concepts should generally show that landscaping will be utilized within yard areas and open spaces to provide for screening or curb appeal.**
5. Are we to assume standard right-of-way improvements along the property line? **Sidewalks and any other right-of-way improvements will need to meet ADA requirements and be provided along the N. Holladay and Hwy 101 frontages.**
6. Can you provide any information in advance for any restrictions to site access and any ODOT involvement? **We do not have information as to what will be required from ODOT for an access permit or expansion of any current permit.**
7. In the narrative on Page 4, there is statement that says “Furthermore, proposals should include a comprehensive landscape plan to ensure the final development is visually appealing and serves as a model for further development”. However, the Proposal Content section on Page 7 does not request a comprehensive landscape plan. Is the intent of the statement on page 4 to signal to developers that a comprehensive landscape plan is a project requirement, and therefore should be included in the budget? Or is the intent of the statement to require a comprehensive landscape plan in our proposal response to the RFP? We would recommend the former, as a comprehensive landscape plan at this early stage would not be recommended, would be difficult to complete before the response deadline, and would be expensive for the respondents to create for a competitive RFP with no assurance of

project award. Landscape plans do not need to be specific and detailed at this point. Landscaped areas should be shown on the site plan and be general in nature, showing where landscaping will be used for appearance or for screening/buffering.

8. Does the City have a plan to remediate the soil piles that include contaminated soil? It would be beneficial for the project if the City could remove the contaminated soil before the project. The extent of contamination is not known at this point. The city does not have a budget allocated for any remediation.
9. Ownership model. Is the City open to a non-profit housing developer/provider owning the property long term? As long as certain negotiated terms are met for property disposition? Per 2021 Senate Bill 8, the development of residential uses on lands zoned for industrial use requires the property to be publicly owned. The city would consider proposals that allow developer ownership in the future if the city can legally do so while utilizing this state law to develop a residential use of an industrial-zoned property.
10. Does the above RFP currently have an estimated budget, target mobilization or completion date? Also, does there happen to be any anticipated union or labor requirements? The RFP does not currently have an estimated budget as the developer will be expected to fund or find funding sources for the project. The city will be providing the land only and not funding any portions of the construction. Union or labor requirements have not been discussed.
11. Setbacks – The M-1 Zone does not have setbacks. The Feasibility plans included in the RFP show dashed setback lines from property lines which appear to match the setbacks of the R-3 Zone. Will The City of Seaside require setbacks for this parcel? There will not be a setback requirement other than the landscape requirement along the Hwy frontage per the TSP. we would like to see some setback from the existing residential dwelling that is in the middle of this property off of Holladay.
12. Access - Is it acceptable to access the site from Holladay Drive and abandon the access from Roosevelt Drive? The use of the access from N. Holladay Dr. will need to be determined by your design professional and approved by the fire department. Further details will be needed for a review by the Fire Marshal.
13. LUR - What type of Land Use Review is anticipated and what are the associated durations? We will be developing this property using [SB 8 \(2021\)](#). This prohibits the city from requiring any kind of conditional use for the project. We will, however, have to complete a Highway Overlay Zone review through the Planning Commission. The Commission meets once a month and we can usually accomplish the review in one meeting. Once plans are more solidified, we will get the application going and get a hearing scheduled.
14. Permit Durations - How long is a typical permit review process in Seaside from intake to issuance, assuming quality documents are submitted? Assuming all the documents necessary for permits are submitted and of sufficient quality, we try to turn permits around within 2-3 weeks. This is all dependent on whether our plans examiner is on an extended vacation. He is retired and working for us part-time while we work to hire a new building official. We are hopeful we will fill that position in the near future.
15. Civil Engineers - Which Civil Engineering firms does your staff see on projects that demonstrate an understanding of local requirements? Unfortunately, we cannot recommend any engineering firms. We see a wide range of engineers, many of whom are from out of this area.