

Responses to questions to the Homestake RFQ as of May 18, 2021

1. **How does PCMC prioritize ground lease rate vs. percentage of AMI served in the project?**
The City is willing to negotiate a lower lease rate to provide units at a rental level that serves the population with a lower AMI level.
2. **Does PCMC prefer to handle the environmental remediation or have the developer complete with support from PCMC?** Once a soil remediation plan is developed, based on the needs of the approved design, the City and developer would negotiate the level of assistance the City will provide to complete the plan.
3. **The RFQ indicates not to rely exclusively on tax credit financing. Can you please elaborate on PCMC's perspective on tax credit financing?** The City sees tax credit financing as a viable funding source for affordable housing projects. The City wants to ensure that the developer is not solely relying on one funding source and has experience using a combination of sources if needed.
4. **How does PCMC define "mixed-income"?** The City would define mixed-income as providing housing units that target various income levels, including affordable and market-rate units.
5. **In our review of the RFQ requirements, we have a question as to the form and content of the Conflict of Interest disclosure. We have reviewed Section 3 of the Park City Municipal Code and are requesting clarification about the requirements needed for the disclosure.** As part of the submittal, the City would like any disclosures of conflicts of interests as outlined in Section 3 of the Park City Municipal Code. These conflicts of interest deal with City officials and/or employees.
6. **Can we request a copy of the Environmental Study on the city-owned Homestake Road parcel?** Here is a [LINK](#) to the study completed by the City.
7. **Can you provide the following information about this parcel?** The answers to all the questions below can be found in the Affordable Master Planned Development section of the Land Management Code.
 - Front yard setback (Zoning Code: 15-2.18-3): the Subject Property is subject to a 20' front yard setback, which may be reduced to 10' if the onsite parking is in the rear of the property (or underground). Is the front yard setback measured from the property line or the snow removal easement?
 - 35' height requirement (Zoning Code: 15-2.18-4): the Subject Property has an approximate 10' drop in elevation from the south to the north. Where will the City measure the floor of the ground level?
 - Open Space: What is the open space requirement for the Homestake parcel?

8. **I could not locate any addenda on the website; please confirm if any addenda have been issued.** Any additional information or answers to questions posed will be posted to the City's website.
9. **Is it a priority to include market-rate units in the development, or would a 100% affordable community be well-received?** While the City is looking to maximize the number of affordable units, the City sees value in mixed-income developments.
10. **What density is the City seeking for the proposed development?** The City is looking to maximize the number of units with a design that meets the Land Management Code.
11. **Is there a range of total number of units that PCMC expects to see developed on the site?** The City has estimated that the parcel could fit 70-100 units but would not be opposed to more units if a developer feels they can design and build these units while still meeting the City's goals.
12. **To what extent will the City provide assistance with the contaminated soil removal/remediation?** The amount of assistance has not been determined. It will depend on the remediation plan based on the approved design of the project.
13. **Do you have any additional reports or information available regarding the environmental concerns on the property or the site in general?** A link to the environmental study can be found [HERE](#).
14. **The RFP made reference to the Condition of Title – can you clarify what the potential issues with Title are?** The City has not identified any issues with the Title but recommends that a developer review the Title report on the property as part of due diligence.
15. **Can you share all the most recent changes to zoning that have been approved that they can incorporate into their massing/designs?** The recent section added to the Land Management Code regarding Affordable Master Planned Developments can be found [HERE](#).
16. **Is the City just looking for a developer to submit its qualifications, or are you looking for a full development team identified in the RFQ that would include architect, civil, management entity, services provider, etc.?** The City is requesting qualifications of a development team. The RFQ requests that the submittal identify all team members. As part of that team, members outside of the organization that will play a role in developing the project could be identified.
17. **Exhibit B — third bullet from the bottom — states “...robust resident services programming, with a programming and operations plan provided”. Are you asking for a services plan with our RFQ submittal or are you just stating that we will need to provide one as part of the project’s development?** This is part of the “preferences” section, and as such, are items that the City would not necessarily require but would be very interested in having included in the project. As part of the submittal, a developer could provide information on programming from past projects and possible programming that may be incorporated into this project.
18. **What level of existing infrastructure is available for the site? Is the Munchkin Road extension expected to be developed during the time that the Homestake project would get built?** The site has access to all utilities. Preliminary investigations have identified power

connections next to the site. There are several infrastructure upgrades planned around the surrounding area. The Munchkin Road extension, north of the property, is scheduled to happen in the next two years. In addition, there are planned water infrastructure upgrades on Homestake Road to upsize the current system to meet the needs of the development in the area. Those upgrades are scheduled to occur in the next year.

19. **Are we required to identify a nonprofit partner as part of the RFQ submittal or can we designate one in collaboration with the City if we are selected as the developer?** The City does not require a nonprofit partner to be identified as part of the RFQ submittal.
20. **Is the City targeting a minimum number of units for the site?** The zoning appears to be flexible per the Affordable Housing Master Planned Development application process. The City would like to see the number of units maximized while staying compliant with the Land Management Code.
21. **Will there be a subsequent Request for Proposal Round? Or as Section III of the RFQ suggests, will the developer for the project be chosen after the RFQ interview process?** The City plans to create a prioritized list of developers and begin negotiations with the top developer on that list to come to a cooperative development agreement for the Homestake Lot.
22. **The RFQ requests financials and net worth on the guarantor(s) of the project. Is there a way that sensitive financial information for entities and/or persons can be submitted separately to a smaller PCMC (decision-making) group rather than disclosed in the RFQ response that will presumably be made available to the public?** The City is obligated to meet all GRAMA requirements. Please refer to the State of Utah Code - Government Records Access and Management Act. Entities responding to this RFQ may want to become familiar with GRAMA, including the Business Confidentiality provisions, and provide information that they are comfortable releasing to the general public accordingly.