

Lyn-Lake Parking Facilities RFP Pre-Proposal Meeting Notes Questions and Answers (Q&A) from February 11, 2020

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Q: Will a single developer receive extra points if it submits proposals for both Lot A and B, versus a proposal for only one of the two?

A: No. The two sites are different and applying for one or both doesn't impact the evaluation.

Q: Why isn't the City honoring the agreements from 1998?

A: Interested stakeholders often refer to "agreements" or "contracts" from when the parking lots were originally developed in 1998-1999. There is a short *History of Lyn-Lake Parking Facilities* document ([Attachment 1](#) to the RFP) that is helpful to read. There are no legal agreements or contracts, but people sometimes reference the contents of a staff letter to the Transportation & Public Works and Ways & Means/Budget Committees of the City Council, written by M. Monahan, the Assistant Director of Public Works, on April 9, 1998. The letter is commonly known as the "Monahan letter." The letter notes several things, including, but not limited to, a *Lyn-Lake Municipal Parking Trust Fund*, land sale revenue, and funding additional parking spaces when the parking demand for the area is proven to exceed the area's comfortable supply. The staff letter has been added to the [Lyn-Lake Parking Lots Project page](#).

No action has been taken by a City Council to change the terms in the 1998 letter, as approved by the 1998 City Council. However, CPED and Public Works anticipate taking a recommendation to the City Council for an action regarding those terms at the time of a Land Sale Public Hearing, if not before.

Q: How will community stakeholders be included in the review process? Will there be an advisory group or informational meetings/presentations?

A: Community stakeholders will have the opportunity to learn about and comment on response(s) to the RFP before the City Council takes an action. City staff will invite the public and community stakeholder groups to learn about the proposals and provide feedback on the proposals through meetings, open houses, or other means to inform the City's review committee.

Q: Is the City offering affordable housing financing if more than the minimum amount of affordable housing is proposed?

A: The selected developer will need to compete for financing for any proposed affordable housing components through the same regular competitive processes as any other affordable housing project in the City. The City is open, subject to City Council approval and specific program guidelines, to supporting and assisting the selected developer with any applications for federal, state, county, and regional funding for which the proposed development might qualify. Please note that to be eligible to apply for some public financial affordable housing assistance may require different affordability levels are met and may trigger additional development requirements. Review funding program specific guidelines to ensure your proposed project is eligible prior to including any as a possible funding source.

Q: Can you share the sign-in sheet from the pre-proposal meeting?

A: Yes, it is public information. Email [Rebecca Parrell](#) to receive a copy.

SITE A / GARFIELD LOT QUESTIONS

Q: How did the City arrive at the minimum of 75 public parking spaces for Site A/Garfield Lot?

A: The 75 spaces number does not come from a specific calculation. Please read the Parking Study ([Attachment 6](#), specifically pages 33-38) to understand the parking demand at the intersection.

Q: Are the 75 public parking spaces to be privately owned or will the City own them through a condominium model?

A: The City is not interested in owning the publicly available parking spaces. Proposals should assume private ownership and can propose a method for ensuring the spaces are publicly available. One model that the City has used is a recordable Public Parking Easement, but the City would consider other methods.

Q: Will the City entertain proposals with fewer than the minimum of 75 public parking spaces for Site A/Garfield Lot?

A: Yes, if, as the RFP states, the proposal “demonstrates how the needs of the area businesses can be served some other way.”

Q: Is the parking to be free or can there be a charge to park in the public spaces?

A: The parking does not have to be free. The City currently charges users to pay to park on Site A and Site B. The City’s 2018 net receipts for both lots together are shown in [Attachment 3](#).

Q: Is the City paying taxes on the Garfield lot?

A: No.

Q: Will public parking stalls in a new development be taxed?

A: Yes, the stalls will be subject to property tax because they will be privately owned.

Q: Is the City willing to “trade-away” the minimum of 75 public parking spaces in favor of achieving other development objectives?

A: No. However, the RFP does allow for proposals to “demonstrate how the needs of the area businesses can be served some other way,” if the minimum of 75 public parking spaces is not met in a proposal.

Q: There are overhead utilities over the site. Is burying them considered a public benefit?

A: Yes.

Q: Does the existing alley between Lyndale and Garfield need to remain as is?

A: The alley between Lyndale and Garfield needs to remain to provide access to the rear of the commercial buildings fronting Lyndale. It could be changed but any changes it underwent would need to provide the same or equivalent access to the buildings fronting Lyndale.

SITE B / 2920 LYNDALE AVE S QUESTIONS

Q: Will the City consider a proposal for SITE B responsive to the RFP that neither has site control of either adjacent property nor a proposed building?

A: The City's preference is for proposals with site control of an adjacent building and immediate new construction. However, if the City does not receive viable proposals for neither immediate new construction nor proposals with site control of an adjacent building, the City may consider other proposals.

Q: Will the City consider a proposal for SITE B responsive to the RFP if it proposes immediate site improvements and a building in 5-10 years?

A: No

Q: Will a developer need site control or intention of site control before submitting their proposal?

A: A proposer will need to provide evidence of site control. Evidence could be a purchase agreement or other evidence of an owner's intent to sell the adjacent property to the proposer.

Q: The City condemned and acquired Site B/2920 Lyndale Ave S for a public purpose. Why is the City no longer requiring the public purpose in a redevelopment of the property?

A: The City condemned and acquired Site B/2920 Lyndale Ave S for the public purpose of constructing an automobile parking facility. Site B/2920 Lyndale Ave S has been used for this public purpose since the City acquired it. The City has now determined that Site B is no longer needed for the same public purpose and is therefore moving forward with a redevelopment of the site.

Q: Is there a parking requirement for 2920/Lot B?

A: No.

Q: Is the appraisal public information and able to be shared?

A: Appraisals completed for the City of Minneapolis on City of Minneapolis-owned property are public information *after* the City and the selected developer enter into an agreement for the purchase and sale of the property.

Q: Who did the appraisal for the City? And is their name public information?

A: Community Planning and Economic Development have a panel of appraisers with contracts for perform appraisal services. The list of panel appraisers is public information. The specific appraiser that completed the recent 2920 Lyndale Ave S appraisal is not, but they are a firm on the list. Email [Rebecca Parrell](mailto:Rebecca.Parrell) to receive a list of the panel appraisers.