



August 29, 2024

Caring for Our Coast



Gary Jones
Director

Amy M. Caves
Chief Deputy Director

Carol Baker
Deputy Director

LaTayvius R. Alberty
Deputy Director

RESPONSES TO PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS RE: 4206 ADMIRALTY WAY RFP

- 1. How will the delivery of the replacement parking take place and has adequate site been identified/ RFP calls for moving some of the existing public location to other locations. Have any locations been identified and what would the process be like to do that?**

Potential locations for replacement public parking within Marina del Rey have been identified at parcels 45, 47, 77, and/or 49M. Currently there are surplus parking spaces that are not designated as public parking at parcels 45, 47, and 77 that may be dedicated as future public parking. There is also a proposed parking structure at 49M that will create net-new public parking spaces that is tentatively scheduled for construction in 2026. The transfer of public parking obligations will require text amendments to the Marina del Rey Local Coastal Program (LCP), which needs to be approved by the Regional Planning Commission (RPC), Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (BOS), and the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The Department of Beaches and Harbors (DBH) and the Department of Regional Planning (DRP) have had preliminary discussions with CCC staff about the proposed affordable housing project and the relocation of public parking to the aforementioned parcels. No concerns were expressed at this stage; however, a more detailed review and additional comments may be expected during the entitlement phase.

- 2. The proposal speaks about 50 units, but then there's also the adjustment to the residential V permit, which goes up to 150 dwelling units. So, are you still looking for that? If at a larger unit count being still a hundred percent affordable, or at least 50 of whatever that total unit count to be affordable, and the other could be kind of market or mixed income.**

We are looking for a 100% affordable housing project. At the very minimum, we are asking for 50 residential units. Any units exceeding the minimum must also be affordable units. Please see Section 1.2 of the RFP.

- 3. Is it the developer's responsibility to kind of work through or prepare any of those site's replacement for replacement parking? Or is the Coastal Commission and the county kind of working through kind of making sure that site close to Chace Park**



and any other locations. Are, you guys are kind of taken care of? Or is that something we need to factor in in terms of cost.

DBH has begun the preliminary work of finding potential County-owned parking replacement sites and initiating discussions with DRP and CCC staff to determine if the locations are viable. The Proposer would be responsible for incorporating the potential parking replacement locations into their proposed project and advancing the project to obtain all necessary entitlements and LCP amendments.

- 4. Do you know the by- rights density? Calc. It looks like it's about 600 square feet per unit. But you know the basic by-right numbers for setbacks, required setbacks, allowable height, residential open space?**

In order to develop a 100% affordable housing project, an LCP amendment is needed to change the current land use category from Senior Accommodation to Residential V. The Residential V land use category permits a maximum of 75 units per acre. The site acreage is approximately 2.07 acres, which calculates out to approximately 156 units (rounded up). The maximum height for the site is 75 feet along Admiralty Way, and 85 feet along Washington Boulevard as Parcel 147 falls into the Oxford area development guidelines for height restrictions, front and rear setbacks are 10 feet, and side setbacks are 5 feet. The Proposer is responsible for verifying this information and determining if any additional requirements (e.g. open space, sidewalk widening, etc.) apply to the site.

- 5. If there is by-right density calc. When you come up with the 150 units, how is that? what is that based on?**

See response to question #4.

- 6. Anything on the required setback or allowable height for the zone or residential open space and one other question is, can the State density bonus be used in the coastal district?**

See response to question #4. State Density Bonus law can be applied, but the number of units is still limited by the maximum buildout in the Development Zone.

- 7. I wanted to ask the zoning constraints that we just talked about like building high front rear side. Is that with the LCP, or that's just what's allowed currently/ Was it 0.5 parking spaces per bedroom or unit, building height- zoning, is it with the LCP or what is required currently?**

The building setbacks provided above are based on the proposed land use category of Residential V. Height restrictions are 75 feet along Admiralty Way and 85 feet along Washington Boulevard as Parcel 147 falls into the Oxford area and thus those development guidelines. Additionally, 0.5 parking spaces per bedroom are required.

- 8. One more question on the parking. I realize this might not be able to be answered right now, but I think what would be super helpful is just to understand the timeline- Is it anticipated that our development may be constrained by identifying that replacement parking and moving like an understanding of what the possible or**

potential timeline of that would be really helpful, I think for all of us to work on our responses.

See response to question #1.

- 9. I did recall that the walk path on the south side is fairly new. Now that I see that there are planners on the call, would they know if the permit drawings for that walk path might be available? And serve, as you know, nicer background information/ there is what looks like a fairly new walk path on the south edge of the property connecting Admiralty to Washington and it looks fairly new. So, I was guessing that perhaps the permit drawings for that are available with the County?**

Please see Attachment 1 for record drawings that DBH has on file. Proposer may wish to contact the Building and Safety office for approved drawings.

- 10. What support will the County provide- the selected proposer for the LCP amendment and California Coastal Commission approval processes?**

DBH would participate in, and when appropriate, lead LCP amendment-related meetings with CCC staff. DBH may also provide some LCP amendment-related support such as suggesting draft LCP text amendments to support the project. The Proposer is responsible for the entitlement and LCP amendment process, including assembling a knowledgeable team and consultants, as appropriate, that have expertise in coastal development and permitting, LCP amendments, and working with the CCC. The County will also sign off on applications to CCC as the property owner.

- 11. Will the project need an approval from the Coastal Commission?**

Yes, see response to question #1.

- 12. Can you clarify the timeline for the LCP amendment? If it is the previously stated 4–6-year timeframe, what role/tasks does the County expect the developer take during this time?**

The timeline for an LCP amendment, which includes public hearings before the Regional Planning Commission (RPC), the Board of Supervisors (BOS), and the California Coastal Commission (CCC), typically can take approximately four to six years. However, the County has already begun having conversations about this development with the approving agencies and all have committed to expediting this important project through the approval process. As such, the timeline is expected to be less than the typical timeframe.

The developer will prepare the application materials, including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. County will facilitate and participate in as needed discussions between the developer and CCC staff to proactively address any concerns they may have, especially related to the sea level rise document. The developer should also conduct public outreach during this time period and proactively address any community concerns. After County staff completes its review, the application materials will be circulated for public review and comment and the project will be scheduled for a public hearing before the RPC. During the RPC public hearing process, the developer will

need to respond to questions and comments from the public and the RPC regarding the project, including the CEQA document and the sea level rise document, and effectively address community concerns. After the RPC takes an action, the project will be scheduled for a public hearing before the BOS. The developer's role during the BOS public hearing process will be similar to their role during the RPC public hearing process. After the BOS takes an action, the project will be scheduled for a public hearing before the CCC. Before the public hearing, CCC staff will review the application materials, including the CEQA document and the sea level rise document. The developer will need to respond to questions and requests for additional information from CCC staff in a timely manner and participate in meetings with CCC staff as needed.

13. Is the fire lane part of the site and if so, can it be used for parking access, trash collection, things like that. Can it be used as a fire lane for the project site, and can it be used for access for trash, or anything like that? Can the alley currently used to access Parking Lot 8 remain available for emergency vehicle access and parking access for the site, and is it acceptable to relocate the driveway access? Is there a preference for the location of vehicular access?

A portion of the driveway is located within the site. The Proposer is responsible for confirming if it needs to remain available for emergency vehicle use and whether there is enough space to safely accommodate other uses such as access for parking and trash. The Proposer is also responsible for confirming that any proposed use of the fire lane does not conflict with the adjacent property.

14. What are the dimensions of the property? Please confirm where the dimensions of the lot start from i.e.: along lots 500 & 501 (the 345' dimension and along lots 501 and 503/Admiralty).

Please see Attachment 2 and Attachment 3. The Proposer is responsible for surveying the site and determining the exact dimensions.

15. Is there a survey or is there any soils information? Do you have a Phase I Environmental report? Soils report?

Please see Attachment 2 and Attachment 3. The Proposer is responsible for surveying the site and determining the exact dimensions. County does not have a soils report or Phase I Environmental Report.

16. And can we assume the sidewalks are not within the property that the property line is essentially the back of the walk. Please confirm the sidewalk along Washington is not within the site and completely within LA City. Please confirm the sidewalk along Admiralty is not within the site.

It appears that the sidewalks along Washington Blvd and Admiralty Way are not located within the subject property. The Proposer is responsible for surveying the site and confirming this detail. Please note that the Marina del Rey LCP may require widening of the sidewalk along Admiralty Way. In addition, a public walkway with a minimum width of 20 feet connecting Washington Boulevard and Admiralty Way is required per the Mdr LCP. This walkway was recently constructed along the eastern edge of the property and

must be either retained in place or reinstalled elsewhere on the site at the sole expense of the Proposer.

17. Would there be an issue with maximizing the site density?

Proposals that maximize site density should demonstrate compliance with applicable local and State regulations, provide adequate on-site parking, incorporate design and massing compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and consider how the unit number may impact the CEQA analysis (e.g. can the project fit under a CEQA exemption or will the number of units trigger additional analysis, traffic impacts, etc.).

18. What is the estimated timeline for LCP amendment Approval?

See response to question #12.

19. Can you confirm that the respondent team/project will not be responsible for costs for replacement parking?

Please see response to question #3.

20. Is there an ALTA survey that can be shared for the site?

County does not have an ALTA survey of the site. Proposer to exercise due diligence.

21. Can you provide any additional details on the sewer easement bisecting the site? Does it need to be maintained free and clear? Are there paths to remove it? Please confirm there are no easements other than those for the pump/storm drain and SCE transformer at the eastern corner). However, we noticed various utility vaults on the site along Washington opposite Wilson Ave. Please clarify what these are. If any easements exist, please provide information. Note that City of LA Zimas maps seem to show LA County Utility easements running through lots 500,502,504 can we assume these will be abandoned.

Please see Attachment 4.

22. Will the permit drawings for the new path adjacent to site be available? Is the public path part of the site? Will the permit drawings for pump station and access adjacent to site be available?

See response to question #9.

23. Please confirm there are no highway/street dedications or widenings required along Admiralty or Washington.

Proposer is encouraged to exercise due diligence prior to submitting their proposal.

24. Please confirm the “by right allowable density” is 75 units /AC per R5 Zone. (90,134sf/43,560sf = 2.069 acres). Does the County have a preferred land use

entitlement pathway, IE which streamlining measures (density bonus, state legislation) are applicable and/or should be utilized?

Please see response to question #4 regarding allowable density. There is no preferred streamlining measure.

25. Please confirm the max allowable unit count is $2.069 \times 75 \text{ du/ac} = 155.18$ units (assume not rounded up)

Please see response to question #4.

26. Can projects provide less than .5 parking stalls per bedroom?

No.

27. At what stage is the Sea Level Rise analysis required?

The SLR analysis is required during the entitlement/permitting phase.

28. There appears to be some sort of large utility structure at the northeast corner of the site; what is this structure? Is it required to remain? If yes, are there any special setbacks or requirements related to this structure?

Please see Attachment 4.

29. What is the engineer's estimate for the project mentioned above?

County does not have an engineer's estimate for the subject project.

30. It seems like there is access to a County of LA Public Works pump station that serves the neighboring Oxford Basin. Are you contemplating maintaining an easement that would kind of cut through a portion of the Admiralty Way facing side of the site? Or will public works access that pump station from Admiralty way east to the site?

We are currently working with LA County Department of Public Works (DPW) to establish an easement for the Oxford Basin and negotiating with the Flood Control District to operate and maintain the Oxford Basin and the west pathway. DPW will continue to access Oxford Basin via the driveway that connects 4209 Admiralty Way to the Oxford Basin until developer creates a new driveway access point. Developer will be required to expand/reconstruct the driveway access point that allows DPW to access Oxford Basin from Admiralty Way prior to commencing construction.

31. What are the County's expectations for the upfront or ongoing ground lease payments?

County will negotiate the terms of any ground lease payments with the selected proposer once the "Good Faith Deposit" is received, and Exclusive Negotiation Agreement is signed.

32. Have you received a confirmation letter from HCD that this RFP is exempt from Surplus Lands Act?

No, but we expect this project will be exempt from the Surplus Land Act based on the requirement that it be 100% affordable housing.

33. How would you define community-serving uses? Is there an expectation to have a mixed-use building with area that serves the community beyond the residents of the building?

Community-serving uses are amenities on the property that serve the residents and/or the public in general (e.g. view deck accessible to the public overlooking Oxford Basin, community room available to the public, outdoor seating, green spaces, etc.). There is an expectation that the development incorporates community serving amenities but there is no expectation that the development be a mixed-use building. Any commercial uses would be subject to the standard parking requirements in Title 22.

34. Are Permanent Supportive Housing units required? If so, what percentage? If there is a PSH requirement, will the county commit to provide project-based vouchers?

Permanent Supportive Housing is not required.

35. Is Beaches and Harbor interested in operating the Aquatics Center if one is included in the proposal?

If one is included in the selected proposal, County is open to negotiate the maintenance and operation terms of a proposed aquatic center.

36. Is there a target population preferred by the County (for example, families, seniors, veterans, homeless individuals)? We have read the MdR for All framework and there appears to be need for all types of affordable housing.

There is no preferred target population. The development must encompass very-low-, low-, and moderate-income households. We do not wish to receive proposals that are restricted to a particular group, e.g., senior housing.

37. Is the Aquatics Center mandatory for this site; is it a goal for this site or other potential sites as well? What is the scope of the proposed Aquatics Center program including size of the Center and estimated number of visitors each year? How much parking would be required for the Aquatics Center?

The Aquatics Center is not mandatory (and likely is not feasible) for this site, but its placement within Marina del Rey is an urgent need identified in our recent stakeholder survey. Any commercial uses, including an Aquatics Center, would be subject to the standard parking requirements in Title 22.

38. ENA deposit - is there a max/cap that the developer will come out of pocket beyond the initial \$50K? If so, what is the cap?

There is no max/cap on what the developer will come out of pocket for while engaging with the County under the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (ENA). Be advised that the County's standard ENA requires developers to reimburse County its costs for legal and consultant fees throughout the process.

39. To what extent has the Supervisor's office been involved in preparation of the RFP?

Supervisor Mitchell's office has been instrumental in helping to identify the appropriate site for an affordable housing development, the desired mix of affordable housing units, and the priority of the urgent needs identified in the initial stakeholder engagement.

40. If the proposer provides an aquatic center and affordable housing, is there still an expectation to get a hard ground lease payment at fair market value in addition?

The terms of ongoing ground lease payments with the selected proposer are negotiable.

41. Which specific stakeholder groups should we plan to meet with as part of the community engagement process? Knowing how many will help us better craft the timeline.

Proposers should be prepared to engage the County's Small Craft Harbor Commission, Design Control Board, residents of MdR and surrounding areas, as well as other groups as requested by the County. It is not possible to provide a specific number of groups at this time.

42. Are we required to use Health & Safety Code rents, instead of TCAC rents? These can be quite a bit lower so that would affect project feasibility.

Proposers are required to use Health & Safety Code rents.

43. Are there requirements for the community serving amenities? Can you describe the intended function of these amenities?

Community serving amenities are required to serve the residents and the general public.

44. What is the license requirement for general contractors?

General contractors must be licensed to operate within California and unincorporated Los Angeles County.

45. Is this project subjected to any unions?

All projects built on County-owned property must utilize a Project Labor Agreement and pay Prevailing Wages. The County also requires compliance with its Local and Targeted Worker Hire Policy. Additionally, entities conducting hospitality (restaurant or hotel) operations at County-owned or operated properties may be required to enter into Labor Peace Agreements with labor organizations representing employees in the hospitality industry.

46. How much is the bidder's self-performance?

The selected proposer will be responsible for delivering improvements to the parcel consistent with negotiations and the eventual lease agreement, including but not limited to making sure that performance bonds are procured at a sufficient level to guarantee project construction is fully completed.

47. Does this project include Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE)?

Yes, this project is open to Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises proposers.

48. What is the duration of this project?

While the timeline for any development project on County property and in the Coastal Zone can be difficult to predict, it is the County's intention to help move this project forward as quickly as possible. We typically use an initial 6-month term for the ENA, and 18-month initial option term to pursue entitlements (both with available extensions), which would be followed by the construction period.

49. Is it possible that the RFP Submission deadline can be extended?

County reserves the right to amend the RFP submission deadline. If the deadline is extended County will release an addendum with the new submission deadline.

50. Can you confirm that the proposal needs to be dropped off and there are no online submittals?

All proposals need to be mailed or delivered to 13837 Fiji Way, Marina del Rey, CA 90292. No online submissions will be accepted.

51. Is there no bid bond required?

A bid bond is not required. A Good Faith Deposit of \$50,000 will be required from the selected proposer prior to executing the Exclusive Negotiating Agreement.

52. Can you confirm that Appendix B and Section 5.3 – 5.11 is what needs to be submitted?

The response to the RFP shall be made according to the submission requirements set forth in Section 5, which include the Required Forms in Appendix B.

53. Will the presentation be shared with the groups of attendees?

Please see Attachment 5.

54. Typically, when we submit our financials, we submit our full financial audit, which is like about 100 pages per year. I'm assuming, based on your explanation of the type of financial capacity or experience that you want to show. Can we show sort of just the first few pages I'm guessing you want 500 pages of our financial audits?

Proposers are required to provide documentation that provides sufficient evidence of proposers' financial health. Proposer can submit abbreviated audited financials so long as the documents can accurately reflect the financial health of the proposer. Acceptable documents can include income statements, balance sheet, statement of cash flows, and statement of retained earnings.

55. Is prevailing wage required?

Yes. See response to question #45 for more information on labor and construction requirements.

56. Will you provide an objective scoring breakdown for each point category?

Please see RFP Section 6.1 – Evaluation Criteria.

57. How will you determine a winning submittal when two submittals have the exact same score, will that be an objective method?

County will conduct proposer interviews to determine a winning submittal when two submittals have the exact same score.

58. Is the Core Team only the developers, and does not include architects, engineers, or other consultants? Confirming that it would only be developers what would take on the liabilities for the project.

“Core Team” can consist of architects, engineers, and other consultants. Developer will be the sole responsible party for the construction of the project, unless otherwise directed by the developer in negotiations.

59. For Development History, can you confirm that you are not looking for photos of all completed projects, just a list of completed projects and details and photos of “project examples,” which may be a shorter list?

Proposer is not required to submit photos of every “completed development,” but the included photos should highlight the applicability of project examples to the subject RFP.

60. Would you please provide the fillable forms for Appendix B?

Please see Attachment 6.

61. Can you expand on the desire for community serving spaces open to the public? How does the inclusion/exclusion of this item impact the RFP's overall scoring?

Community serving amenities are required to serve the residents and the general public. All other things being equal, proposals that offer better public-serving amenities (which may include a mix of commercial and non-commercial spaces and features) will receive higher scores than those that include fewer such amenities, or strictly commercial amenities.

62. What is the difference between Proposer & Prime Proposer in Development History (5.5.2.1)?

Prime Proposer refers to a proposer who serves as the development team's primary financial sponsor and is the main point of contact with the County.

63. How many completed projects should we include? Is there an expected number from the Proposer and/or Core Team?

Proposer should include at minimum five completed projects from the Proposer and/or Core Team. Proposers with fewer than five completed projects are encouraged to submit a list of all completed projects.

64. Is there a maximum page count for the entire RFP?

There is no maximum page count for the entire RFP proposal.

65. May the pre-proposal meeting attendance of the submitting architect on the project be used to qualify the entire project team?

A member of the "Core Team" must have attended the mandatory pre-proposer's conference in order for the proposal to be accepted.

66. Is there a page limitation for the response? Is there a different page limitation in the printed vs. electronic copy?

There are no page limitations for the RFP proposals.

67. Are you going to make a list of the participants in this preproposal conference available?

A list of attendees from the mandatory pre-proposers' conference will be available to the public and other proposers once a proposer is identified and recommended to the Board of Supervisors for approval to enter into the ENA.

68. Will there be architects on the review board on the Selection Committee scoring those 250 points? Or will it be folks here on your conference panel?

The selection panel has not yet been determined but it may include architects and may include both County and non-County members.

69. I know you touched on, of course, the increase in affordable housing and open space. But I wonder if you could speak at all further to the Marina del Rey for All initiative and the other youth serving community serving like the aquatic center and other wayfinding and signage. If there's any requirement or desire to align be included with this project.

This project will directly address one of the urgent needs identified in the MdR for All initial stakeholder engagement, affordable housing. For additional details regarding MdR for All please visit - [MdR For All \(mdr4all.org\)](http://mdr4all.org).

70. Will LACDA subordinate ground lease payment to a permitted lender (i.e. for CalHFA Mixed Income Program)?

County will not subordinate ground lease payments.