



**CITY OF BOULDER  
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**

**MEETING DATE: September 26, 2017**

**AGENDA TITLE:** Consideration of a motion authorizing the city manager to issue a letter of intent to negotiate a master development agreement with Zocalo Community Development as the master developer of the property located on the northeast corner of 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl streets based upon the proposal dated June 15, 2017.

**PRESENTERS:**

Jane S. Brautigam, City Manager  
Jim Robertson, Director for Planning, Housing + Sustainability  
Molly Winter, Executive Director Community Vitality  
Kurt Firnhaber, Deputy Director for Housing (PH+ S)  
Erin Poe, Senior Assistant City Attorney, City Attorney's Office  
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager (PH+S)  
Edward Stafford, Development Review Manager, Public Works  
Jeff Haley, Parks and Planning Manager, Parks and Recreation  
Beth Roberts, Housing Planner (PH+S)  
Jonathan Koehn, Regional Sustainability Coordinator (PH+S)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of this item is for city staff to update City Council on the selection process for development of the city-owned site at the northeast corner of 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl streets and for City Council to authorize the city manager to enter into negotiations for a joint development agreement with the recommended developer.

A [Request for Proposals \(RFP\)](#) for the redevelopment of the city-owned site at the northeast corner of 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl streets was issued on March 10, 2017, responses were due on June 16, 2017. Four proposals were received. The proposals were evaluated based on the review process and criteria established in the RFP. The proposals were reviewed by a selection committee comprised of city staff from the following departments: Planning Housing and Sustainability,

Community Vitality, Energy Future, Public Works, Finance, City Attorney's Office, and Parks and Recreation staff.

The intent of the first review was for the selection committee to score the proposals based on the criteria established in the RFP and the proposals with the highest scores were to continue to the next review. During the first review, the committee formed a list of clarifying questions for each proposal team and requested each team submit additional information regarding permanent and market rate affordability, area median incomes (AMI's) served, unit types (e.g., beds, tenure, stacked flat, townhome). Staff decided it would be of benefit to the community and staff to invite each of the development teams to participate in the next review.

The second opportunity for staff to review the proposals occurred during the public presentations held on July 14 in city council chambers.

The final review was completed by the selection committee on July 18.

The committee unanimously agreed that the Zocalo Community Development proposal consistently met and in many cases exceeded the review criteria established in the RFP and the desired development outcomes established for the city-owned site. Zocalo's proposal consistently scored the highest throughout the review process.

Once the RFP process is complete, staff will move into the next phase of the redevelopment process and prepare a joint development agreement. Council will need to approve the joint development agreement.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the following motion: Motion authorizing the city manager to issue a letter of intent to negotiate a master development agreement with Zocalo Community Development as the master developer of the property located on the northeast corner of 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl streets based upon the proposal dated June 15, 2017.

### **QUESTIONS FOR COUNCIL**

1. Does council have questions about the selection process?
2. Does council have questions about the selected proposal and its alignment with the goals of TVAP?
3. Does council agree with the recommendation to enter into negotiation of a joint development agreement with Zocalo Community Development?

### **BACKGROUND**

In 2000, the city initiated a planning effort for a transit oriented development in east Boulder as an extension of the 28<sup>th</sup> Street corridor planning project. The 11.2-acre site at the northeast corner of 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl streets (then owned by Pollard Friendly Motors) was identified through a site selection process as the preferred location for a Transit Oriented Development (TOD). The site was acquired jointly by the city and the Regional Transit District (RTD) in October 2004.

In September 2007, the plan for the area's future redevelopment, the [Transit Village Area Plan \(TVAP\)](#) was adopted shortly after the acquisition of the Pollard Motor property in 2004. The plan outlines a set of goals and objectives for achieving a broad vision established for the 160-acre Transit Village Area.

In July 2012, a City Council study session was held regarding the Transit Village Area Plan implementation and the city-owned site at 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl streets. Council expressed a desire to have more than the required 20 percent affordable housing in the area, as well pursuing zoning changes to encourage commercial uses. Additionally, there was a desire to ensure a variety of housing types and sizes with both rental and home-ownership housing.

In October 2016, a City Council [study session](#) was held to solicit council feedback on a representative range of potential redevelopment options of the city-owned site at 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl. Four redevelopment scenarios were presented to Council. The purpose of analyzing various scenarios was to illustrate the different ways that the unmet TVAP goals could be met on the city-owned site.

The analysis assumptions that were constant in the four scenarios:

- Parking: All assumed approximately one space per dwelling unit and one space per 500 square feet of non-residential space.
- Use mix: All assumed approximately 21,500 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail at ground level along 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl streets, and adjacent to the Hyatt hotel, in line with TVAP and [Form-Based Code](#) (FBC). The vast majority of the site was dedicated to housing, including a large amount of affordable housing.
- Site plan: The site plans for all scenarios were very similar, reflecting rigid adherence to form-based code.

The ways the scenarios differed were:

- Unit count: Different scenarios contained different numbers of total housing units.
- Permanent affordability: The scenarios offered different numbers of permanently affordable housing units for low and moderate-income households and middle income households.
- Unit type variety: Some scenarios included only stacked flat units, while others offered a variety of stacked flats and lower density options such as townhomes.
- Range of incomes served: All scenarios featured different combinations of low-mod affordable, middle income, and market rate units.

Council was supportive of a redevelopment scenario featuring a mix of uses with an emphasis on housing. In particular, council was interested in affordable housing, a mix of housing types, including stacked flats and some townhomes or other types that may be somewhat less dense than stacked flats. A summary of the session can be [found here](#).

In March 2017, a RFP for the redevelopment of the site was issued. The RFP stated desired development outcomes of the site which include:

### Housing

The city acquired the property with the intention of maximizing the housing opportunities of this transit oriented development site. Grounded in the city's housing priorities, the [Transit Village Area Plan](#) and policies of the [Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan](#), the city seeks to accomplish multiple housing and transit goals. The goals and desired outcomes include:

- Create a new transit oriented, mixed-use neighborhood that is predominantly residential, with some retail and/or office space;
- Provide and maintain a mixture of housing types offering varied unit types, prices and sizes; encourage development of housing serving a full range of households (singles, couples, families with children and other dependents, extended families, non-traditional households, seniors); and
- Integrate permanently affordable and permanently supportive housing.

### Parking, Access, and Management

As conceived in the Transit Village Area Plan, Boulder Junction is a transit-oriented development that was designed to maximize multimodal access, manage parking and ensure that vehicle trip generation does not increase as land uses within the planning area changed from light industrial to mixed use commercial and residential. Options to own and manage include:

- Private Ownership and Public Management. The city's preference is to have all on-site parking managed by the Boulder Junction Parking District, which would be facilitated by a parking management agreement between the developer and the District. At some point in the future, as the parking district matures, the city may want to purchase some or all the parking associated with the site; and
- Private Ownership and Private Management. If the proposer determines it is more beneficial for parking to be managed privately, the management will still be required to conform to the same principles and policies used by the Parking District, including the SUMP principles of parking management: Shared, Unbundled, Managed, and Paid.

### Affordable Commercial Space

Form-based code and the city's analysis accounted for some amount of ground floor commercial space in the project (planning level estimates indicate approximately 21,000 square feet). Given rising rents in Boulder in recent years, there is a desire to explore models for permanently affordable commercial space which would help preserve smaller, local businesses that find it hard to compete with regional or national restaurants, retailers, etc. when it comes to rent. Proposers were encouraged to include ideas for affordable commercial space to support local businesses or non-profit organizations.

### Sustainability

The city has adopted aggressive sustainability goals with an emphasis on reducing the community's impacts on climate change through strategies identified in the city's [Climate Commitment](#). Proposers were required to meet all minimum requirements of the building, land use, and energy codes. To advance industry practice and encourage innovation in sustainable design, however, the RFP suggested the participation of the very best architects, engineers and developers to go beyond minimum requirements.

### Pocket Park

The northeast portion of the Boulder Junction site, approximately 0.75 acres, is a public park as indicated in the TVAP and is managed by Parks and Recreation. The site currently accommodates the multi-use path connection of Goose Creek up to Depot Square. Funding is allocated for final design and construction of additional park amenities to serve the larger development. The park is immediately adjacent to the 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl site and staff recommends aligning the park design and development with the redevelopment of the 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl site to maximize the integration of urban design, site connectivity and access and amenities that are provided to the public. Staff will work closely with the proposed developer through the development agreement, planning and construction to maximize efficiency in design and amenities available to the public on the park site in alignment with the existing and future uses of Boulder Junction.

The RFP also noted the city is aware of the ambitious nature of this project, and of the RFP. Proposers were expected to meet the minimum parameters for the city's development vision and attempt to maximize the priorities and outcomes in other areas. Proposers were invited to explain how different priorities might be in conflict or where tradeoffs might be required. In addition, proposers were requested to note if such tradeoffs can be alleviated through the introduction of additional subsidy.

### **PUBLIC FEEDBACK**

As part of the review process, proposal teams were required to make presentations to the public. Attendees were given the opportunity to ask questions after each of the presentations, many clarifying questions were asked about aspects of each proposal. Staff received emails both before and after the July 14 presentations. Most emails were general in nature, one email communicated a desire to specifically see the commercial space as a food hall. A link to the recorded presentations, including the question and answer period, is available on the Division of Housing's website and can be [viewed here](#).

Staff participated in an outreach event held in Boulder Junction, many in attendance expressed interest and hopes for affordable commercial space in the redevelopment. In general, there was interest and support of commercial space and affordable commercial space in particular.

### **ANALYSIS**

The four proposals received are listed below and include a project summary and housing data table for each.

- A. Carmel Partners
- B. Element Properties and The John Buck Company
- C. Gorman & Company
- D. Zocalo Community Development

### Carmel Partners

Carmel proposes a mixed-use development consisting of 3- and 4-story buildings connected by paseos and a neighborhood park. The project will include 300 residential units, 15 percent of which are permanently affordable, with 95 percent of the permanently affordable units as rentals and 5 percent for sale. The permanently affordable rental units will be built as senior housing

units owned and managed by Carmel. The proposal also included 35 percent of the units as deed-restricted rentals targeted at 120 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI). Although the applicant intends to provide these as deed-restricted units, 120% AMI is not a category defined as affordable in the RFP. Affordable rents are defined as not to exceed 60% AMI.

The community will be served by a 314-space underground parking garage owned by Carmel and managed by the Boulder Parking District. The proposal includes 9,750 square feet of commercial space proposed as a food hall, year-round market and retail center at the corner of 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl streets. Vendors will be offered favorable rents subsidized by the developer.

The proposal states a sustainability goal that goes beyond the minimum code requirements to achieve Boulder's goals related to energy, climate, waste, and transportation. The overall design standard was expected to meet USGBC's Gold LEED for Homes. Sustainability strategies include minimizing natural gas use, solar PV for common areas, roof-top garden beds and the use of carbon offsets to further reduce the carbon footprint. Additionally, the pocket park is intended to be an accessible open space.

Carmel Partners Housing Data table:

	Affordability Description	# Efficiency units	# of 1 bedroom units	# of 2 bedroom units	# of 3 bedroom units	# of townhome units	Total	% of Total
AFFORDABLE RENTAL	30% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	40% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	50% AMI	0	45		0	0	45	15%
	60% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	120% AMI*	0	66	40	0	0	106	35%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>151</b>
AFFORDABLE OWNERSHIP	70% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	80% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	100% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	120% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
MARKET	Market Rental	0	87	46	0		133	44%
	Market Ownership	0	0	0	0	16	16	5%
	<b>Total Market</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>Total of all units:</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*120% AMI exceeds the RFP defined affordability level for rental units, therefore these units were not counted as affordable units. These units were counted as market rate rental units in the analysis and evaluation.*

Element Properties and The John Buck Company

Element and JBC propose a mixed-use development that consists of 3- and 4-story buildings. The project will include 298 residential units, 33 percent of the units as permanently affordable; 30 percent as senior housing with a preference for LGBTQ seniors, and a partnership with a local social services provider to support 5-10 units available for permanently supportive housing. 92 percent of the units will be for rent, 8 percent will be for sale. The applicant’s intent is to partner with Boulder Housing Partners (BHP) on one or more of the affordable components within the project.

Below grade parking will have 280 spaces owned and operated by the Boulder Junction Access District. The proposal includes 20,000 square feet of specialty retail of which 15,500 is designated as non-profit office, retail and civic space.

Practices in sustainability are proposed that are either net positive, net zero carbon or net zero carbon ready with a low carbon footprint. The applicant states a goal to go beyond the city’s progressive energy policy and create an environment for “affordable living” that integrates affordability and sustainability into an integrated whole that considers energy, transportation, and healthy living. The applicant also envisions that the development could be all electric, and utilize storage to increase resilience at the site. The proposal redefines the boundary at the park to provide a more useable shape for the outdoor space and interface with the neighborhood and The Depot. This includes a performance space in the park.

Element Properties and The John Buck Company Housing Data table:

	Affordability Description	# efficiency units	# of 1 bedroom units	# of 2 bedroom units	# of 3 bedroom units	# of townhome units	Total	% of Total
<b>AFFORDABLE RENTAL</b>	30% AMI	0	10	0	0	0	<b>10</b>	<b>3%</b>
	40% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	50% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	60% AMI LGBTQ Seniors	4	87	7	0	0	<b>98</b>	<b>30%</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>33%</b>

<b>AFFORDABLE OWNERSHIP</b>	70% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	80% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	100% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	120% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

<b>MARKET</b>	Market Rental	56	72	55	7	0	<b>190</b>	<b>59%</b>
	Market Ownership	0	0	0	0	26	<b>26</b>	<b>8%</b>
	<b>Total Market</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>Total of all units:</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>100%</b>

Gorman and Company

Gorman’s proposal is a mixed-use project which includes 2, 3- and 4-story buildings. The project will include 381 total units, with 21 percent of the units as permanently affordable housing at or below 60 percent of the AMI. The applicant intends to partner with BHP who will own, develop and manage the affordable rental units. Additionally, they propose that 76 percent of the units will be rental units that are permanently affordable to middle income families from 80 to 150 percent of the AMI. 97 percent of all the units will be for rent, 3 percent for sale. The applicant proposes a co-housing micro-unit component, but has not proposed the units be deed-restricted.

The proposal offers two alternative approaches to parking. The first, a mobility approach to support the long-term goals of the community and deepen the affordability of the housing on the site in perpetuity with a fleet of shared cars and bikes. The FLEET is an onsite, on-demand car and bike share program that includes 30 shared cars and 50 shared bicycles. The second approach to mobility is to provide approximately 300 spaces of below grade parking that meet the SUMP principals. The proposal integrates 18,700 square feet of affordable deed-restricted commercial space within the ground floors of four buildings and an additional 6,900 square feet in live/work spaces.

The proposal is intended to exceed the Boulder energy code for achieving Net Zero Energy. The applicant identifies an overall design standard of LEED for Homes Platinum level. The project is intended to minimize or exclude natural gas and anticipates 60-80 percent of the annual energy use may be met from rooftop solar. In addition, the project proposes exploring ground source heat exchange for a district-wide geothermal scaled system and to connect to the future city pocket park with residential townhomes and an integrated landscape.

Gorman and Company Housing Data table:

	Affordability Description	# Efficiency units	# of 1 bedroom units	# of 2 bedroom units	# of 3 bedroom units	# of townhome units	Total	% of Total
AFFORDABLE RENTAL	30% AMI	0	2	2	0	0	4	1%
	40% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	50% AMI	0	2	2	1	0	5	1%
	60% AMI	0	36	24	11	0	71	19%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>21%</b>
AFFORDABLE RENTAL*	80% AMI	0	33	23	1	0	57	15%
	100% AMI	0	45	40	2	0	87	23%
	120% AMI	0	33	24	1	0	58	15%
	150% AMI	0	42	44	1	0	87	23%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>76%</b>
MARKET	Market Rental	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	Market Ownership	0	0	0	0	12	12	3%
	<b>Total Market</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Total of all units:</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>100%</b>



*\*Gorman and Company relabeled the housing data table to show affordable rental units proposed for 80% to 150% AMI. This ranges exceeds the RFP defined affordability level for rental units, therefore these units were not counted as affordable units. These units were counted as market rate rental units in the analysis and evaluation.*

Zocalo Community Development

Zocalo proposes a mixed-use project in 3- and 4-story buildings. 53 percent of the units will be permanently affordable rentals owned and managed by BHP. 35 of these units will be cohousing and coop units managed by Boulder Housing Coalition in conjunction with BHP. 37 percent of the units will be for-sale, market rate units and 10 percent of the units will be for-sale permanently affordable.

The 280 spaces of below grade parking will be owned and managed privately and will incorporate the city’s SUMP principles. 21,000 square feet of affordable commercial space will be deed-restricted, limiting annual rent increase to no more than the consumer price index.

Environmental sustainability is expected to be achieved using a variety of tools (e.g., renewable energy, alternative transportation, Transportation Demand Management (TDM), and ecological restoration of the Goose Creek Greenway). The applicant expects to exceed city standards related to energy through on-site generation, aggressive efficiency strategies and user load monitoring, storage technologies and high performance design. The project aims to be an electric-only infrastructure eliminating the future use of natural gas. Plans include integrating and activating the city’s pocket park, Goose Creek Greenway and other open space amenities.

Zocalo Community Development Housing Data table:

	Affordability Description	# efficiency units	# of 1 bedroom units	# of 2 bedroom units	# of 3 bedroom units	# of townhome units	Total	% of Total
<b>AFFORDABLE RENTAL</b>	30% AMI	2	2	2	5	0	<b>11</b>	<b>4%</b>
	40% AMI	2	2	2	4	0	<b>10</b>	<b>3%</b>
	50% AMI	4	4	4	4	0	<b>16</b>	<b>5%</b>
	60% AMI Includes (35 coop / cohousing units)	23	68	31	2	0	<b>124</b>	<b>41%</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>53%</b>

<b>AFFORDABLE OWNERSHIP</b>	70% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	80% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	100% AMI	0	0	23	0	6	<b>29</b>	<b>10%</b>
	120% AMI	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>10%</b>

<b>MARKET</b>	Market Rental	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Market Ownership	0	0	91	0	23	<b>114</b>	<b>37%</b>
	<b>Total Market</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>Total of all units:</b>		<b>31</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>100%</b>

Staff analysis of each proposal was performed in accordance with the process and evaluation criteria established in the RFP. The evaluation criteria and points assigned are listed in the table below.

<b>Percentage of Permanently Affordable Housing (Low/moderate and Middle Income)</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Ability to Meet Other Housing Goals</b>	<b>20</b>
<i>Mix of housing types and tenure (rent and for sale)</i>	
<i>Variety of special needs (i.e. senior housing, permanently supportive housing, other creative housing solutions)</i>	
<b>Urban Design - Creative, High Quality design and Architecture</b>	<b>20</b>
<i>How plan responds to transit-oriented surroundings, Goose Creek Greenway, planned city pocket park</i>	
<i>Internal and External street frontages</i>	
<i>Ideas for open space elements as required by form-based code</i>	
<i>Massing and materials</i>	
<b>Ability to meet Additional Goals</b>	<b>10</b>
<i>Access and Parking</i>	
<i>Permanently Affordable Commercial Space</i>	
<i>Desired sustainability outcomes</i>	
<b>Qualifications</b>	<b>15</b>
<i>Experience with affordable housing development and management</i>	
<i>Overall track record</i>	
<b>Public feedback from presentations</b>	<b>10</b>

**Scores and Evaluation:**

Selection committee scores, shown in the table below, are an average of scores by each reviewer for each proposal and compiled after the final review. The selection committee agreed all presenters communicated their projects goals and objectives equally well and addressed questions posed by staff during the presentations; no proposal specific feedback forms were received from audience members.

30th and Pearl Redevelopment Proposals							
	1. Percentage of Permanently Affordable units (Housing)	2. Other Housing Goals (All)	3. Urban Design( All)	4. Ability to Meet Additional Goals (All)	5. Qualifications (All)	6. Feedback from Presentation (All)	Total Points
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Carmel Partners</b>	7	6	9	5	9	NA	<u>35</u>
<b>Element JBC</b>	16	15	9	6	11	NA	<u>57</u>
<b>Gorman</b>	10	9	10	6	10	NA	<u>46</u>
<b>Zocalo</b>	25	18	12	8	12	NA	<u>75</u>

## **Evaluation:**

The staff selection committee used the evaluation criteria both in its preliminary review of proposals and its final recommendation to the City Council. The committee identified areas of strengths and concerns for each proposal.

### *Carmel:*

#### Strengths:

- 45 permanently affordable senior housing units at 50% AMI.
- Applicant can finance construction without tax credits, firm well capitalized.
- Plan responds well to Junction Place, live-work units integrate with street.

#### Concerns:

- Proposal does not meet the Inclusionary Housing requirement of 15 percent of units as affordable to households at income not to exceed 60 percent AMI. Proposal does not reach the targeted 50 percent of units as affordable.
- Unit mix, type and tenure not varied.
- Proposal would require modification to the FBC.

### *Element and The John Buck Company:*

#### Strengths:

- Second highest percentage of affordable housing, includes 30% AMI units.
- The team has experience delivering development projects in Boulder.
- Partnering with BHP for the affordable rentals.
- 98 units of affordable senior housing with a preference to house LGBTQ seniors.
- Parking is proposed as 280 spaces owned and operated by the Boulder Junction Access District.
- The designed bend in Spruce Street captures view shed.
- Commercial space proposed as a 10,000 sf food hall at 30th and Pearl.
- Retail along 30<sup>th</sup> and Pearl streets meets form-based code.

#### Concerns:

- Proposal does not reach the targeted 50 percent of units as affordable.
- Unit type and mix not varied.
- Public realm concerns -- commingling of pedestrian and automobile; some open spaces not available to the public; seeming lack of coordination between ground-floor uses and public realm.
- Park programming, how would it be programmed and actively managed.
- The plan presumes other funding from the community to support a performance space.
- Proposal would require modification to the FBC.

### *Gorman and Company:*

#### Strengths:

- Applicant took a risk with the FLEET a la carte parking proposal.
- Live/work units and adjacent paseo on park, inviting element.

- Co-housing community proposed.
- Partnering with BHP for the affordable rentals.

Concerns:

- No proposed parking in option one is a concern; the surrounding communities may be impacted by parking spillover.
- Parking should not be visible from the public realm; not addressed by option one, the FLEET proposal.
- Proposal does not reach the 50 percent affordable target with only 21 percent of the units proposed as permanently affordable.
- Proposes 3% of the units as for-sale.
- Potentially too much retail space with limited strategy to fill.
- Public realm is predominantly hardscape; circulation pattern seems arbitrary.
- Proposal would require modification to the FBC.

*Zocalo Community Development:*

Strengths:

- Utilizes multiple architects to create varied architectural and urban design.
- Team has past experience and knowledge in developing co-housing communities. Team has experience with Boulder's form-based code.
- Site and urban design relates to surroundings.
- Ground floor works well with public spaces.
- Overall sustainability approach for geo-thermal is a realistic path to net zero.
- Team has experience with affordable housing.
- Approach to commercial is to deed-restrict the space, limit rent increases to no more than the change in Consumer Price Index, Zocalo will manage the space
- Highest percentage of permanent affordable units of the 4 proposals.
- Proposal includes for-sale units.  
Proposal requires no modification to FBC.

Concerns:

- Achieving all proposal outcomes may be challenging.
- Parking management agreement, needs to be addressed in the letter of intent and detailed in the joint development agreement.

**Recommended Proposal Selection**

All proposals were developed by experienced individuals and strong project teams. Each proposal has its strengths and weaknesses and often included creative, interesting and sometimes risk-taking approaches, and sophistication. The proposals showed varied percentages of permanently affordable units, unit types and tenure, The applicants demonstrated experience of varying levels with affordable housing. Most importantly staff felt the applicants understood the expectation set forth in the RFP for the redevelopment of the site.

Zocalo Community Development proposal's consistently delivers on all evaluation criteria and development outcomes.

- Dedicates 161 units (53%) as permanently affordable rental housing serving households from 30% to 60% AMI, and 29 units (10%) as permanently affordable for-sale housing serving households up to 100% AMI;
- Partners with Boulder Housing Partners who will own and manage 126 permanently affordable rental units and Boulder Housing Coalition who will manage 35 of the units as affordable coop / cohousing units;
- Proposes a mix of rental and for-sale, unit type and size;
- Parking is proposed to be privately owned and managed; Zocalo acknowledges and understands the requirement to manage parking in accordance to the same principles and policies used by the Parking District, including the SUMP principals of parking management;
- Proposed affordable commercial space will be deed-restricted;
- Environmental sustainability is expected to be achieved using a variety of tools, including renewable energy and energy efficiency; alternative transportation, TDM and Complete Streets; LEED, Passive House, Healthy Homes Index and WELL Building standards; and, ecological restoration of the Goose Creek Greenway; and
- Urban design plans integrate and activate the city's pocket park, Goose Creek Greenway and other open space amenities.

## **NEXT STEPS**

Staff anticipates there will be a significant number of details to address to make redevelopment a success for both the city and the developer. A letter of intent by the city to the developer will form the precursor to a joint development agreement which will govern the redevelopment process and outcomes; the agreement will address all the necessary details. If the city and the developer are unable to reach agreement during this phase, the city will have the option to pursue negotiations with the second highest scoring proposer, Element Properties and The John Buck Company. Outside legal council may be hired to work with staff, development agreements are an area where it's of benefit to consider outside council, in drafting a letter of intent or a development agreement. The final development agreement will be brought back to Council for their final approval.

Fourth Quarter 2017 – Negotiation of a Letter of Intent

Second Quarter 2018 – City Council approval of the Joint Development Agreement

Late Summer 2018 – Development review submittal timeline published by staff and developer

2018 to 2019 – Disposition of the city-owned site