

## St. Vincent's Priority Housing Site RFP Questions & Answers

### Due Diligence

1. **Q:** Where is the location of the public trust easement? Does CCSF have diligence materials related to this issue? Does this easement encumber the housing site? Is the State of California open to modifying this easement? (p. 12) Can we get a copy of title exceptions #22 and 23 (p. 7 of title report)

**A:** The information on the public trust easement comes from a narrative in a decades-old appraisal and does not appear in the most recent title report. CCSF does not have any additional information on this issue at this time. To the extent any such easement remains in place, we suspect it pertains to Miller Creek, which is just *outside* the southern border of the St. Vincent's Priority Housing Site, but we encourage developers to investigate this issue in the public records for avoidance of doubt. Regarding exceptions #22 and #23, unfortunately, we do not have a title report with live links to these documents. Again, we encourage developers to obtain these public documents as part of their own due diligence process.

2. **Q:** What is the anticipated timing of Catholic Charities' planned wetlands mitigation bank? Is CCSF open to collaboration regarding engagement with Federal and State regulators to utilize these extra lands for mitigation or banking purposes? (p. 13)

**A:** CCSF is open to considering a collaboration with a developer-partner to utilize these wetlands for mitigation and banking purposes.

3. **Q:** Has CCSF engaged the regulator to better understand what onsite mitigations will be required for these impacts? PCE Plume Pg 13

**A:** Mitigation of the PCE plume is already underway, and testing is ongoing. The latest testing of the site took place this month, and a report should be issued soon. As any additional required mitigation efforts will likely depend in large part on the location and nature of the proposed construction, developers should engage with the relevant regulators regarding any further required mitigation once they have a development plan in place.

4. **Q:** Has there been a historic resource and/or tribal cultural resource assessment of the site?

**A:** There is anecdotal evidence of a historic resource or tribal cultural resource on or near the site. In 2016 the Army Core of Engineers and Graton tribe members visited the greater St. Vincent's property regarding an archaeological site adjacent to the SMART rail line. This identified site is a substantial distance from the RFP development site. During this visit, a tribal member pointed out that there may be an archeological resource located northwest of the development site, on or near the hills but no further investigation was taken. In any event, a study related to such resources will likely be required as part of a developer's due diligence process.

5. **Q:** Has the County indicated what offsite transportation signal requirements will be required in the public roads adjacent to the site? Any feedback on specific infrastructure required that is not included in the RFP? Pg 13

**A:** The County may require infrastructure improvements given the increase in use resulting from the development. The County has stated a preference for providing specific input on traffic infrastructure needs when a final proposal is under consideration (rather than evaluating multiple proposals that will not be selected). At minimum, we currently anticipate the need for a second emergency vehicle access point. See Answer #18 below for additional details.

6. **Q:** Have any further details been developed on the transportation demand plan by CCSF or the County?

**A:** CCSF and the County have not commissioned a transportation demand plan. We would expect the developer to provide a transportation plan consistent with the need of their proposed development.

7. **Q:** Can you provide details of the local sewer upgrades to confirm if they were sized for a new development?

**A:** As discussed in the RFP, while much of the local sewer system has been upgraded in recent years, the older 21" downstream pipes are likely undersized to deal with the additional demand associated with a new large residential development. While this issue is on the sewer district's fix-it list, no work is currently underway and future development on the Site will likely require close coordination and negotiation with the sewer district. CCSF encourages developers to reach out to the local sewer district to confirm the scope of local sewer upgrades and their ability to support new residential development at the site.

8. **Q:** Please share a copy of the Utility Easements and Maps.

**A:** See [Attachment 1](#) (utility easement map).

9. **Q:** Is there any additional information you can provide related to the PCE plume.

**A:** Data about the plume and clean up can be found at the State Water Resource Control Board – Geo Tracker, for the former Prosperity Cleaners' site at 187 Marinwood Ave, San Rafael, CA 94903.

10. **Q:** Please share a copy of any wetlands map/information you have.

**A:** See [Attachment 2](#) (wetlands map).

11. **Q:** Has a geotechnical study been done for the site?

**A:** CCSF does not have access to any geotechnical study for the site. Presumably, such a study would be completed as part of a developer's due diligence process.

## Zoning & Regulatory Considerations

**12. Q:** Is CCSF open to consideration of an additional lot line adjustment prior to application? Would any of the other parcels be available to aid with Lot Line Adjustments to create lots excluding the wetlands? Meaning could we combine other of these parcels and use those lost lots to subdivide the 54 acres into multiple parcels?

**A:** The current parcel generally represents the portion of the broader Catholic Charities holdings CCSF is willing to convey. Moreover, we understand that additional lot line adjustments and subdivisions would be subject to discretionary approval and may impact the ability of a proposed project to be realized quickly. Therefore, the rationale behind any proposed changes should be fully articulated in the proposal as well as strategies to mitigate potential project delays.

**13. Q:** Is the site on the Cortese list?

**A:** The site is not on the Cortese list to CCSF's knowledge. However, the site is associated with another site that is on the State Water Resource Control Board – Geo Tracker. This related site is the former Prosperity Cleaners' site at 187 Marinwood Ave, San Rafael, CA 94903.

**14. Q:** Would CCSF consider land swaps from the identified parcel with other developable areas of the larger property, if any are available, due to loss of developable acreage due to wetland?

**A:** CCSF would not prioritize a land swap. If a land swap is proposed, the developer should fully articulate the reason for the change as well as strategies to mitigate potential project delays related to further land divisions.

**15. Q:** Is a complete realignment of St Vincent Drive acceptable, or would CCSF prefer it remain relatively in the same location?

**A:** CCSF is open to a realignment of St. Vincent's Drive. The trees along the current drive are at the end of their life cycle. CCSF is comfortable, for example, with a realignment that would connect the main entrance directly to the Chapel via a straight main road.

**16. Q:** Has CCSF identified any specific funding sources that would be available to support the infrastructure development for this project? (Pg 9)

**A:** Per page 9 of the RFP, "ABAG's Priority Sites Program provides various types of technical assistance and funding for Priority Sites. According to ABAG, these sites will also be included in the update to Plan Bay Area 2050, known as Plan Bay Area 2050+, and will be considered for additional funding for infrastructure, housing, and planning." CCSF has not had direct talks with ABAG and local agencies about supporting infrastructure development.

**17. Q:** Does CCSF have concerns with utilizing waivers (as allowed by State Bonus Density Law) on development standards in the form based code?

**A:** CCSF's primary concern is being able to execute the proposed plan. CCSF is open to developers utilizing waivers but strongly suggests that developers investigate potential impacts of waivers related to the form-based code on ministerial review and approvals processes. Per the RFP, "Housing development projects are permitted ministerially in an HOD combining district through application of the Form Based combining district, Form Based Code, and Housing Development Regulation Compliance Review...The Form Based combining district may be applied to housing development projects on any HOD site. Housing development projects under the Form Based combining district are subject to a Housing Development Regulation Compliance Review and must conform with the standards of the Form Based Code as specified in Section 22.14.100."

**18. Q:** The title report attached appears to be linked, but the blue text is not connected to URLs. Will a linked title report be provided?

**A:** While CCSF has the original linked title report, unfortunately, the links are no longer functioning.

**19. Q:** We understand that the Fire Marshal may require a second access point. Please confirm if this is needed.

**A:** At this early stage, CCSF believes that a second access point may be needed, but the development team should discuss the details of their specific proposal with the Fire Marshal. CCSF has preliminarily investigated a few options to realize a second access point, which are described in [Attachment 3](#) (fire access options). Of course, this is not an exhaustive list of access/mitigation options, and we look to developers and their teams to develop their own solutions.

### **CCSF Objectives & Selection Criteria**

**20. Q:** Related to Objective 2 on page 18, on our site tour, it was conveyed that ongoing compensation was a higher priority than upfront compensation. Please confirm this is the top priority given that upfront compensation was listed first in this goal.

**A:** CCSF's top priority is selecting a developer and proposal with a high probability of success. This is followed closely by financial support, with a preference for ongoing compensation under a ground lease or other ongoing payment structure. In terms of a preference for some form of additional upfront payment, CCSF's primary interest is covering the costs associated with the RFP, related due diligence, selection of and negotiations with a developer, financial closing, and ongoing oversight/collaboration during construction.

**21. Q:** Besides potential traffic/transportation impacts, are there any other specific concerns about impediments to St. Vincent school operations?

**A:** CCSF wants to ensure that all current programs on the St. Vincent's campus (including those of its tenants as well as the St. Vincent's School for Boys) can operate unimpeded during the years of construction expected on the site. This means fully mitigating all the effects of such an undertaking, including ensuring continued free flow of vehicle and pedestrian traffic, minimizing dust and environmental hazards during construction, and potential use of visual and sound

barriers. In general, CCSF is looking for developers to be mindful of the type of activities that will need to continue on neighboring properties during construction and take proactive steps to ensure mitigation of potential negative effects, so impediments to those activities are minimized to the greatest extent possible.

**22. Q:** Will the weighting/scoring of each metric be shared, as that information is not shown on the scorecard?

**A:** The weighting/scoring will not be shared in advance of selection. Developers should work to create a proposal that achieves all of CCSF's objectives and addresses all selection criteria.

**23. Q:** Would Catholic Charities like to be involved in the community outreach process, helping reach out to community partners, or leveraging its contacts?

**A:** CCSF does not have full-time staff dedicated to the development of the St. Vincent's parcel but will support community outreach efforts to the extent possible. CCSF will ask the selected developer to provide periodic updates on all community outreach efforts and activities in which CCSF staff cannot be present. Where CCSF's contacts can be leveraged to ensure a successful project, we will do everything we can to help connect developers with the right people and express our support to the extent we agree on the proposed course of action.

**24. Q:** Does Catholic Charities have a preference for the population type / demographic for affordable units - family vs senior for example (this ties into financing)?

**A:** In general, CCSF does not have a preference for the population type/demographic of those served by the project. We understand there is significant need for housing in the County across the income spectrum and for many different types of populations. CCSF also realizes that there are needs assessments available concerning affordable units in Marin County and would defer to the developer's judgment on how best to produce what's needed while respecting our legacy of providing social services for vulnerable members of our community from all walks of life. Finally, we realize that accessing competitive financing, as well as other site-specific considerations, will play a role in which populations the affordable units can ultimately serve.

**25. Q:** Would Catholic Charities like to provide onsite services for families in the affordable units?

**A:** CCSF's current programming and staffing is suited for affordable housing resident service provision, and CCSF would be open to supporting affordable households at the new project through existing programming. However, involving Catholic Charities in ongoing service provision at the project is in no way a prerequisite for selection.

**26. Q:** Does Catholic Charities have an estimate of its professional expenses (page 23 of the RFP)?

**A:** As described in answer 19 above, CCSF's primary interest in ensuring some upfront payment is covering the costs associated with the RFP, related due diligence, selection of and negotiations with a developer, financial closing, and ongoing oversight/collaboration during construction. Any upfront compensation should be sized to cover CCSF's professional costs (e.g., lawyers, accountants, development consultants, financial advisors, and various third-party professionals) during that entire time period. CCSF does not have an estimate of total cost at

this time; rather, we are looking to developers to propose the level of payment that would be acceptable to them and to identify any ceilings or constraints on such a payment they might propose (caps by dollar amount, percentage, cost type, etc.).

- 27. Q:** In reference to developer support for St. Vincent's, has Catholic Charities contemplated any opportunities for financial support, and if so, what strategies would complement the existing operations (page 23 of the RFP)?

**A:** One of Catholic Charities' key objectives is to ensure the long-term viability and quality of St. Vincent's School for Boys. Consequently, CCSF is interested in any type of support a developer could provide to help achieve that goal. This could mean anything from a one-time or ongoing endowment to an agreement to allow school use of newly constructed buildings/facilities, to creating facilities or amenities for use by the school, to any number of other benefits. CCSF recognizes that the primary source of support for the School's operations will be the land payment itself, but to the extent that developers can propose creative ways to further support the School and help ensure its legacy of service continues for decades to come, we are interested in considering such proposals.