

State of California

Request for Proposals

By Respondents Pre-Qualified via RFQ

Affordable Housing Development

Under Executive Order N-06-19



Location: San Quentin, CA

Released: September 25, 2020

Due: November 20, 2020

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Affordable Housing Development

Proposals must be submitted by:

1. Emailing Josh Palmer, joshua.palmer@dgs.ca.gov; and
2. Uploading to Box.com.

It is the responsibility of the Respondent to ensure their proposal is emailed and uploaded in its entirety. Any information or material submitted after the deadline will not be considered.

DEADLINE: Submit by 5:00 PM PT on November 20, 2020.

THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS IS OPEN ONLY TO INVITED TEAMS THAT SUCCESSFULLY MET THE QUALIFICATIONS OUTLINED IN THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS NO. 2-20, WHICH CLOSED ON JULY 20, 2020.

Respondents that successfully qualified for this opportunity during the Qualification stage have been notified of their eligibility to submit a proposal.

Note: The California Public Records Act (California Government Code Sections 6250 et seq.) mandates public access to government records. Therefore, unless the information is exempt from disclosure by law, the material submitted may be made available to the public.

STATE CONTACT:

Josh Palmer
 Department of General Services
 Asset Management Branch
 707 3rd Street, 5th Floor
 West Sacramento, CA 95605
joshua.palmer@dgs.ca.gov

PROJECT WEBSITE:

Page: [Executive Order N-06-19 Affordable Housing](#)

URL: <https://www.dgs.ca.gov/RES/Projects/Page-Content/Projects-List-Folder/Executive-Order-N-06-19-Affordable-Housing-Development>

RFP SCHEDULE:

The following timeline is provided for the Respondent’s scheduling information but is subject to change at the State’s discretion.

Activity	Date
Request for Proposals Released	September 25, 2020
RFP Questions and Requests for Clarification Deadline	October 16, 2020
State Response to RFP Questions/Clarifications	October 23, 2020
RFP Submittal Deadline	5:00 PM on November 20, 2020
Interviews Conducted (approximate)	Week of December 14, 2020
Selection of Qualified Developer (approximate)	December 2020

DISCLAIMER

The State obtained the information contained in this RFP from sources deemed reliable; however, the State makes no guarantees, warranties, or representations, nor expresses or implies any opinion concerning the accuracy or completeness of the information provided. It is furnished solely as an aid to Interested Parties. Interested Parties are responsible for undertaking all necessary investigation on and off the State Property to determine the suitability of the State Property for Interested Party’s intended use.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION..... 6

1. DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY OVERVIEW 7

2. DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES AND PARAMETERS 8

3. SITE CONDITIONS AND APPLICABLE LAND USE POLICIES 10

4. DEVELOPER’S ROLE..... 12

5. TRANSACTIONAL TERMS 14

6. RFP SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS 16

 Proposal Guidelines and Format 16

 1. Cover Letter 16

 2. Development Entity 16

 3. Proposed Development..... 18

 4. Financing Plan and Development Pro Forma..... 19

7. EVALUATION PROCESS 21

8. EVALUATION CRITERIA 22

 1. Affordability and Market Context: 200 pts..... 22

 2. Financial Offer and Feasibility: 175 pts. 23

 3. Financial Offer and Feasibility: 150 pts. 23

 4. Development Program: 300 pts..... 24

 5. Community Benefit: 175 pts. 24

EXHIBITS

- A. Executive Order EO N-06-19
- B. Government Code Section 14671.2
- C. Phase I Environmental Assessment
- D. Condition of Title Guarantee
- E. Sewer Easement
- F. Proposed Housing Area

ATTACHMENTS



1. Ground Lease and Regulatory Agreement Template*
2. Exclusive Negotiation Agreement Template*

*The Ground Lease, Regulatory Agreement, and Exclusive Negotiation Agreement included in attachments are templates and may be modified by the State prior to signing the lease.

INTRODUCTION

Executive Order N-06-19 (EO) (see Exhibit A) was signed by Governor Gavin Newsom on January 15, 2019 to address the housing affordability crisis that is facing the State of California. Governor Newsom ordered the Department of General Services (DGS) and the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), (the “State”), to identify and prioritize excess state-owned property and aggressively pursue the goals of affordable, sustainable, innovative, feasible, and cost-effective housing projects.

The State is pleased to issue this Request for Proposals (RFP) for respondents capable of developing affordable housing on a state-owned property located in the County of Marin, California (the “County”) that will be consistent with and help fulfill state and regional goals, including affordability and feasibility. Projects must include a minimum of 50 percent deed-restricted affordable housing units, consistent with Government Code section 14671.2.

It is the intention of the State to collaborate with the County of Marin in its selection of a development team and creation of a development program.

At the conclusion of the RFP process, the State intends to enter into an Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (ENA) with the Respondent whose qualifications and development proposal the State deems best suited to achieve the objectives described in the RFP. Successful completion of negotiations will lead to the execution of a low-cost, long-term ground lease and regulatory agreement with a maximum term of 99 years.

1. DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY OVERVIEW

The State is seeking proposals for the development of affordable housing on an excess, state-owned property that will be consistent with state and County's housing goals, including affordability and feasibility.

Located on the north side of Sir Francis Drake Blvd, between Drake Cove Road and the San Quentin State Prison in Marin County, the subject property (the "Site") is oriented at the southwesterly corner of the state's landholding adjacent to the Drakes Cove Neighborhood.

The Site is in close proximity to the City of Larkspur, San Rafael and the town of Corte Madera and unincorporated community of Greenbrae with excellent proximity to San Francisco, Marin, East Bay communities. Proximity to public transit includes bus and ferry service. The Site affords excellent views of the Bay. Well-planned, new development will strengthen and enhance affordability in Marin County.

The site is located within unincorporated Marin County. The County offers incentives and fee waivers for affordable housing developments. The County has a Housing Trust which funds affordable housing developments.

2. DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES AND PARAMETERS

The lack of affordable housing across California is a matter of vital statewide importance and the State is working to expand housing opportunities through a new level of innovation and cooperation between the public and private sectors. To help solve the affordable housing crisis, the State is seeking knowledgeable, financially sound, and experienced providers of affordable housing.

The State is seeking proposals from Respondents who can support meeting the goals of the EO, including the provision of housing affordable to lower income households, and will creatively adhere to the following principles. These are not requirements but are intended to make the State's desired expectations clear and guide the project from solicitation through construction.

- **Affordability:** Maximize the affordability on site, including depth of affordability as well as percentage of units that are affordable (accounting for size differences between units with different bedroom counts);
- **Family Housing:** Create units that can accommodate families with children to account for a deficit in affordable family rental housing in the County;
- **Quantity of Units:** Maximize quantity of units that can fit on the site per code and good design as this is one of few vacant lots that provides an opportunity for new affordable housing development in unincorporated Marin County;
- **Innovative Housing and Construction Types:** Catalyze and incubate innovative models for construction (such as modular or prefabrication), financing, and workforce development—recognizing that design and construction quality should not be comprised. Innovative Housing and Construction is desirable, but *not* a strict requirement;
- **Efficiency:** Identify a strategy for delivering on the timing goals for the EO (i.e., feasibility of breaking ground within two years of entering the lease and regulatory agreement and completing units within three years) and employing several time saving measures. Efficiency of delivery also recognizes that deeper affordability may need multiple funding sources which are available through different and competitive funding cycles and Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs);
- **Accessibility:** As part of providing for accessible housing for all Californians, Respondents are encouraged to incorporate cost-effective design approaches consistent with universal design principles and/or related local ordinances;

- **Sustainability:** Reflect the state’s emphasis on sustainable construction, including the use of recycled products, commitments to low energy use, building electrification, and/or the use of renewable construction materials, such as mass timber as recognized through approved guidelines by the California Building Officials (CALBO) and the California Building Standards Commission;
- **Development Costs:** Pursue cost reducing measures such as impact fee program waivers or reductions, innovative housing types (e.g., modular or other prefabricated systems), and other measures while maintaining a high-quality design that complements the neighborhood;
- **Outreach:** Facilitate meaningful public participation consistent with the Ralph M. Brown Act, if applicable, and other strategies to engage the community throughout the development process;
- **Partnership and Collaboration:** Seek creative partnerships with the County and stakeholders, including alignment with the County’s housing and community and economic development goals and existing resources and opportunities such as the availability of services, transportation, and amenities and planned County-sponsored improvements; and
- **State Planning Priorities:** Maximize land resources and efficient land use patterns by developing as densely as feasible.

3. SITE CONDITIONS AND APPLICABLE LAND USE POLICIES

The Site includes approximately 5 acres north of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, unincorporated area of Marin County, California. The Site is in area known as San Quentin, approximately 100 feet north of San Francisco Bay and 3,400 feet west of San Quentin State Penitentiary.

Currently, the Site is owned by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and is vacant land. There is a small paved parking lot on the southern edge of the Site. On the southwestern edge of the Site sits a sewage junction box, chemical dosing station with an associated underground water pipe, which supports the sewer easement which runs towards the northeast.

Characterized as steep to precipitous (20- to 40-degree inclinations). The Site is sloping from the west, north, and east towards to center. The central and southwest portion of the Site is generally flat. The Site has a mixture of tall trees with brush and shrubs up to approximately ten feet above ground surface with some tall grasses and thickets.

The Central Marin Sanitation Agency currently has an easement agreement to operate the sewage junction box, chemical dosing station, and an underground water pipe on the Site. Based on the on-site observations, the equipment appears to be well maintained.

The Site's zoning is A2-B2 (Agriculture Limited) and the use code is PF (Public Facility).

To increase affordable housing throughout the State of California, the Governor's EO addresses instances where local zoning is inconsistent with the anticipated housing use. EO N-06-19 states:

WHEREAS local zoning ordinances do not govern the use of state property, and the State possesses legal authority to enter into low-cost, long-term leasing agreements with housing developers and accelerate housing development on state-owned land as a public use.

The State will work with the selected developer to identify the most prudent path to project completion.

Site	Control	APN No.	Acres*	Zoning	Current Use
Sir Francis Drake Blvd.	CDCR	018-152-12	±5	A2-B2 (Agriculture Limited)	parking



*Source: DGS

4. DEVELOPER'S ROLE

Upon approval and execution of an Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (ENA) with the State, the selected Respondent shall be responsible for all on-site and off-site costs and expenses associated with the development, site security and maintenance, construction, ownership, management, and operation of the proposed project, including but not limited to, planning, design, environmental clearance, entitlement, permit fees, utility charges, operation, and management expenses, as more specifically set forth in the ENA and in accordance with the following requirements:

- A. The selected Respondent shall accept the Site in its present state and condition, as-is, without any express or implied warranties;
- B. The selected Respondent shall enter into a low-cost, long-term ground lease and regulatory agreement, similar in form to Attachment A;
- C. The selected Respondent shall be responsible for obtaining any and all approvals such as land use entitlement, zoning and/or subdivision approvals, and all necessary building, grading, and construction permits required for the proposed project;
- D. The selected Respondent shall agree to follow Chapter 11a and 11b of the California Building Code;
- E. DGS shall serve as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The selected Respondent shall be responsible for assisting DGS with CEQA compliance, including exploring the applicability of streamlining and exemption provisions, and the preparation of any necessary environmental documents. The cost of all required environmental review and compliance shall be the responsibility of the selected Respondent (Note: If selected Respondent seeks any federal subsidy or funding, they shall also be responsible for facilitating compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA);
- F. The selected Respondent shall be responsible for payment of the applicable local agency development mitigation fees and off-site facilities fees (the selected Respondent should pursue fee waivers and other streamlining opportunities where appropriate);
- G. The selected Respondent shall be responsible for efforts towards meeting expectations and milestones as outlined in this RFP and the EO;
- H. Building on the pre-selection due diligence led by the State, the selected Respondent shall submit evidence of market demand for the type of units being proposed, investigate the need for on-site and off-site improvements including infrastructure to service the proposed project, and further describe the feasibility of breaking ground and completing construction in an efficient and expedited manner;

- I. The selected Respondent shall be responsible for the security and maintenance of the proposed project;
- J. The selected Respondent shall be responsible for ensuring that there are no inconsistencies between their response to this RFP and any existing and applicable affordable housing programs that the selected Respondent is planning to utilize for additional funding. If there are any inconsistencies between the requirements of this RFP and other program requirements, the more restrictive requirement shall control;
- K. The selected Respondent must employ a variety of outreach methods to ensure all segments of the community are included in all stages of the development process, including on an ongoing basis. Respondents are encouraged to reach out and involve various local community organizations to gain support for the proposed affordable housing project and respond to community/neighborhood concerns where appropriate throughout the project construction and property management. Respondents also must conduct affirmative marketing to households least likely to apply; and
- L. The selected Respondent shall adopt a written non-discrimination policy requiring that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, age, medical condition, genetic information, citizenship, primary language, immigration status (except where explicitly prohibited by federal law), arbitrary characteristics, and all other classes of individuals protected from discrimination under federal or state fair housing laws, individuals perceived to be a member of any of the preceding classes, or any individual or person associated with any of the preceding classes be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity funded in whole or in part with program funds made available pursuant to this subchapter. The selected Respondent shall comply with the requirements contained in the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Fair Housing Amendments Act, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, the Unruh Act, Government Code Section 11135, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and regulations promulgated pursuant to those statutes, including 24 C.F.R. Part 100, 24 C.F.R. Part 8, and 28 C.F.R. Part 35, in all of the Sponsor's activities.

5. TRANSACTIONAL TERMS

Predevelopment process

The predevelopment process includes:

- Meeting all milestones identified in the ENA;
- Developing project management tools or trackers to share with State (with special attention to EO goal of breaking ground within two years of entering the lease and regulatory agreement and completing units within three years);
- Delivering a community engagement plan to engage local stakeholders, County staff, neighborhood representatives, social service providers, low income residents, etc. to gauge support, build relationships, and leverage existing resources;
- Refining architectural plans for entitlement submittal;
- Survey and mapping tasks related to defining relevant land parcel. Obtaining land use entitlements and environmental clearances;
- Securing utility infrastructure service and building permits;
- Developing a finance plan and applying for financing;
- Finalizing development team, including general contractor; and
- Any other investigation or due diligence to prepare for development as requested by DGS or HCD.

Land Transaction

The State Property is owned by the State and will remain under State ownership. The selected Respondent will enter into a development agreement for a low-cost, long-term ground lease transaction (e.g., \$1 annually) and agrees to accept the State Property in its present state and condition, as-is. The selected Respondent also agrees to reimburse the State for the cost of administering the lease, as provided for in Government Code section 14671.2.

For general lease terms and regulatory agreement terms, please refer to Attachment A for the ground lease and regulatory agreement template.

Affordable Housing Restrictions

Project proposals must include a minimum of 50 percent restricted affordable housing units, consistent with Government Code section 14671.2.

Project proposals that show a commitment to 100 percent affordable units, significantly deeper targeting, and/or special needs components with units affordable to very low- and/or extremely low-income households are encouraged. When considering

affordability levels, Respondents should focus on meeting the EO goals of affordability and feasibility and meeting local housing needs. Per Health and Safety Code section 50093, income levels are defined using the income limits published annually by HCD for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households.

NOTE: The EO requires the payment of state prevailing wage on any construction project.

6. RFP SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

The proposal must be sufficiently detailed and descriptive in the State's sole discretion to assess the viability of the proposal.

The submitted proposals must meet all requirements outlined in this RFP and only those that meet all requirements will be scored. The State reserves the right to make its selection based on its sole and absolute discretion. In addition, the State reserves the right to reject any or all proposals at any time for any reason.

Proposal Guidelines and Format

The following guidelines are provided for standardizing the preparation and submission of proposals. The intent is to assist Respondents in the preparation of their submissions and to assist the State by simplifying the review process and providing standards for comparison of submissions.

Statements submitted in response to this RFP shall include a complete response to the requirements in this section in the order presented below. Statements should be a straightforward delineation of the Respondent's capability to satisfy the principles, parameters, and requirements of this RFP and should not contain redundancies and conflicting statements.

Respondents shall submit **an electronic copy of their proposal via email and a Box.com link.**

Proposals shall contain the following information in the order listed:

1. Cover Letter

The cover letter shall include information about the Respondent, name, and contact information of the person designated to act as the primary contact. The cover letter must include a statement of acceptance of all the requirements and conditions in this RFP, and that the signer has full authority to bind the Respondent.

2. Development Entity

The Respondent shall address the following elements regarding their capacity to develop the State Property as proposed. In addition to the requirements set forth in the Evaluation Criteria, provide concise and specific responses.

a. Organization

Identify and describe the principals, including any joint ventures or limited partners, and entity type (corporation, partnership, LLC, etc.) that would enter into the lease, regulatory agreement, and other agreements with the State.

Include descriptions of other firms relevant to the Project's development, construction and management including but not limited to the management company, service providers if applicable, architect, engineers, contractors, and experience working together and on similar projects.

Identify key development team members, including the architect and engineer, their resumes, and their roles and responsibilities for the Project.

Identify the principal in charge, project manager, and legal counsel.

Identify key team members and provide an organizational chart showing roles, responsibilities, resumes, and availability to implement the project as proposed.

Identify any and all litigation that has settled or is ongoing, for the previous five (5) years facing the Respondent, its principals, and partners. Identify any and all investigations by the State or federal agencies that have settled or are ongoing, for the previous five (5) years facing the Respondent, its principals, and partners. This also includes identifying if Respondent has had any mortgage foreclosure proceedings, loan Respondent, if Respondent has declared bankruptcy, if the Respondent or any member of the proposal has been convicted of fraud, larceny, forgery, money laundering, or tax evasion.

b. Examples of Relevant Projects

Provide details of at least three (3) completed comparable projects completed by the principals of the development team and their roles. Comparable projects are defined as new construction affordable and/or mixed income developments comparable in size and scope to this Project. This information should include project description, location, date completed, density, population served, number of units, structure of public/private partnerships, financing, service providers, any special circumstances (i.e., phased development, specific plan, public amenities, etc.), and management issues. It should be noted that these are the minimum requirements, but proposals will be scored according to Section 7320(b)(3)(D) of the Multifamily Housing Program guidelines:

Four points will be awarded for each Project completed in the five years preceding the application due date, and two points will be awarded for each Project completed in the five years preceding that period, up to a maximum of 20 points.

Please provide references for each comparable project, including contact name, title, organization name and address, and current telephone number and email addresses.

Please include the following:

- Details about participation in public-private joint development partnerships
- Details on previous or pending development projects in the area
- Include developer qualifications that are adherent to the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program or other state or federal funding programs

c. Financial Capability

The State wants assurances that the proposed entity has the financial capability to complete the proposed transaction. Respondents shall provide the last three years of audited financial statements, including a recent balance sheet and income statement of the proposed entity.

All documents submitted in response to this RFP will become the property of the State of California and are subject to review or release to the public under the California Public Records Act, Government Code section 6250 et seq., unless the State in its sole and absolute discretion determines there is a legal basis for exemption. Any document submitted which has been marked “confidential” or “Proprietary” will not be accepted.

d. Project Capacity

The State wants assurances that the proposed entity has the capacity to complete the proposed transaction. Respondents shall address their current capacity and why they can take on this project, including detail on specific staff assignments and workload.

3. Proposed Development

a. Summary

In addition to the requirements set forth in the Evaluation Criteria, the proposal should include a detailed and cohesive description describing the proposed Project, including at a minimum and as appropriate the development concept for

the site, proposed building square footage, building height, number of stories, number of units, size of units, total parking spaces, proposed rents, resident incomes, resident amenities, and any other mixed uses or features that meet the development principles and statutory authority.

b. Project Design

The proposal shall provide a site plan, building elevations, and rendering of the proposed development that are specific to the Site.

The site plan should illustrate the proposed development concept for the Site, including proposed building(s) footprint, proposed open spaces and landscape design concept(s), parking, and vehicular and pedestrian access that are specific to the Site.

A ground floor plan should show proposed ground floor usage (e.g., common areas, management office space, apartment units, etc.). Additionally, a roof plan should illustrate any rooftop amenities, or illustrate pertinent features or anticipated screening of equipment.

Respondents must at least submit the front elevation (e.g., street view) of the property. Other views are welcome but not required.

c. Schedule

Respondents shall provide a detailed project development schedule through completion that contains time and performance benchmarks and include all predevelopment activities and any plans for phased development. The proposal shall provide a narrative and graphical schedule of all phases of development including, but not limited to, securing of financing, formulation of development concepts, community outreach, environmental review, entitlements, design, environmental reviews, planning reviews, construction, modular processes, marketing, and resident selection(s).

e. Additional Benefits

Include a description of any additional potential benefits offered by the proposal. Examples of additional benefits can include amount of open space, sustainability, amenities, on-site services, etc.

4. Financing Plan and Development Pro Forma

The Respondent shall include a detailed development pro forma that estimates the total development costs. The development pro forma shall include a detailed sources and uses of funds statement covering all project costs from design and construction through

stabilized operations, including all hard and soft costs, and shall provide evidence (e.g., letters of support) of sufficient funding sources to meet project development requirements, including construction and permanent financing, and Developer's equity requirements.

The development pro forma should identify important underlying assumptions that govern the cash flows, including, but not necessarily limited to gross income, the amounts and frequency of loan repayments (all sources), annual rent increases, occupancy levels, operating costs as a percent of revenue, timing, amounts of replacement costs and the Project's anticipated cash flows over a period of 30 years from project initiation. The Respondent must confirm the cost estimates in the development pro forma include payment of California prevailing wages. The development pro forma must include a calculation of the return on investment to the Developer and include interest rate assumptions for all sources of debt and equity.

Respondents shall include a working electronic copy(ies) of the financial model(s) for the project in Microsoft Excel format.

7. EVALUATION PROCESS

A. Submittal of Questions and Requests for Clarification

Any questions or requests for clarification regarding this solicitation should be in email to joshua.palmer@dgs.ca.gov and mehgie.tabar@hcd.ca.gov. All questions must be received by October 16, 2020 by 5:00 PM in order to ensure their timely response well in advance of the RFP deadline.

B. Selection Process

The proposal must be completely responsive to the RFP. Incomplete proposals will be deemed as nonresponsive and will be rejected. DGS and HCD reserve the right to reject any or all proposals submitted, and no representation is made hereby that any contract will be awarded pursuant to this RFP or otherwise.

1. Committee

Following the submission deadline, DGS and HCD will establish a technical review committee to evaluate the proposals. The proposals will be reviewed for completeness and responsiveness to the requirements of this RFP.

2. Interview

Following the written evaluation, the State may conduct oral interviews with one or more teams to further understand team qualifications and/or project concept, if needed.

3. Selection

Upon selecting a proposal, the State intends to issue an ENA with the selected Respondent who, at the sole discretion of the State, poses the best opportunity for the State to meet its objectives as set forth in this RFP.

Submittal Deadline & Address for Submittals

Submittal Deadline: **November 20, 2020 at 5:00 PM PT**

Method for Submittals: Email Josh Palmer at joshua.palmer@dgs.ca.gov and upload to Box.com with link to Josh Palmer

8. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated by the Respondent’s ability to satisfy the development principles and parameters (see Section 2) and meet all RFP submittal requirements (see Section 6).

No.	Criterion	Maximum Points
1	Affordability and Market Context	200
	<i>Base Points</i>	<i>150</i>
	<i>Bonus Points</i>	<i>50</i>
2	Financial Offer and Feasibility	175
	<i>Base Points</i>	<i>125</i>
	<i>Bonus Points</i>	<i>50</i>
3	Development Experience	150
	<i>Base Points</i>	<i>100</i>
	<i>Bonus Points</i>	<i>50</i>
4	Development Program	300
	<i>Base Points</i>	<i>250</i>
	<i>Bonus Points</i>	<i>50</i>
5	Community Benefit	175
	<i>Base Points</i>	<i>175</i>
	Total Possible Points	1,000

1. Affordability and Market Context: 200 points

Project proposals must include a minimum of 50 percent restricted affordable housing units, consistent with Government Code section 14671.2 (see Exhibit A). Project proposals that show a commitment to 100 percent affordable units, significantly deeper targeting, and/or special needs components with units affordable to very low- and/or extremely low-income households are encouraged.

Respondents should identify:

- Quantity and bedroom type of affordable units to be built
- Maximization of land resources and level of affordability (e.g., density, integration, depth of affordability)

Proposals will be evaluated by the extent to which the project:

- Serves households at the lowest income levels consistent with Section 7320(b)(1)(A) of the Multifamily Housing Program guidelines, while maintaining financial feasibility;
- Maximizes social benefit by serving the greatest number of residents.

2. Financial Offer and Feasibility: 175 points

Reasonableness Points

Proposals will be evaluated for risk in completing the proposed projects, in part, by assessing the reasonableness of the proposal's assumptions, including the reasonableness of cost, revenues, and public subsidy assumptions. Proposals will be evaluated for their ability to cost-effectively deliver affordable housing, manage transaction risk, and maximize the quantity of affordable housing and/or level of affordability.

Respondents should include an evaluation of other HCD or soft sources that could support their project and provide deeper affordability than state statute requires.

Implementation Points

Respondents must also demonstrate implementation feasibility, including phasing and market timing, as well as the ability to meet the goals identified in the EO—breaking ground and completing units in an efficient and expedited manner. A schedule that expands beyond the EO timing must provide substantial reasoning why breaking ground or completing units may take longer.

NOTE: To the extent supportive housing units are proposed, please clearly indicate separate annual budgets for regular operations and maintenance and the annual costs of supportive services. Please also indicate the anticipated source(s) of funding for any supportive services.

Within the Financial Offer and Feasibility's total of 175 points, 50 bonus points are available, such as for creative financing models or funding sources (e.g. social impact bonds, philanthropic sources, etc.).

3. Development Experience: 150 points

Respondents must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the State, experience and capacity (including a staff and payroll) relevant to owning, developing, and managing high quality affordable rental housing.

Once the minimum RFP requirements are met (see Section 6), proposals will be evaluated according to Section 7320(b)(3)(D) of the 2019 MHP Final Guidelines.

Within the Development Experience's total of 150 points, 50 bonus points are available, such as for experience with factory built or multifamily modular construction.

4. Development Program: 300 points

Respondents must clearly articulate the project vision and plan, schedule, and factors for project delivery including site layout, regulation compliance, and use requirements and restrictions (see Section 4), consistent with the State's guiding Principles.

Respondents should describe any additional accessibility measures (e.g., higher percentage ADA accessible units) and/or consistency with universal design guidelines.

Projects should identify the ability to:

- Expand housing opportunities
- Develop partnerships
- Catalyze and incubate innovative models (e.g., construction, financing, workforce development)
- Use renewable materials and implement other sustainability and resource conservation measures
- Meet state planning priorities

Proposals will be evaluated for:

- The desirability and quality of the concept and design;
- How well it delivers on the EO goals and the development principles and parameters (see Section 2); and
- Compliance with state and federal codes, regulations, and guidelines.

Within the Development Program's total of 300 points, 50 bonus points are available, such as for innovative construction models, extraordinary sustainability, or resource conservation features (e.g., creative PV and/or solar water heating innovations).

NOTE: If project includes any supportive housing, such as housing for veterans or chronically homeless individuals, the proposal must describe on-site supportive services and/or describe coordination with nearby services. The description should also include an estimate in cost over normal operation and maintenance costs and a description of proposed long-term funding sources for any proposed supportive services. The Respondent may describe planned supportive services, even if there is no plan for formal supportive housing.

5. Community Benefit: 175 points

Proposals will be evaluated by the community engagement plan (plan to engage local stakeholders, County staff, neighborhoods, social service providers, etc. to gauge support, build relationships, and leverage existing resources) and the provision of community benefits and service connectivity, both on-site and off-site.

Within the community engagement plan, proposals should identify process, schedule, and means of engagement.

Community benefits are defined as improvements benefiting the general public and/or contributing to local and regional equity and capacity building, including, but not limited to:

- Gathering space/meeting rooms
- Open space or civic amenities that are accessible to the public
- Bicycle and pedestrian trail preservation and connectivity
- Pop-up space for local small business incubator opportunities
- Commitment to hire and/or subcontract local or Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises, Small Businesses, Women-owned businesses, Minority-owned businesses, or LGBT-owned businesses
- Enhancement of connectivity to public transit, active transportation access, and/or reduces vehicle miles traveled
- Enhance climate resiliency strategies through smart infrastructure and design and develop climate-smart adaptation measures
- An organization's historic support of underserved communities, such as information about staff, Board membership, and resident selection