



IMPROVING OUR COMMUNITY

COLUMBIA GATEWAY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

CITY OF THE DALLES

AGENDA
COLUMBIA GATEWAY
URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Conducted in a Handicap Accessible Meeting Room

Tuesday, May 25, 2004
5:30pm
City Hall Council Chambers
313 Court St.
The Dalles, OR

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Pledge of Allegiance
- IV. Approval of Agenda
- V. Approval of Minutes of: April 20, 2004
- VI. Public Comment
- VII. Action/Recommendation
 - A. Wasco Warehouse Milling Property RFP
- VIII. Discussion
- IX. Next Meeting Date: June 15, 2004
- X. Adjourn



IMPROVING OUR COMMUNITY

COLUMBIA GATEWAY URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

CITY OF THE DALLES

Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Advisory Committee Minutes

Tuesday, April 20, 2004

City Hall Council Chambers

313 Court Street

The Dalles, OR 97058

Conducted in a handicap accessible room.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Dan Ericksen at 5:35 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Administrative Secretary Denise Ball conducted roll call.

Present members: Dan Ericksen, Jack Evans, Dick Elkins, Chris Zukin, Nikki Lesich
and Ken Farner

Absent members: Randy Carter

Staff present: Nolan Young, City Manager, Dan Durow, Community Development
Director, Denise Ball, Administrative Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ericksen lead the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA ITEMS

Ericksen asked if there were any changes or additions to the agenda. Zukin moved to approve the agenda as submitted and Evans seconded. The motion carried unanimously with Carter absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ericksen asked if there were any corrections or additions needed for the minutes of February 17, 2004. There were none. Evans moved to approve the minutes and Farner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Carter absent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Eric Gleason, 704 Case Street, The Dalles, Oregon asked that the Urban Renewal Advisory Committee investigate the need for the demolition of, possibly, both of the Wasco Warehouse buildings on the Flour Mill site. Gleason suggested hiring a third party structural engineer to make that decision. Gleason said his personal opinion is that the southern building can be saved and he feels the property will have less value if the southern building is also demolished.

Ericksen asked if the Commission had any questions.

Lesich said she admires Gleason for holding on until the last breath.

Gleason said this is a special building and he would hate to see it demolished entirely without due diligence, especially since the City has a financial investment in it.

Ericksen asked for Staff comments on the state of the building.

Durow said that the City did not order the demolition of the building. The building became a dangerous building due to the collapse of the roof during this winters snowfall. The owner, Cereal Foods, was told to stabilize the building and it was the owner's option as to how to do that. Cereal Foods hired a demolition contractor to remove as little of the building as possible until stabilization was attained. The shared wall between the two buildings creates a problem.

Durow said he explained to Gleason that the City couldn't interject itself between a property owner and his contractor. The City does have an option to buy but does not have contractual rights with the demolition of the building. Cereal Foods has a vested interest in limiting the amount of the demolition because the demolition expense is coming right out of the sales price. The demolition bid was in two parts: the north half and the south half. The owner has a representative on site to oversee the project.

Durow said there is historical value in the buildings. However, most of the prospective RFP contractors, who are looking at bidding on the redevelopment of the site, have said the time to worry about saving the warehouse was twenty years ago. One contractor did some quick calculations and said it would cost approximately an additional one million dollars just to salvage the warehouse building.

Lesich suggested that when Urban Renewal has money invested in historical properties that a clause be added that protects the historical artifacts and allows the City first right of refusal at obtaining those items.

City Manager Young said that could be looked at in future situations. He indicated that there would be bricks left over for the City when the demolition is completed. Evans asked if historic documentation of the warehouse building was being performed and Durow said he is taking many pictures and complying with State Historic Preservation requirements.

Durow clarified that historic items in the building, that are not a structural part of the building, stay with the owner, Cereal Foods. The City has no rights to those historic items and would need to purchase them if the owner is willing.

ACTION/RECOMMENDATION

Chamber of Commerce/Visitor Center Scope of Work and Contract Approval: City Manager Young briefly discussed the history of the Chamber's search for an appropriate facility and location.

Director Durow presented the Staff Report and asked for questions.

Lesich asked if there are other projects for privately owned properties that Urban Renewal funds have been expended. Lesich said she does not want this project to set a precedent. She asked, "If this were the Texaco Station would the City and Urban Renewal be doing the same thing"?

Durow said the Gateway Project and the Urban Renewal Plan talks about W. 2nd Street and property redevelopment, redesign and reconstruction. The Plan allows for this to be done. Durow went on to say that from the private sector side this is the first project. Money has been spent on the Thompson Park project, which is a public/private project.

Lesich asked if the Cannon Packer property in the East Gateway would be a similar situation and Durow said yes.

Lesich asked if the Chamber is taxable property and was told no.

Elkins asked if this is just a first request and how much further the spending could go.

Durow said he does not foresee anything beyond this.

Young added that there could be additional costs for construction of the West Gateway and possibly the building of public parking lots.

Elkins said his concern was not future infrastructure but whether Urban Renewal would be asked to help fund a new Chamber building.

Young said no, there will be no funding for construction.

Lesich asked if there is any consideration in the design of the West Gateway project for the Chamber to have public restrooms.

Young said it does present an opportunity to look at public restrooms on the site.

Eric Gleason, from the audience, asked if this proposal includes remodeling/reusing the existing, historic building.

Ericksen confirmed that the building has gone through the Historic Landmarks Commission public hearing process.

Young said this proposal does not include remodeling or reusing the building.

Lesich asked what "secondary" means in referring to a historic building and Gleason explained that secondary refers to the time period the building was constructed and does not mean the building is less significant than a "primary" building. The Chamber building was constructed in 1938.

Farner asked why Urban Renewal is involved in the developmental work for the property; this appears to be a developer's task.

Durow said the Visitor Center and the entry into our downtown area are City and Urban Renewal interests. The traffic flow has to work, the streetscape has to be attractive, and a visitor must have a good experience moving in and out of the site.

Zukin said he certainly sees the City's interest in being involved in the design. However, Zukin is uncomfortable having the City take the entire burden of the design. Zukin said he believed the hospital paid a portion of the Thompson Park preliminary design work and Durow said that was correct.

Zukin said he would feel more comfortable with the proposal if the Chamber were paying a share of the design work.

Young said the Chamber had its own plan originally and that the City stepped in and asked to be involved because the development of the West Gateway is so important to the downtown area. The Chamber did not come to the City and ask for help and has rejected an earlier proposal from David Evans and Associates because the Chamber did not feel the proposal was in its best interest.

Zukin said if that is the relationship, then this project could be completed and presented to the Chamber and they could say, "No, we don't like that."

Young said they could, however, that is why this process will be handled as a partnership and decisions will be made with all parties present. The Chamber will still have to go through the local Site Plan Review process after this preliminary design is completed.

Elkins said when he travels he looks for the Visitor Center not the Chamber office. Elkins asked why this project is called the Chamber site and not the Visitor Center.

Evans said it is a dual-purpose facility.

Ericksen said the Chamber would be making a huge investment during the construction phase. There is a significant public interest in this project so that it meets City and community needs and criteria.

Durow said the current Chamber site offers a lot of challenges and it could turn out, at the end of this project, this site will not work.

Lesich recalled comments from a previous meeting and asked Durow if the Chamber will lose any of its control as a property owner by having the City involved in this process.

Durow said the Chamber would retain control and has the right to reject any proposals.

Lesich asked what Urban Renewal has learned from the Granada Theatre situation. She also asked if Urban Renewal would be proposing to spend this money if the Visitor Center were a "contract" Visitor Center.

Durow said what was learned from the Granada is that a valuable historic asset of the community has been preserved from damage and the investment is not lost.

Zukin answered the second part of Lesich' question. He said Urban Renewal funds will not be spent improving the building for the Visitor center but will be used in making sure access and traffic flow work correctly.

Young added that Urban Renewal would probably do site planning for a "contract" visitor center but not constructing a visitor center.

Ericksen pointed out that had the warehouse buildings been re-roofed twenty years ago the demolition of those buildings would not be taking place now. The Granada will still be there in twenty years as will the Commodore.

Lesich said she doesn't understand why the Urban Renewal Advisory is being asked to approve this expenditure when the City has already offered the proposal to the Chamber. Ericksen said this is a checks and balance on Staff. Staff has recruited a request from the Chamber but must still follow the policies of the Urban Renewal Plan. This committee needs to make sure staff is not over zealous in its commitments.

Young said the City has not made any commitments. If the Urban Renewal Advisory Committee recommends against the proposal and the Agency accepts that recommendation, then it is over.

Durow said Staff is paid to look at opportunities and propose the best plan available. If the Chamber were not looking for a new building the City would not be proposing this contract. Durow added that property values in the Urban Renewal District went up 11% last year in comparison to 2% in the other areas. This is either causal or coincidental and Staff would like to believe it is causal. The Urban Renewal projects are important and effective.

Zukin moved to recommend to the Urban Renewal Agency that an expenditure, not to exceed \$33,393, be authorized to complete the conceptual plan for the Gateway Project, The Dalles Visitor Center and Chamber Office, as proposed in the attached Scope of Work with DEA. Farner seconded the motion.

Deliberation:

Elkins asked what would happen if he didn't vote yes or no.

Ericksen explained that a member of the committee really has to make a decision unless he has a conflict of interest or bias that he has stated. Ericksen said he doesn't let people off the hook that easy.

Elkins said he did not have a conflict.

Zukin said he does have a concern with the proposal and would like to see the Chamber as a true partner and be involved monetarily. However, he does feel Staff has made a good case that this proposal will solve a design problem for the City and benefit the City more than the Chamber. Zukin said he would vote yes, but with reservations.

Ericksen said he feels it does serve the public interest and there is justification for the fact Staff has gone out and solicited the Chamber. This is an opportunity to be pro-active in an acknowledged difficult traffic area.

There were no additional comments and Chair Ericksen called for a vote.

The motion carried with Zukin, Farner, Elkins, and Ericksen voting for, Lesich voting against, and Evans abstaining.

DISCUSSION

Durow updated the committee members on the Quick Response Grant awarded to the City and how it will be used in developing the Flour Mill property. Durow is expecting to have the RFP ready, for the Flour Mill property, by the end of June 2004.

Lesich said she is hoping, during the next month or two, to discuss the \$371,000 in uncommitted funds by looking at the priority list and things that have been put on the back burner because of the Underpass.

Durow said the preliminary budget would be going out this week, so the Committee will get an opportunity to review the proposed expenditures.

Elkins asked the status of 3rd Street and what year it will be complete.

Durow said at the end of this fiscal year the Public Works Department Engineers would have 3rd Street about ½ designed. For the next fiscal year, the budget will show an additional half-time amount for additional engineering to finish the design on 3rd Street. Plus, there is an estimated \$20,000 to design the traffic signals. This equals about \$58,000 for next fiscal year for 3rd Street. This includes prepared contracts, so the project will be on the shelf and ready to go.

FUTURE MEETINGS

The next regular meeting is scheduled for May 18, 2004, at 5:30 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by Denise Ball, Administrative Secretary.


Dan Ericksen, Chair
Chris Zukin, Acting Chair

AGENDA STAFF REPORT

URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Date: May 25, 2004

DATE: May 20, 2004

TO: Urban Renewal Advisory Committee

FROM: Dan Durow, Urban Renewal Manager



ISSUE: Recommendation to the Urban Renewal Agency on the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Wasco Warehouse and Milling Company property.

BACKGROUND: The RFP is the next step in the process to redevelop the flour mill property. It needs to be out by July 1, 2004, in order to meet the deadlines between now and November. The delay in getting the Quick Response grant from the Department of Land Conservation and Development has consumed all of the little "slack" we did have in the option to purchase schedule. The schedule now stands as follows:

URAC recommends on RFP.....	May 25, 2004
UR Agency approves RFP.....	June 14, (if needed June 28) 2004
Staff finalizes RFP packets, background information....	June 15 to June 30, 2004
Issue Request for Proposals.....	July 1, 2004
Site Tour	July 9, 2004
Due Date for Proposals.....	12:00 noon, September 1, 2004
Evaluate Proposals.....	Sept. 1, 2004 through Sept. 10, 2004
Review/Recommendation by the UR Advisory Committee.....	Sept. 21, 2004
Review and comments by the Historic Landmarks Commission....	Sept. 22, 2004
Review/Approval by the CGURA.....	October 11, (if needed Oct. 25 th) 2004
Purchasing paperwork, finalizing contracts.....	Oct. 26 to Nov. 12, 2004

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Make necessary changes, and recommend approval to the Urban Renewal Agency.

AGENDA STAFF REPORT

URBAN RENEWAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Date: May 25, 2004

DATE: May 20, 2004

TO: Urban Renewal Advisory Committee

FROM: Dan Durow, Urban Renewal Manager



THRU: Nolan Young, City Manager

ISSUE: Recommendation to the Urban Renewal Agency on the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Wasco Warehouse and Milling Company property.

BACKGROUND: The RFP is the next step in the process to redevelop the flour mill property. It needs to be out by July 1, 2004, in order to meet the deadlines between now and November. The delay in getting the Quick Response grant from the Department of Land Conservation and Development has consumed all of the little "slack" we did have in the option to purchase schedule. The schedule now stands as follows:

URAC recommends on RFP.....	May 25, 2004
UR Agency approves RFP.....	June 14, (if needed June 28) 2004
Staff finalizes RFP packets, background information....	June 15 to June 30, 2004
Issue Request for Proposals.....	July 1, 2004
Site Tour	July 9, 2004
Due Date for Proposals.....	12:00 noon, September 1, 2004
Evaluate Proposals.....	Sept. 1, 2004 through Sept. 10, 2004
Review/Recommendation by the UR Advisory Committee.....	Sept. 21, 2004
Review and comments by the Historic Landmarks Commission....	Sept. 22, 2004
Review/Approval by the CGURA.....	October 11, (if needed Oct. 25 th) 2004
Purchasing paperwork, finalizing contracts.....	Oct. 26 to Nov. 12, 2004

Active Revisions Draft

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

**WASCO WAREHOUSE & MILLING COMPANY PROPERTY
a.k.a. SUNSHINE BISCUIT COMPANY PROPERTY**

THE DALLES, OREGON

July 1, 2004

**Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency
City Hall
313 Court Street
The Dalles, Oregon 97058
FAX: 541-298-5490
Voice: 541-296-5481 x1128**

Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency

Public Notice

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Project Title: Wasco Warehouse & Milling Company Property

Proposal Closing Date: September 1, 2004, 12:00 noon

Expected Time Period for Contract: Redevelopment must be completed within two years of the acquisition date (regardless of ownership), or later if concurrent with the completion of the East Gateway/Transition Area street reconstruction work.

Eligible Applicants: Except as herein noted, individuals, partnerships, governments, for-profit and non-profit housing development organizations are all eligible to make a proposal. A person or entity that has previously made an offer for the property is not eligible.

CONTENTS OF THE RFP

1. Introduction
2. Funding
3. Instructions to Applicants
4. Application

Additional Information: This Request for Proposals (the “**RFP**”) is considered to be the application request for the acquisition (partial or in total) and redevelopment of the Wasco Warehouse & Milling Company property in The Dalles, Oregon. If selected under this RFP, the successful applicant will be expected to complete additional project information and financial certifications.

INTRODUCTION

The Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency (the “**CGURA**”) announces a request for proposals for the acquisition (partially or in total) and redevelopment of the Wasco Warehouse & Milling Company property (the “**Property**”) in The Dalles, Oregon. All Proposers will identify and provide redevelopment budgets for the Property within the parameters of the attached application format. The CGURA may provide gap funding to the Property as determined to be legal and necessary, and solely at the discretion of the CGURA.

It is the intent of the CGURA to simultaneously construct the East Gateway/Transition Area street improvement project (the “**Street Project**”) as a necessary and companion project. The CGURA may provide gap or grant match funding for the Street Project as determined to be legal and necessary, and solely at the discretion of the CGURA. The Property may be required to participate in the funding of the Street Project through a local improvement district process or as part of the direct redevelopment costs of the Property. If this is necessary, the costs for this participation will be provided to the proposers in July 2004.

The CGURA is requesting RFP applications to determine the eligibility of individual project proposals and selection of the successful applicant. If a proposal is selected, additional information and financial certifications will be requested from the successful applicant. This information will generally follow the information required for the RFP application but with more detail and with certifications and assurances for identified funding sources.

Project Description

In the summer of 2003, the CGURA began discussions with Cereal Foods Processors, Inc., a Kansas corporation, the current owner of the Property (the “**Owner**”) to negotiate a purchase option (the “**Option**”) on the Property. The Option was signed on November 14, 2003, and runs for a one (1) year period. The CGURA has this one year period to assemble a redevelopment project that has a high level of certainty for success.

The Option is assignable to another buyer at the consent of the Owner under certain conditions. The Owner and the CGURA have agreed to do whatever can be done to allow the Owner to take advantage of any tax deductible gift (based upon the sale price and appraised value) that may be available to them through the sale of the Property to a municipal corporation. If this tax advantage is not available, the consent of the Owner will not be unreasonably withheld. It is expected that the successful applicant will be willing to effectuate this Option condition to the greatest extent possible.

The Owner has agreed to do a full appraisal of the Property and to provide the appraisal to the CGURA. The Owner and The CGURA have also agreed to pay for a structural evaluation of the concrete buildings and for a level II environmental review from the monies placed in an escrow account for the Option. These studies will only be done after the successful applicant has been determined and in no case will the studies exceed \$27,000, the amount placed in the escrow account for the one year Option period. The structural evaluation will be done after the successful applicant has been determined so that the analysis can be targeted to specific structural concerns and redevelopment issues. If the structural evaluation requires more money than in the escrow account, it must come from another source and will not be included in the purchase price of the Property. The CGURA has completed a land survey and map determining lot corners, building locations and elevations on the Property. A level I environmental review and the conceptual design for the Street Project have also been completed.

The Property and buildings are not currently on the National Register of Historic Places, although they could qualify for this designation. The warehouse portion of the buildings was severely damaged this winter with the heavy snowfall and is being demolished. Some portions of this warehouse building may remain upon completion of the stabilization effort. The remaining larger portion of the buildings, the milling and storage areas, were built in 1911-12 and could qualify for historic designation.

It is important that RFP applicants address the historic value of these buildings in any redevelopment design. However, the preservation of these buildings, in part or in total, is not a fixed requirement. The City's Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) will be consulted during the proposal review process. The HLC is attempting to get additional professional evaluation of the National Register nomination potential of all the buildings, and of their reconstruction, renovation, and reuse possibilities for proposal consideration. This evaluation will be made available to RFP applicants if, and as soon as, it is completed.

The Property contains 2.23 acres of land with about 50 percent covered by building footprint (less that of the warehouse portion that is being demolished). It is surrounded on three sides with street and railroad right-of-way. Access to the site is difficult but will be greatly improved upon completion of the Street Project. A small piece of railroad property is adjacent to the Property on the east side. The State is attempting to contact the railroad about possible acquisition of this property. If this property is available it will be made known and will be an option for consideration by proposal applicants.

The Street Project has been conceptually designed through a public involvement process and approved by the City Council. This design will be part of the background documents and be available in the Community Development department. The CGURA has obtained a grant from the State of Oregon and is the process of doing; preliminary engineering design to determine a cost estimate for the Street Project, three conceptual redevelopment concepts for the Property, and a listing all known

funding sources and programs that may be of use in redevelopment of the Property. This information should be available to the proposers in early July.

All RFP applicants should consider the placement of a State Police facility on the Property. Information about the needs of the police facility will be made available with the RFP.

Objective

The objective of the Property redevelopment project is to create a high quality example of historically sensitive, mixed uses on this exceptionally visible site. The additional Street Project will complete the creation of a “gateway” experience into the commercial center of the community for visitors and residence alike. Together, the two redevelopment projects, the Property and the Street Project, are intended to eliminate blight, serve as a catalyst to bring additional development into the downtown area, and increase property values in the Urban Renewal District.

FUNDING

A multiple-layered funding scenario is envisioned for the Property and Street Project. The CGURA may provide gap funding to the Property, and gap or grant match to the Street Project, as determined to be legal and necessary, and solely at the discretion of the CGURA. The CGURA may provide funding in total for the Property and Street Projects in the range of \$250,000 to \$1,000,000. Priority for CGURA funding will be to complete the Street Project. The CGURA funds can be in the form of an outright grant or a buydown of the acquisition cost and certain redevelopment costs. The CGURA contribution could also be structured as a low interest loan. RFP applicants need to indicate what their preference is for the CGURA contribution and the amounts needed for a successful project.

The CGURA will also work closely with State and Federal agencies to secure additional grants and other funding assistance for both the Property and Street Project.

RFP applicants are expected to determine other funding sources, public and private, to complete their own redevelopment proposals as necessary. The greater the probability of attaining all funding needed in a timely manner will result in higher ratings under the financial capability scoring criteria.

RFP applicants are also expected to make some contribution of developer equity to the project, based on the projected cash flow. The greater the equity investment by an applicant the higher the ratings under the financial capability scoring criteria.

INSTRUCTIONS TO APPLICANTS

Proposals must follow the format described below in order to be considered eligible to compete under this RFP.

Complete proposals must be received at the City's Community Development Department no later than September 1, 2004, 12:00 noon. Applications submitted after this date and time will not be considered under this RFP.

Complete applications will consist of, and be evaluated on:

- Project description
- Construction management
- Property management
- Financial packaging/Developer experience
- Financial capacity
- Design and engineering

Site Visit

The CGURA will conduct a site visit to the property on July 9, 2004, from 9:00 am to 12:00 noon. This will be an opportunity for all applicants to view the existing Property and the Street Project and ask questions about the RFP. Items discussed during the site visit will be noted in writing and distributed to all potential RFP applicants.

Submission of Proposals

One (1) RFP application is required with original signatures, along with four (4) copies. One of a kind exhibits or hard to produce originals will be shared among the review team. The RFP applications must be received by CGURA, at the address listed below, no later than **12:00 noon, September 1, 2004**. Faxed or late RFP applications will not be accepted. All proposals will become the property of the CGURA and will not be returned. The CGURA manager, Daniel C. Durow, will be the point of contact for this solicitation. Please address the RFP application to:

Daniel C. Durow, Manager
Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency
City Hall, Community Development Department
313 Court Street
The Dalles, OR. 97058

Proposal Format

All proposals must be on 8.5 by 11 inch paper, typed, and preferred double-spaced, this limitation does not apply to graphic design materials. Proposals must be signed

and dated by the President or Executive Director if a corporation, the managing partner if a partnership, or the proprietor if a sole ownership. Proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by an evaluation committee based upon the evaluation criteria set forth below. The evaluation committee will make a recommendation for award of the proposal to the CGURA.

CGURA reserves the right, at their sole discretion, to reject any and all proposals received without penalty. The final selection, if any, will be the proposal that, in the opinion of the CGURA, best meets the requirements set forth in the RFP and is in the best interest of the CGURA.

In the event it becomes necessary to revise any part of the RFP, addenda will be provided to all potential and known applicants who receive the RFP.

CGURA reserves the right, at their sole discretion, to waive minor administrative irregularities contained in any applicant's proposal.

Applicants whose proposals have not been selected will be notified in writing at the address given in the proposal after the selection is made.

CGURA will not be liable for any costs incurred by the applicant associated with the preparation of a proposal submitted in response to this RFP.

The successful applicant will be expected to enter into funding agreements with the CGURA.

Interpretation Of Proposed Contract Documents

If any person contemplating submitting a Proposal for the proposed contract is in doubt as to the true meaning of any part of the plans, specifications or other proposed contract documents, he/she may submit to Daniel C. Durow a written request for an interpretation thereof. The person submitting the request will be responsible for its prompt delivery. Any interpretations of the proposed documents will be made only by Addendum, duly issued and a copy of such Addendum will be mailed or delivered to each person receiving a set of proposed documents from the CGURA. The CGURA will not be responsible for any other explanations or interpretations of the proposed documents.

Examination Of Plans, Specifications, Site, Etc.

Copies of any background, pre-development documents will be made available for review by the RFP applicants at the City's Community Development Department in The Dalles. Copies will be available for purchase for the cost of reproduction and mailing. While the background, pre-development documents will be made available for review, the successful applicant will ultimately be responsible for all due diligence, including development assumptions and project costs, in the completion of the project.

Proposers must examine and judge for themselves as to the nature of the work to be done and the different conditions that exist or could occur.

Equal Opportunity

Minority Business Enterprises/Woman's Business Enterprises and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit proposal applications in response to this invitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in consideration for an agreement entered into pursuant to this project.

Information To Be Submitted

Failure to submit any required data item may be cause for rejection. Proposers may submit such other data, as they deem appropriate, however, voluminous or overly elaborate proposals are discouraged.

Modification Of Proposal

Proposals which contain conditions which will alter or modify the proposal, specifications, or other proposing documents shall not be considered as responsive proposals and are unacceptable; however, a proposer may withdraw its proposal at any time prior to the scheduled closing time for receipt of proposals.

Withdrawal Of Proposal

At any time prior to the scheduled closing time for receipt of proposals, any proposer may withdraw its proposal, either personally or by written request, to Daniel C. Durow, 313 Court Street, The Dalles, Oregon 97058. If withdrawal is made personally, proper receipt shall be given therefore.

Rejections Of Proposals

The CGURA may reject any proposal not in compliance with all prescribed public proposing procedures and requirements, and may reject for good cause any or all proposals upon a finding of the CGURA it is in the public interest to do so. The CGURA also reserves the right to waive any informalities in connection with said proposals. Any proposal that is obviously unbalanced will be rejected.

Resolution Of Discrepancies In The Proposal

Should there be a discrepancy between the words and figures in the proposal, the words hold.

Intent Of Specifications

The specifications are designed to be complimentary. It is the intent of the specifications to adequately describe the service to be provided. If errors or discrepancies are discovered in the proposing documents, Daniel C. Durow shall be notified in writing no later than five (5) days prior to the proposal opening date. The CGURA shall not be responsible for oral interpretations of these specifications. Upon receipt of a written communication from a prospective Proposer, the CGURA will release a clarification in the form of addenda, to be issued to all proposal holders.

Comment Upon Specifications

Any Proposer who believes any of the proposed specifications may limit competition among potential vendors must submit written comments or objections on the proposed specification to Daniel C. Durow at 313 Court Street, The Dalles, Oregon 97058. The comments must specify why the proposed specification limits competition, and must be received not later than five (5) calendar days before the date when the proposals will be received.

Schedule, Proposal Evaluation

Issue Request for Proposals.....July 1, 2004
Site Tour July 9, 2004
Due Date for Proposals.....12:00 noon, September 1, 2004
Evaluate Proposals.....Sept. 1, 2004 through Sept. 10, 2004
Review/Recommendation by the UR Advisory Committee.....Sept. 21, 2004
Review and comments by the Historic Landmarks Commission...Sept. 22, 2004
Review/Approval by the CGURA.....October 11, (if needed Oct. 25th) 2004

Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Project Description (narrative) – 10 points

1. Housing proposed, number of units and population to be served
2. Expected commercial, public, or other tenants/owners and basis for this expectation
3. Plans for any long-term operating costs

Construction Management (narrative)– 20 points

1. Demonstrated comprehension of required elements of housing and commercial development
2. Ability to deliver a timely project and meeting all requirements

Property Management (narrative)– 15 points

1. Demonstrated ability to manage housing and/or commercial properties
2. If low/moderate income, assisted housing is proposed, provide long-term management details

Financial Packaging (see exhibit A)– 25 points

1. Complete pro forma as per the format prescribed in the application materials
2. Reasonableness of costs
3. Appropriate use of funds (programmatic requirements of funding sources are met)
4. The extent of the use of historic tax and/or preservation programs
5. Provisions for the Owner to take advantage of any tax deductible gift of value (if possible)

Financial Capacity/Developer Experience (narrative and statements) – 30 points

1. Names and biographical resume of organization's principals
2. Demonstrated ability to complete housing and/or mixed-use projects
3. Demonstrated ability to arrange project financing
4. Financial statements of the last two years
5. Equity investment

Design and Engineering (attach plans and narrative) – 30 points

1. Names and biographical resume of organization's principals
2. Statement of the organization's architectural experience
3. Preservation of historic values in architectural design elements or building reuse
4. Creativity in use of property and buildings
5. Connectivity of all forms of transportation, pedestrian, vehicular, and biking, with the downtown core area and surrounding neighborhoods
6. Connectivity with the proposed East Gateway/Transition Area street design
7. Creating an attractive gateway into and out of the downtown core area

SOURCES OF FUNDING

Project Name: _____

Source	<u>Committed</u>	<u>Conditional</u>	<u>Tentative</u>	<u>Anticipated Commitment Date</u>
HCS PROGRAMS				
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
GRANTS				
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
LOANS				
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
APPLICANT CONTRIBUTIONS				
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
OTHER				
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____
SUBTOTALS	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	

TOTAL FUND SOURCES \$ _____

(Note: Total Fund Sources must match "Total Project Cost" from Uses of Financing page.)

Acquisition Costs

SOURCE

TOTAL PROJECT COST

§

AUTHORIZATION TO SUBMIT INFORMATION

Effective this date, authorization has been given by the _____

Board of Directors to: _____
Name Title

to apply under the Wasco Warehouse and Milling Company Request for Proposals in accordance with section _____ in the corporation's By-laws. The Board further acknowledges that additional information regarding the proposed project and the sponsoring organization will be required if this proposal is selected for funding, and agrees to submit that information as requested by the Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency.

Board Chair Signature Date

Organization

THIS PAGE MUST BE COMPLETED, SIGNED AND RETURNED
PRIOR TO THE PROPOSAL CLOSING DATE AND TIME.
FAILURE TO DO SO WILL RESULT IN PROPOSAL REJECTION.

Proposal Certification Statement

Our/my proposal, of which this statement is a part, identifies certain representations of project components identified in the Request for Proposals for the Wasco Warehouse and Milling Company property in The Dalles, Oregon, for the Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency.

The undersigned hereby: acknowledges he/she has read and understands all the requirements and specifications of this request for Proposal (including attachments); and agrees to all requirements, specifications, terms, and conditions contained in this Request for Proposal.

(Company name)

By: _____

(Typed or printed name)

(Address)

(Title)

(City)

(Telephone number)

(Authorized signature)

(Date)

Application**Project Summary**

Project Location:	The Dalles, Oregon
Project Name:	The Wasco Warehouse Milling Property
Project Address:	901 E. 2nd Street
City, State, Zip Code:	The Dalles, Oregon 97058

Project Sponsor/Developer:	
Sponsor Name:	Contact Person:
Address:	Phone:
City, State, Zip Code:	Fax:
	E-mail:
	Tax ID Number:

The undersigned, being duly authorized to submit this application on behalf of the named Applicant hereby represents and certifies that all required documents have been submitted in this application packet, and that the information provided in this application, to the best of his/her knowledge, is true, complete, and accurately describes the proposed project. The undersigned further authorizes the release of project information to Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency from all financial partners listed in the application and authorizes Columbia Gateway Urban Renewal Agency to verify any application information, including financial information, as required to complete its due diligence.

Name and Signature of Authorized Individual:

Signature: _____

Title: _____

Name (Please Print) _____

Date: _____