



---

---

**Addendum #4**  
**RFP 14-21, Downtown Clearwater Waterfront Development Opportunities**  
**March 26, 2021**

---

---

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the following addendum serves to provide clarification and to answer the questions received on RFP #14-21, Downtown Clearwater Waterfront Development Opportunities.

**Add: Exhibit C\_ Utility Drawings 1 & 2 & Exhibit D\_ Asbestos Report**

Link to added exhibits: <https://www.myclearwater.com/Home/Components/RFP/RFP/255/1111>

Question 1: Where are you planning on putting the replacement for City Hall?

**Answer to Question 1:** *Clearwater City Council has identified the current Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA) transfer station property, located at 525 Park St., Clearwater, FL 33756, as well as the West adjacent Pinellas County Water/Sewer Utilities' parcel(s) as a possible land assembly for a parking garage and city hall building. The property is bordered on the south by Pierce St., on the east by S. Garden Ave. and on the west by S. Ft. Harrison Ave.*

Question 2: The RFP mentions that you will be constructing additional parking on a to be located parcel. Has that parcel been identified?

**Answer to Question 2:** *Reference Answer to Question 1 above.*

Question 3: Has there been a replacement site identified for Harborview Center?

**Answer to Question 3:** *The City is not pursuing the replacement of the former Harborview Center.*

Question 4: Could the Harbor Parcel extend to the old depth of the Harbor View Center? Could it extend a little further into the Gateway entrance?

**Answer to Question 4:** *No. The Gateway Plaza entrance area is not considered for other uses. It is expected that the adjoining site will take advantage of outdoor seating and assembly in the plaza area as a part of the pedestrian oriented and activated retail/restaurant space.*

Question 5: The concept plans attached to the RFP contemplate Cleveland Street running dead end into the park at the bottom of the bluff. Will the City contemplate extending that road and connecting it into Pierce Street to allow for Pierce to close and connect the other parcels?

**Answer to Question 5:** *Reference Section IV. Site Details; City Hall Site, Core Considerations - bullet 5, pg.19 and Pierce St. Site, Core Considerations- bullet 4, pg. 20. The City has considered the possibility of relocating Pierce Street to the south, adjacent to the Bridge area, and allowing for the abandonment of a portion of the existing right-of-way (ROW) in order to combine the former City Hall and Park Street sites. The current park design does not indicate Cleveland Street as a through connection to Pierce Street*



---

***and the City I would does not anticipate a redesign of the park at this juncture. While it is not inconceivable, further delay on design/construction is problematic and would incur additional cost.***

Question 6: How many publicly accessible parking spaces is the city anticipating needing the project developers to provide on these lots? What is the need? What is the desired maximum? Can spaces be shared?

***Answer to Question 6: The City has not identified a specific number of parking spaces needed for the bluff properties. It is desired that all parcels generate positive economic activity beyond parking revenue. As indicated in the RFP, we are open to a public-private partnership for the bluff properties. The structure of such a deal is subject to negotiation.***

Question 7: What is the timing for construction to begin on the Imagine Clearwater Amphitheater and Park?

***Answer to Question 7: Initial construction work by Duke Energy has commenced and is now largely completed. A final construction document is being sent to Skanska USA Building Inc. (Skanska) by Stantec Consulting Services Inc. in order for Skanskato generate the final guaranteed maximum price (GMP) for full construction in late May 2021. Next, full phase of construction will commence fully by early summer 2021.***

Question 8: We see that Skanska has set up a trailer camp on the North site for management of the Imagine Clearwater project. What commitment does the city have for them to continue using this site/space and what is the guaranteed completion date for the project?

***Answer to Question 8: The City has authorized the use of the site by Skanska for construction staging. The estimated timeframe for completion of this project is March – June 2023.***

Question 9: Have the design teams completed noise studies for the proposed amphitheater and what considerations have been addressed to assure the new development on the city's sites are not negatively impacted by events?

***Answer to Question 9: Noise studies were performed early in the park design phase. Ultimately, as a result of the studies the site of the performance venue was moved to the north end of the park and oriented toward the back of the library.***

Question 10: Same question as above for lighting systems and possible bleed over to the city sites?

***Answer to Question 10: Engineers are designing the lighting component of the park. Use of decorative fixtures is contemplated. If a particular location or fixture is found to have glare impact they will need to be adjusted.***

Question 11: Please provide current (and any future upgrades planned) utility system infrastructure drawings that support the 3 parcels advertised for development?

***Answer to Question 11: Reference Exhibit C\_ Utility Drawings 1 & 2***



---

**Question 12:** Has the City considered the storm water development needs of the 3 parcels in designing the Imagine Clearwater project? Can the Imagine Clearwater park site be utilized to offset the storm water needs of the new development to allow higher density/flexibility of the development?

**Answer to Question 12:** *The Imagine Clearwater Stormwater pond has been designed with approximately 1.22 acre-feet of excess volume. The City will request memorialization of this within the SWFWMD Environmental Resource Permit to help mitigate the required treatment volumes associated with the redevelopment of these three (3) sites. The amount of mitigation available for each of the sites will be dependent upon the specific redevelopment of each parcel and the hydraulic connectivity to Imagine Clearwater's pond location.*

**Question 13:** Has a recent parking study been conducted by the City/County to address current and long-term needs of downtown?

**Answer to Question 13:** *The City has performed numerous parking studies over the years. While documented use and demand result in a need for additional parking in the next several years, the City Council has nonetheless prioritized additional parking facilities in a more immediate time frame. Additionally, reference Answer to Question 1 above.*

**Question 14:** What is the current revenue for paid parking in city and is this a cost-effective program for city?

**Answer to Question 14:** *The total paid parking revenue for Fiscal Year (FY) 20 was \$7M. The parking program is cost-effective for Clearwater per the significant profit generated annually and consistently. Despite the impact of the pandemic, the profit for FY 20 was \$1.7M.*

**Question 15:** Please verify the amount of public parking currently planned for the new amphitheater and park?

**Answer to Question 15:** *Provided is a breakdown of planned parking within and adjacent to the new park once it is completed:*

<b>Drew Street (On Street) =</b>	<b>33 (32 regular + 1 ADA)</b>
<b>Library (New) =</b>	<b>10 (6 regular + 4 ADA)</b>
<b>Library (Existing) =</b>	<b>57 (51 regular + 6 ADA)</b>
<b>Cleveland Street (On Street) =</b>	<b>30 (29 regular + 1 ADA)</b>
<b>Pierce Street (Surface Lot) =</b>	<b>153 (147 + 6 ADA)</b>
<b>Total =</b>	<b>283 (265 + 18 ADA)</b>

**Existing parking within 2 blocks (Between Drew & Court Streets, with Garden Ave as the eastern boundary):**

<b>CMA lot (unpaved)=</b>	<b>142 (until developed)</b>
<b>Garden Ave Garage=</b>	<b>250 (evenings and weekends when pass holders are not utilizing)</b>



---

---

<b><i>On-Street=</i></b>	<b><i>158</i></b>
<b><i>Total=</i></b>	<b><i>550</i></b>

---

***There are also numerous private lots in this area that could be utilized during large events (at the discretion of the owner). If you expand a little further, the Municipal Services Building (MSB) garage, Station Square garage, and multiple county lots could be included in the count.***

***Also note that the County is considering allowing some of their employees to continue to work from home after the pandemic. This could result in fewer county employees utilizing downtown parking and thus freeing up space for visitors to park.***

Question 16: The RFP contained an Imagine Clearwater excerpt noting: “The Clearwater City Council is seeking a combination of residential, retail and parking on the sites, with the possibility of a hotel, to complement the bordering redevelopment of the roughly 22-acre Coachman Park. “The city of Clearwater is looking forward to breaking ground on Imagine Clearwater, a \$64 million public investment in Downtown Clearwater,” said Mayor Frank Hibbard. “We are now inviting the private sector to invest alongside us on some of the most picturesque property in the State of Florida.”

- a. What market studies have been completed to support the city’s interest for the proposed multi-use development for:
  - i. Residential
  - ii. Retail
  - iii. Parking
  - iv. Hotel
- b. Please provide a cost breakdown of the \$64 MM for the Coachman Park, including:
  - i. Amphitheater?
  - ii. Sound system? (capacity for bands and larger venues?)
  - iii. Portion of funding is set up for Public Parking?

***Answer to Question 16: Market studies were performed by the City’s park design team comprised of HR & A Advisors Inc and Sasaki. Analysis of these studies suggested that there was some market potential for residential and retail as activated edge development to the park. The study did not identify substantial potential for overnight accommodation at this time, although the City is open to a negotiated development partnership for such uses if a viable beneficial agreement is determined to be desirable.***

***Final costs of the amphitheater, sound systems, and parking infrastructure will be included with the GMP anticipated in late May 2021.***



---

Question 17: Who did the city utilize to take the drone video shots at the 100 Foot elevation? Does the city have any restrictions on drone flights to shoot views of each site at the 50 FT, 150 FT, 200 FT and 300 FT elevations?

**Answer to Question 17: *The City hired an external licensed drone operator for the video footage provided with this RFP. The City is not aware of any restrictions a licensed drone operator would encounter at the stated heights.***

Question 18: Using current P&Z site allowances what is the maximum FAR for each of the City sites?

**Answer to Question 18: *Reference Section V. Regulatory Framework on page 21 of the RFP.***

Question 19: We understand that the allowable FAR is 4.0 and the allowable density is 75 units per acre or 95 hotel units per acre. The Downtown Core has no maximum height limit or ISR restrictions; however, building design criteria, such as step-backs, do apply above a 75' height threshold. Attached dwellings require one space per unit and overnight accommodations require 0.75 spaces per unit. Most other uses have no minimum parking requirements. Given that we are planning a true mixed-use development, would the city consider a shared use parking solution to enhance usability and financial return for both the Public and Private Partners? Can the zoning density be shared between the 3 sites?

**Answer to Question 19: *Reference Answer to Question 6.***

Question 20: The City is requesting the responders to provide the proposed development option knowing that two of the key sites are subject to citizen referendum. Given the time and expense of developing the proposals we are asking the city to consider completing a survey of clearwater citizens to assure support of the project based on the maximum allowable development and also confirm the desired development attributes coexist with the Imagine Clearwater Park development? Using one of the premier electronic survey engines like Qualtrics Core XM, Survey Monkey, Get Feedback, etc... to prove out 'PUBLIC' support and ideas for the project before the RFP responses would greatly enhance the results and selection process.

**Answer to Question 20: *Comments noted***

Question 21: We understand that the Church of Scientology will most likely be proposing on the project or possibly influencing the referendum on the development? Please advise what measures are being considered if any on this issue?

**Answer to Question 21: *The City will approach the project by the usual process of implementation in a manner which we believe will give us the best chance for success.***

Question 22: We toured the exterior of the City Hall after learning that we could not gain entry as requested to consider reutilizing the building. Is the city currently using the building for any city functions and if so when would the building be fully vacated?

**Answer to Question 22: *The City Hall site is being maintained but is currently vacated and not in use.***



---

Question 23: We understand from the City Preproposal meeting that the City is contemplating a new city hall to replace the abandoned city hall which has been designated an “Unhealthy Building”. Assuming the current building will be razed, would the city consider one of the 3 sites acceptable for a new city hall?

**Answer to Question 23: Reference Answer to Question 1 above.**

Question 24: Would the city be interested in leasing of space for City Staff?

**Answer to Question 24: The city’s objectives for the three (3) bluff sites is to provide commercially viable active edge to the park. Specific development proposals have not been dictated by any respondent however, office use generally does not achieve the objectives outlined in the RFP.**

Question 25: Would the city be interested in coexisting with other tenants in a joint use facility that provides all the necessary access and security measures including “Post Pandemic” state of the art technology including single air filtration and touchless fixtures/door systems throughout?

**Answer to Question 25: Reference Answer to Question 24 above. Sustainability Initiatives are a portion of the evaluation criteria as stated in the RFP, Section VII. Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Criteria, Item 1(a)(5), pg.31.**

Question 26: Is the City willing to allow the successful developer to expand the Marina to support boat slips to be assigned for developer reservation coupled to residential units or as part of marketing for the overall project?

**Answer to Question 26: When the Clearwater Harbor Marina was constructed in 2010 it was built out to its’ maximum potential. There are no opportunities to expand in any direction, including under the Memorial Causeway Bridge. In addition, no slips can be reserved or assigned to any developer.**

Question 27: We understand from the pre-proposal meeting, that the city is very interested in the Gondola Project being implemented to support the downtown development, including possible residential and parking options for employees working at the Clearwater Beach resorts. Please provide details of the proposed Gondola project, including costs and timetables to implement the project along with locations for the east side loading/unloading facilities.

**Answer to Question 27: A Study is currently being conducted by the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit Authority (TBARTA) and information is not available at this time.**

Question 28: We noted the RFP contained a statement of the City of Clearwater Parking Fund as noted: The City of Clearwater’s parking fund can be utilized to pay for the construction of public or publicly accessible parking within the city. For the sites specifically outlined in this RFP, use of the parking fund is dependent on the type of parking use proposed (i.e., public or private, and use of area requiring parking support, such as a hotel convention center). Based on use, the City will provide \$25,000 for each public parking space provided, up to 100 spaces, or \$2.5 million for public use. Respondents must propose an operations plan for managing parking. The City has budgeted \$10.5 million for the fiscal year 2023-2024 towards a Downtown Garage,





---

which may be used to support this project. The garage, intended to be 5-7 stories in height, is intended to be located no further than two blocks from the sites. Is the city willing to allow the successful development partner to incorporate the parking garage into the city owned site(s)? Would the city like to retain ownership short or long term?

***Answer to Question 28: The \$10.5 million was budgeted for a parking garage to be built in conjunction with a new City Hall. As such, that garage project was expected to be built closer to the new City Hall. The proposed capacity of that garage would be enough to provide parking for City employees, plus a significant amount of parking available to the public. The public parking component would be close enough to the Waterfront Development project to provide lots of additional parking for that area, but the main primary role would be to provide daily parking for City Hall.***

***The new “City Hall” garage should be fully owned and maintained by the City. Public/private partnerships are desirable and sometimes required to move a project forward. However, our existing agreements, where the City only owns a portion of a garage, have not worked to the City’s benefit. If we were to build a garage in conjunction with a privately owned business, it would be best to have a stand-alone garage with connectors to the private building or perhaps an adjoining wall. Public garages within, on top of, or under private property often resulted in unforeseen expenses being added, that the City has little or no control over.***

Question 29: The RFP notes that the CRA has agreed to allocate up to \$5 million total paid over four years to the sites listed in this RFP, starting in 2023. This funding is applicable to workforce housing and public or cultural amenities, such as performance venues, galleries and museums, theaters, etc. Are there any amenities that were planned for the Imagine Clearwater park that were not funded or designed into the project that we should consider including into our development?

***Answer to Question 29: The City has developed a “Value Engineered” list of items that can or may be planned to be add as alternates dependent upon where the project ends up in terms of the needed financial resources. A respondent could propose add/alternate or other items as part of amenity packages that would be a public component of the park. Recognition for such items can be considered such as plaques or other means of identifying sponsorships.***

Question 30: We understand that the city is offering opportunities for tax credits & alternative financing as noted in the RFP with the language: “In addition to potential additional density and FAR granted by City Council, the City and CRA will consider certain development incentives to support the achievement of the goals and requirements stated in this RFP. These incentives could include, but not be limited to, offsetting impact and development fees and funding to support parking and rental housing. The pool of incentives will be applied across the three sites on a competitive basis, as utilized. Respondents are asked to state whether they intend to seek incentives and outline anticipated needs, which will be evaluated as part of the Financial Feasibility and Financial Offer sections of the evaluation process (see Section VII, Evaluation Criteria); all incentive types will be weighted evenly, regardless of source.” Can you please



---

confirm what available funding is currently set aside to support the project and the source i.e. City, CRA, Grants, etc...?

**Answer to Question 30:** *The project currently has a total of \$49.7 million in identified funding from City funding sources, including \$29.5 million from City Council-approved bonds to be issued after construction commences. This total does not include any Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) or grant funding. Additional funding will be identified in the coming months.*

**Question 31:** Given the anticipated timetable to review and answer questions, we are requesting the RFP due date to be reset by the City of Clearwater 30 days from issuance of the Addendum, so that we may evaluate and implement recommendations and answers into our proposal?

**Answer to Question 31:** *At this time, This City does not anticipate extending the due date for this RFP.*

**Question 32:** Are there any available analysis or reports on the City Hall structure?

**Answer to Question 32:** *Reference Exhibit D - Asbestos Report*

**Question 33:** The RFP states that it has not been yet determined if it [City Hall] will be demolished- when will this decision be made?

**Answer to Question 33:** *The City will determine the future of the structure of City Hall post RFP submittals likely has a part of a negotiated partnership agreement when future use and redevelopment options are determined.*

**Question 34:** Are there specific floodplain resiliency goals/guidelines that the development needs to follow?

**Answer to Question 34:** *Reference Section I. Summary of Development Opportunity, pg. 3 of the RFP.*

**Question 35:** Has the City considered an increase in FAR? Is there a possibility to increase max height?

**Answer to Question 35:** *Reference Section I. Summary of Development Opportunity, pg. 5. Other than a general desire for the Harborview Site to have design compatibility with the Main Library building, there is no height limit.*

**Question 36:** Has the City considered an increase in density for this project? If so, what density has been contemplated, and what process would that entail?

**Answer to Question 36:** *Reference Section V. Regulatory Framework; Zoning Context, pg. 21.*





---

**Question 37:** What criteria does the City use to define affordable units? This would relate more specifically to a market rate building that incorporates affordable units as well.

**Answer to Question 37:** *Workforce housing is generally 80 to no more than 120 percent of Area Median Income (AMI).*

**Question 38:** Just to confirm, the parcels can be purchased fee simple?

**Answer to Question 38:** *Reference Section IV. Site Details, ppg 18 & 20, Section VI. Submission Requirements; Item 5- Financial Offer, pg. 28 and Section VII. Evaluation Criteria; Minimum Threshold Requirements of the RFP*

**Question 39:** How many residential units exist in downtown and how many are under construction and approved?

**Answer to Question 39:** *According to the American Community Survey (ACS) five (5) year (2015-2019) data, there are 2,608.5 existing housing units. In addition, there are 102 units that are currently under construction and a pending site plan for a 173-unit multi-family development.*

**Question 40:** What is the maximum density in the Future Land Use Central Business District?

**Answer to Question 40:** *Reference Section V. Regulatory Framework, pg. 21 of the RFP.*

**Question 41:** How many public parking spaces exist downtown? Is there sufficient parking to meet current demand?

**Answer to Question 41:** *Between parking lots, garages and on-street parking, the total number of parking spaces downtown is approximately 2,941. While current parking options are generally manageable for all events, the City is currently in the planning stages for additional parking infrastructure as a component of a new City Hall site that would be located in close proximity to the waterfront park and venue area. Reference Answer to Question 1.*

**Question 42:** Could we combine both Pierce Street and City Hall sites and vacate the street as long as pedestrian access is preserved? How would that work? What is the approval process and is this something the City would consider?

**Answer to Question 42:** *Reference section IV. Site Details on page 16 of the RFP*

**Please Note:** *The deadline for submitting questions is now closed and no further questions will be responded to.*

*End of Questions and Answers*

*End of Addenda*