

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

Evans Vista Neighborhood Development Partnership

City of Port Townsend, Washington

The City of Port Townsend, Washington (City), invites proposals from development teams shortlisted through the City's Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI) process to partner in the development of the Evans Vista Neighborhood, a City-owned site of approximately 14 acres located near the Rainier Street roundabout along Sims Way. Evans Vista is envisioned as a complete mixed-income, mixed-housing neighborhood that will deliver approximately 321 residential units while advancing the City's long-term affordable housing, workforce housing, and community development objectives.

This Request for Proposals (RFP) is the second phase of the City's two-round developer selection process. Through this RFP, the City seeks detailed, implementation-oriented proposals that present a clear and feasible approach to financing, developing, constructing, operating, and maintaining the Evans Vista Neighborhood in a manner consistent with the Evans Vista Master Site Plan, applicable City policies, and the objectives outlined in this solicitation. Unlike the preliminary RFEI stage, this second-round RFP requires comprehensive proposals that enable the City to evaluate and compare affordability outcomes, site planning quality, phasing strategies, infrastructure delivery, financial feasibility, implementation readiness, and long-term operational capacity. Only shortlisted respondents from the RFEI may submit a response to this RFP.

Proposals must include, at a minimum, a refined site development plan, Phase 1 development program, infrastructure and phasing strategy, affordability program, ownership and operations structure, financing plan, development budget, implementation schedule, and evidence of organizational and financial capacity to deliver the project. The City seeks a development partner capable of translating the Evans Vista Master Site Plan into an implementable, financially sustainable development program that delivers meaningful community benefit. Particular emphasis will be placed on affordability outcomes, housing production, site development quality, infrastructure feasibility, financing readiness, long-term compliance with affordability requirements, and the respondent's demonstrated experience delivering mixed-income and affordable housing communities.

Consistent with state grant requirements and City objectives, proposals must provide a minimum of twenty-five percent (25%) of all residential units as income-restricted affordable housing serving households earning eighty percent (80%) of Area Median Income (AMI) or below for a minimum affordability period of twenty-five (25) years. Respondents are encouraged to propose affordability levels, affordability durations, housing types, and community benefits that exceed these minimum requirements where financially feasible. Submission of a proposal in response to this RFP does not obligate the City to enter into a development agreement, convey property, or award any contract. The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, request clarifications, conduct interviews or presentations, negotiate with one or more respondents, and request best-and-final offers as necessary.

Following evaluation of proposals, the City may enter into exclusive negotiations with the highest-ranked respondent for the purpose of negotiating a development agreement and related transaction documents. Complete proposals must be received by the City no later than 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time on September 4, 2026. Late submissions may be deemed non-responsive and may not be considered.

Table of Contents

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP).....	1
Evans Vista Master Site Plan and Development Context.....	3
Proposal Requirements.....	4
Second-Round RFP Scoring Framework.....	5
Evans Vista Neighborhood – RFP Evaluation Scoring Rubric.....	6
Detailed Scoring Guidance.....	7
1. Affordability & Housing Outcomes (15 Points).....	7
2. Site Development Plan & Urban Design Quality (15 Points)	8
3. Phasing & Infrastructure Implementation (15 Points)	8
4. Financial Feasibility & Funding Strategy (15 Points).....	9
5. Development Team Qualifications & Experience (10 Points).....	9
6. Operations, Asset Management & Compliance (10 Points).....	10
7. Implementation Strategy & Contractual Readiness (15 Points)	10
8. Community Benefits & Neighborhood-Serving Amenities (5 Points)	11
Proposal Minimum Thresholds	11
Solicitation Schedule & Deadlines	12
Schedule of Deadlines	12
Questions and Addenda	12
Development Contract Type	12
Protest Process	13
Reservation of Rights	14
Disclaimers.....	14
Title VI Statement	14
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information	14
Public Inspection of Certain Records	15
City Contact.....	15

Evans Vista Master Site Plan and Development Context

The Evans Vista Master Site Plan constitutes the City's current planning framework for development of an approximately 14-acre, City-owned property as a principal gateway to Port Townsend. For purposes of this solicitation, the Master Site Plan is intended to convey the City's development vision, establish the overall planning assumptions for the site, and provide a structured basis upon which respondents may prepare development proposals. The City envisions Evans Vista as a complete, mixed-income, mixed-housing neighborhood and seeks a development partner capable of advancing that vision through a proposal that is technically sound, financially feasible, and responsive to the City's adopted policy objectives. Consistent with current City materials, the site is anticipated to support approximately 321 residential units in a combination of multifamily and townhome forms, with the potential for vertical mixed-use and limited neighborhood-serving commercial uses where such components can be demonstrated to be compatible with the site, support project feasibility, and contribute to the overall public purpose of the development.

The Plan is intended to establish the site's overall spatial, functional, and implementation framework rather than prescribe a final, immutable development scheme. It identifies the anticipated relationship among building areas, internal circulation, access points, utility corridors, pedestrian and trail connections, open-space opportunities, parking areas, and environmental constraints so that the property may be developed in coordinated phases over time. City concept materials indicate that the planning work completed to date has considered topography, access, solar orientation, views, multimodal connectivity, and critical-area constraints, including wetlands, buffers, and geologic conditions. Respondents should therefore understand the Master Site Plan as a foundational planning document that communicates the City's expectations regarding site organization, public realm quality, infrastructure coordination, and phased deliverability, while also preserving sufficient flexibility for a selected development partner to refine the plan through due diligence, design development, financing, and entitlement.

The City has also advanced substantial community engagement in advance of this solicitation because Evans Vista is intended to implement long-range housing and land-use policy through a development program that is durable, publicly accountable, and responsive to community priorities. The planning context for the site includes the Rainier Street and Upper Sims Way subarea planning effort, the 2025 Comprehensive Plan update, and related housing policy work, each of which involved extensive public participation. Through those processes, the City has been able to identify recurring community priorities relating to affordability, mixed-income housing, neighborhood character, open space, childcare, transportation connectivity, and design quality. This prior engagement is relevant to respondents because it establishes a clearer policy and public-interest framework for the project and provides important guidance regarding the development outcomes, amenities, and design values that are most likely to align with City expectations and community objectives.

The City's objectives for Evans Vista follow directly from this planning and policy framework. First, the City intends for the project to make a meaningful contribution to local housing supply by delivering new homes at a scale that responds to documented community need and supports the City's broader housing strategy. Second, the City intends for the development to advance long-term affordability in a manner consistent with applicable public funding obligations and adopted housing goals. As stated in the City's current solicitation materials, at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the total residential units must be restricted to households earning eighty percent (80%) of area median income or below for a minimum of twenty-five (25) years. Third, the City intends for Evans Vista to function as a genuinely mixed-income neighborhood rather than a single-income development, with housing types and price points capable of serving households across a broader income spectrum, including workforce and moderate-income households.

In addition to housing production and affordability, the City seeks a development outcome that demonstrates high-quality site design, environmental stewardship, neighborhood compatibility, technical feasibility, and phased deliverability. Evans Vista is intended to emerge as a complete neighborhood that provides lasting public value through a coordinated site pattern, attractive and functional open spaces, strong pedestrian and multimodal connections, and, where feasible, neighborhood-serving amenities such as childcare, community gardens, public art, gathering space, or limited commercial uses integrated into a compatible and well-executed development concept. At the same time, the City intends to preserve appropriate flexibility within the Master Site Plan so that a selected development partner may contribute innovation, technical expertise, and financially viable refinements without departing from the project's core public objectives. Accordingly, the City seeks a respondent capable of translating the Master Site Plan into an implementable development program that advances affordability, supports thoughtful growth, manages delivery risk, and produces a well-designed, enduring mixed-income neighborhood that contributes measurable long-term community benefit.

Proposal Requirements

Proposals shall provide sufficient information to permit the City to evaluate development feasibility, affordability outcomes, implementation readiness, financial capacity, and long-term operational sustainability. Each proposal shall address all requirements identified in this section. Each respondent shall submit an Executive Summary describing its overall development approach, vision for the Evans Vista Neighborhood, affordability strategy, financing plan, development schedule, and anticipated public benefits.

Each respondent shall identify all members of the proposed development team, including the lead developer, co-developers, architects, engineers, contractors, property managers, consultants, and financing partners. The proposal shall describe the qualifications, experience, and responsibilities of each team member and demonstrate successful delivery of affordable housing, mixed-income housing, public-private partnerships, phased residential developments of similar scale and complexity, and, where applicable, the respondent's experience attracting, structuring, or leveraging Opportunity Zone investment or other mission-aligned private capital for community development projects.

Each proposal shall include a Refined Site Development Plan that demonstrates how the proposed development advances the Evans Vista Master Site Plan. The site plan shall identify proposed building locations, residential unit counts, housing types, vehicle circulation systems, parking facilities, pedestrian and bicycle connections, open space, utility concepts, environmental considerations, and neighborhood-serving amenities. The proposal shall demonstrate consistency with applicable development regulations and City objectives.

Each respondent shall submit a detailed Phase 1 Development Plan and a Phasing Strategy describing the proposed sequence of development through full buildout. The proposal shall identify the number of phases anticipated, the estimated duration in years to achieve full buildout, anticipated unit delivery by phase, infrastructure sequencing, utility installation, stormwater facilities, road improvements, development milestones, and major implementation risks. Respondents shall clearly demonstrate how Phase 1 establishes a viable and financially sustainable foundation for subsequent development phases and shall describe contingencies addressing how later phases may proceed if market conditions, financing availability, entitlement timing, infrastructure costs, or other material assumptions change.

Each proposal shall include a Housing and Affordability Plan identifying total unit count, unit mix, bedroom mix, tenure assumptions, affordability levels by AMI category, duration of affordability restrictions, workforce housing components, and any housing targeted to seniors, persons with disabilities, extremely low-income households, families with children, veterans, formerly unhoused households, or other special

populations. The proposal shall include a table showing proposed phases, estimated delivery year or timeframe, total unit counts, affordable and market-rate unit counts, and AMI levels served in each phase. At a minimum, twenty-five percent (25%) of all residential units shall be restricted to households earning eighty percent (80%) of Area Median Income or below for a minimum affordability period of twenty-five (25) years. Respondents are encouraged to exceed these minimum requirements where feasible.

Each proposal shall include an Operations and Compliance Plan describing the proposed ownership structure, asset management approach, property management structure, affordability monitoring procedures, compliance reporting protocols, and long-term enforcement mechanisms necessary to maintain compliance with funding requirements and affordability restrictions. The proposal shall identify the proposed property management entity, describe its experience managing mixed-income and regulated affordable housing communities, disclose relevant reputation, performance, licensing, compliance, resident-service, and reference information, and explain how property management practices will support long-term livability, maintenance, resident stability, and regulatory compliance.

Each proposal shall include a Financial Feasibility Package consisting of a development budget, sources and uses statement, capital stack summary, financing strategy, funding gap analysis for subsidized housing, development assumptions, financing schedule, and evidence of financial capacity. The package shall include an established pro forma for the proposed development program and shall identify key assumptions, sensitivity factors, material risks, risk mitigation measures, and contingency plans, including contingency strategies if one or more phases cannot proceed as scheduled or if anticipated financing, infrastructure delivery, or market assumptions materially change. Respondents shall demonstrate that the proposed development program is financially feasible and supported by realistic cost assumptions and financing strategies.

Each proposal shall include a Development Schedule identifying anticipated milestones for predevelopment activities, entitlements, financing applications, infrastructure construction, vertical construction, occupancy, and project stabilization. The proposal shall identify significant implementation risks and describe proposed mitigation measures. Each respondent shall identify its preferred approach to obtaining the property such as a purchase and sale agreement for purchase, long-term lease, phased acquisition, or other. Each respondent shall also identify its preferred entitlement process such as development agreement, Planned Unit Development, binding site plan, or subdivision. The rationale for its preferred method of property transfer and securing entitlements should be provided.

Each proposal shall identify proposed community benefits and neighborhood-serving amenities and explain how those amenities contribute to the long-term success, livability, and public value of the Evans Vista Neighborhood. If childcare is proposed, the respondent shall describe the intended operating model, partner or provider assumptions, licensing and regulatory considerations, space and access requirements, financial feasibility, long-term operating risks, and risk mitigation approach.

Second-Round RFP Scoring Framework

For the second-round RFP, the City will use a 100-point scoring framework that places primary emphasis on affordability outcomes, site development quality, phasing and infrastructure feasibility, and the respondent's ability to finance and implement the project. The following scoring framework is intended to align the required submittals with the City's award priorities and to provide a transparent basis for evaluating shortlisted proposals.

The City shall evaluate proposals based upon the criteria and scoring framework established in this Request for Proposals. The purpose of the evaluation process is to identify the proposal that best advances

the City's housing, affordability, implementation, and community development objectives while demonstrating a realistic path toward financing, permitting, construction, and long-term operation.

An evaluation committee is established consisting of City staff, consultants, subject matter experts, and other individuals selected by the City. The evaluation committee shall review and score proposals in accordance with the published criteria.

Following evaluation of written proposals, the City may request clarifications, supplemental information, interviews, presentations, reference checks, revised proposals, or best-and-final offers. The City may conduct negotiations with one or more respondents if necessary to further evaluate implementation feasibility or contractual terms.

Selection shall be based upon the City's determination of overall value and public benefit. The highest-scoring proposal shall not necessarily be selected if the City determines that another proposal better advances the City's objectives or presents a lower implementation risk.

Selection of a preferred respondent does not constitute a final award, property conveyance, development approval, or authorization to proceed. Any final development agreement and related transaction documents remain subject to negotiation, execution, and required City approval.

Evans Vista Neighborhood – RFP Evaluation Scoring Rubric

Evaluation Category	Requirements to be Evaluated	Maximum Points
1. Affordability & Housing Outcomes	Total unit count; housing production relative to site capacity; percentage of affordable units; affordability by AMI bands; affordability term beyond minimum 25 years; housing diversity; mixed-income strategy; inclusion of workforce housing; units serving special populations (seniors, disabilities, ELI households); long-term affordability compliance plan	15
2. Site Development Plan & Urban Design Quality	Refined site plan; consistency with Evans Vista Master Site Plan; neighborhood design quality; building placement; open space design; pedestrian connectivity; multimodal circulation; compatibility with surrounding development; environmental stewardship; integration of community amenities	15
3. Phasing & Infrastructure Implementation	Detailed phasing plan; phase 1 feasibility; infrastructure sequencing; backbone utilities; roads and circulation; stormwater systems; coordination between horizontal and vertical development; constructability; long-term buildout strategy	15
4. Financial Feasibility & Funding Strategy	Development budget; sources and uses; capital stack; identification of funding sources; financing strategy; funding gap analysis; reasonableness of assumptions; ability to secure financing; feasibility of delivery schedule	15
5. Development Team Qualifications & Experience	Experience with affordable housing; mixed-income developments; public-private partnerships; phased development; Opportunity Zone investment or comparable private capital strategies, where applicable; project delivery	10

	record; development, design, construction, financing, and property management team qualifications	
6. Operations, Asset Management & Compliance	Ownership structure; property management plan; property management reputation, references, resident-service approach, maintenance standards, and compliance history; asset management approach; compliance monitoring; reporting procedures; demonstrated capacity to maintain affordability and regulatory compliance over time	10
7. Implementation Strategy & Contractual Readiness	Land disposition proposal; preferred entitlement and implementation method, including purchase and sale agreement by parcel or phase, development agreement, planned unit development, binding site plan, or other legally available mechanism; allocation of infrastructure responsibilities; requested City participation; risk allocation assumptions; performance milestones; permitting schedule; construction schedule; estimated years to full buildout; contingency approach for delayed, failed, or deferred phases; readiness for negotiation and execution	15
8. Community Benefits & Neighborhood-Serving Amenities	Childcare feasibility, operating model, provider assumptions, regulatory considerations, risks, and mitigation approach; examples of comparable projects with childcare or family-supportive services; community gardens; public art; gathering spaces; neighborhood-serving commercial uses; sustainability measures; public realm enhancements; measurable long-term community benefits	5
TOTAL		100

Detailed Scoring Guidance

The detailed scoring guidance is intended to assist respondents in understanding how proposals will be evaluated and how points may be awarded within each evaluation category. The guidance provides general descriptions of the characteristics associated with higher- and lower-scoring proposals and is intended to promote transparency and consistency in the evaluation process.

The scoring guidance is illustrative rather than exhaustive. The City will evaluate proposals based on the totality of the information submitted and reserves the right to consider the overall quality, feasibility, responsiveness, and public benefit of each proposal. Respondents are encouraged to address all evaluation criteria thoroughly and demonstrate how their proposal advances the City's housing, affordability, implementation, and community development objectives.

1. Affordability & Housing Outcomes (15 Points)

Score Range	Detailed Scoring Guidance
13–15	Proposal substantially exceeds the minimum affordability requirement; provides a clear mix of AMI levels including deeper affordability where feasible; demonstrates a credible strategy for mixed-income integration, workforce housing, bedroom diversity, and special population

	needs; includes a realistic long-term compliance structure and affordability term that materially exceeds 25 years.
10–12	Proposal exceeds minimum affordability requirements in percentage, depth, duration, or housing diversity; provides a reasonable phase-by-phase affordability table; demonstrates a strong mixed-income strategy and credible compliance approach, with only minor uncertainties regarding implementation or funding.
6–9	Proposal meets the required 25% affordability threshold at or below 80% AMI for at least 25 years and provides an acceptable housing mix, but offers limited additional affordability depth, duration, or special population benefit; compliance approach is generally adequate but may require clarification.
1–5	Proposal provides limited, unclear, or poorly supported affordability outcomes; unit counts, AMI levels, tenure assumptions, or affordability terms are incomplete or internally inconsistent; housing mix does not clearly advance mixed-income neighborhood goals; compliance plan is weak or largely conceptual.
0	Proposal fails to satisfy the mandatory affordability threshold or does not provide sufficient information to determine compliance with affordability requirements.

2. Site Development Plan & Urban Design Quality (15 Points)

Score Range	Detailed Scoring Guidance
13–15	Proposal presents an exceptional, coherent site plan that strongly advances the Evans Vista Master Site Plan; integrates housing types, open space, pedestrian and bicycle connections, parking, access, utilities, environmental constraints, and neighborhood-serving amenities into a complete neighborhood concept; demonstrates strong design quality, constructability, and compatibility with surrounding development.
10–12	Proposal provides a strong and well-organized site plan that is generally consistent with City objectives and the Master Site Plan; design approach is credible and functional, with minor gaps or unresolved details related to circulation, open space, environmental conditions, parking, or amenity integration.
6–9	Proposal provides an adequate site concept but lacks sufficient detail, cohesion, or demonstrated integration with the Master Site Plan; design may meet basic functional needs but includes deficiencies in neighborhood character, connectivity, open space, environmental responsiveness, or public realm quality.
1–5	Proposal includes a weak, incomplete, or poorly supported site plan; material feasibility concerns exist regarding access, grading, infrastructure, environmental constraints, site capacity, compatibility, or consistency with City objectives.
0	Proposal does not include a meaningful site development plan or provides insufficient information to evaluate site design quality.

3. Phasing & Infrastructure Implementation (15 Points)

Score Range	Detailed Scoring Guidance
13–15	Proposal provides a highly credible phase-by-phase implementation strategy, including a viable Phase 1 plan, infrastructure sequencing, utility and stormwater approach, road and access improvements, estimated years to full buildout, and clear coordination between horizontal and vertical construction; risks and contingencies are specific and realistic.

10–12	Proposal presents a strong phasing and infrastructure approach with generally realistic sequencing and constructability assumptions; Phase 1 appears viable, though some details regarding cost responsibility, utility timing, stormwater, road improvements, or later-phase contingencies may require clarification.
6–9	Proposal includes a reasonable but incomplete implementation strategy; key infrastructure assumptions, Phase 1 feasibility, buildout timing, cost allocation, or risk mitigation measures are not fully developed.
1–5	Proposal contains major feasibility concerns regarding infrastructure delivery, phasing, access, utilities, stormwater, constructability, or dependence on unresolved assumptions; Phase 1 does not clearly establish a viable foundation for later phases.
0	Proposal does not provide a viable phasing or infrastructure strategy.

4. Financial Feasibility & Funding Strategy (15 Points)

Score Range	Detailed Scoring Guidance
13–15	Proposal includes a complete, internally consistent, and realistic financial feasibility package, including development budget, sources and uses, pro forma, capital stack, financing schedule, funding gap analysis, evidence of capacity, and credible contingency strategies; assumptions are well supported and aligned with the proposed phasing and affordability program.
10–12	Proposal presents a strong financing strategy with generally credible cost and revenue assumptions, identifiable funding sources, and manageable risks; some financing commitments, sensitivity analysis, or contingency details may remain preliminary but are reasonably explained.
6–9	Proposal appears potentially feasible but contains notable uncertainties, unsupported assumptions, incomplete or unclear budget information, unclear financing sources, or insufficient explanation of funding gaps, timing risks, or contingency strategies.
1–5	Proposal raises significant financing concerns, including unrealistic cost assumptions, inadequate funding sources, unsupported pro forma inputs, material funding gaps, weak evidence of financial capacity, or limited ability to deliver the project as proposed.
0	Proposal does not provide a credible financial plan or omits required financial feasibility materials.

5. Development Team Qualifications & Experience (10 Points)

Score Range	Detailed Scoring Guidance
9–10	Team demonstrates exceptional, directly relevant experience delivering affordable, mixed-income, public-private, and phased residential developments of comparable scale and complexity; roles are clear; key partners are committed; references and prior project outcomes support strong confidence in delivery capacity.
7–8	Team demonstrates strong relevant experience and capacity, with credible qualifications across development, design, construction, financing, and property management; some roles, comparable project details, or partner commitments may require clarification.
4–6	Team has some relevant qualifications but limited comparable experience, incomplete role definition, or insufficient evidence of capacity to deliver a complex, multi-phase affordable housing project.

1–3	Team qualifications are weak, incomplete, or poorly matched to the project; proposal lacks sufficient evidence of affordable housing experience, public-private partnership experience, or organizational capacity.
0	Proposal does not identify a qualified development team or fails to demonstrate required affordable housing development experience.

6. Operations, Asset Management & Compliance (10 Points)

Score Range	Detailed Scoring Guidance
9–10	Proposal provides a complete and credible ownership, operations, asset management, property management, maintenance, resident-service, and compliance plan; responsible parties are identified; compliance monitoring and reporting procedures are specific; property management qualifications and history support long-term affordability stewardship.
7–8	Proposal provides a strong operations and compliance approach with minor gaps in reporting detail, enforcement mechanisms, property management documentation, or long-term asset management responsibilities.
4–6	Proposal provides a generally acceptable but incomplete plan for operations, property management, asset management, or compliance; key responsible parties, procedures, or monitoring tools require further development.
1–3	Proposal provides minimal or largely conceptual information regarding operations, property management, asset management, or affordability compliance.
0	Proposal fails to demonstrate long-term affordability compliance capability or omits required operations and compliance information.

7. Implementation Strategy & Contractual Readiness (15 Points)

Score Range	Detailed Scoring Guidance
13-15	Proposal provides a clear, realistic, and negotiation-ready implementation approach, including a well-supported land disposition structure, preferred entitlement pathway, allocation of infrastructure responsibilities, requested City participation, performance milestones, permitting and construction schedule, estimated years to full buildout, risk allocation assumptions, and contingency approach for delayed, failed, or deferred phases. The proposed contractual structure is legally and operationally coherent and supports City oversight, affordability enforcement, phased delivery, and timely execution.
10-12	Proposal provides a strong implementation and contractual readiness strategy with a plausible entitlement and land disposition approach, generally reasonable milestones, and identifiable responsibilities. Some details regarding City approvals, risk allocation, phase-specific conveyance or lease terms, remedies, modification procedures, or negotiation readiness may require clarification, but the overall approach appears feasible.
6-9	Proposal identifies a potential implementation pathway but leaves material issues unresolved, including land transfer structure, entitlement process, infrastructure obligations, requested City participation, performance milestones, remedies, approval timing, or contingencies for delayed or failed phases. The approach may be workable but would require substantial refinement before negotiation of a development agreement or related transaction documents.

1–5	Proposal provides minimal, internally inconsistent, or largely conceptual information regarding implementation, entitlement, land disposition, contractual structure, risk allocation, City participation, or performance milestones. The proposal does not demonstrate sufficient readiness to proceed efficiently into negotiation or implementation.
0	Proposal omits a meaningful implementation strategy or does not provide sufficient information to evaluate contractual readiness.

8. Community Benefits & Neighborhood-Serving Amenities (5 Points)

Score Range	Detailed Scoring Guidance
5	Proposal provides a compelling and feasible package of community benefits and neighborhood-serving amenities that clearly strengthens the Evans Vista Neighborhood and advances long-term public value. Any proposed childcare component is supported by a realistic operating model, provider assumptions, licensing and regulatory considerations, space and access requirements, financial feasibility, operating risk analysis, and mitigation approach. Additional amenities such as community gardens, public art, gathering spaces, limited neighborhood-serving commercial uses, sustainability measures, public realm enhancements, or family-supportive services are specific, measurable, compatible with the site plan, and supported by credible implementation responsibilities.
4	Proposal identifies meaningful community benefits or amenities that are strongly aligned with City objectives and appear feasible, but minor details regarding design integration, operating responsibility, funding, implementation timing, maintenance, childcare feasibility, partner commitments, or long-term public benefit measurement may require clarification.
2–3	Proposal identifies community benefits or amenities that are generally aligned with City objectives but only partially supported. Key details regarding feasibility, funding, operating responsibility, maintenance, childcare assumptions, partner commitments, or measurable long-term benefit require further development.
1	Proposal provides limited, generic, or weakly supported community benefits or amenities. Proposed features may be aspirational, disconnected from the site plan, unsupported by operating or funding assumptions, or insufficiently detailed to determine feasibility, public benefit, or long-term maintenance responsibility.
0	Proposal does not identify community benefits or neighborhood-serving amenities, or provides insufficient information to evaluate the proposed public benefit.

Proposal Minimum Thresholds

In addition to scoring, proposals will be deemed non-responsive if they fail any of the following mandatory requirements:

1. Minimum 25% of units affordable at ≤80% AMI.
2. Minimum 25-year affordability term.
3. Submission of a complete Phase 1 site plan.
4. Submission of a phasing and infrastructure plan.
5. Submission of a financing strategy and sources-and-uses statement.
6. Demonstration of affordable housing development experience.
7. Demonstration of long-term affordability compliance capability.

This rubric provides the City of Port Townsend with a transparent, defensible, and procurement-ready framework that closely follows the priorities articulated in the Evans Vista second-round RFP narrative.

Solicitation Schedule & Deadlines

The solicitation schedule was structured to identify qualified development teams and allow refinement of development concepts before final selection. The City intends to balance clarity and transparency with flexibility, recognizing the complexity of large-scale affordable housing development and the need for collaboration as project details evolve.

The proposal must be submitted in electronic PDF format via email by **Friday, September 4, 2026, at 5:00 p.m.** Please submit one digital version of the proposal via email to frontdesk@cityofpt.us. The subject line should read: Proposal for Development of the Evans Vista Neighborhood — Attn: Renata Munfrada, Housing Grants Coordinator.

Timely submission is the sole responsibility of the proposer. Proposers assume all risk of late delivery, regardless of cause, and the City reserves the right to determine whether any submittal is timely.

The project schedule below is tentative, and the City reserves the right to revise it at its sole discretion.

Schedule of Deadlines

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Second-Round RFP Issued	July 8, 2026
Deadline for Questions	August 14, 2026
Addenda Issued By	August 28, 2026
Refined Proposals Deadline	September 4, 2026
Final Proposal Selection	October 5, 2026

Questions and Addenda

Questions regarding this RFP must be submitted by email to the City contact identified in this solicitation no later than the deadline stated in the solicitation schedule. Questions should clearly identify the relevant section of the RFP and describe the issue for which clarification is requested.

The City may respond to questions and issue clarifications, interpretations, or revisions to this RFP by written addendum. Addenda, if any, shall be distributed to interested parties and shall become part of this solicitation.

Respondents are responsible for reviewing all addenda issued by the City and for ensuring that their proposals reflect any clarifications or revisions contained in those addenda. Oral statements or informal communications shall not modify the requirements of this RFP.

Development Contract Type

The City anticipates entering into one or more legally binding agreements with the selected development team to implement the Evans Vista Neighborhood in a manner that advances public affordability objectives, supports timely infrastructure delivery, and ensures long-term stewardship of the site. This RFP is intended to identify a preferred development partner and does not constitute a commitment by the City to enter any contractual structure or to convey City-owned property.

Given the size, phasing, and public funding considerations of the project, the City intends to retain flexibility in structuring the contractual relationship and will determine the appropriate contract form based on project feasibility, risk allocation, funding requirements, and long-term public benefit. Contractual arrangements may include, but are not limited to, a purchase and sale agreement with recorded affordability covenants, a long-term ground lease, a development agreement with phased or conditional conveyance, or a combination of such instruments. Any conveyance or lease of property shall be subject to enforceable affordability restrictions, permitted use limitations, performance milestones, and remedies for nonperformance.

Respondents shall identify their preferred entitlement and implementation method for the project and explain how the proposed method supports efficient phasing, financing, infrastructure delivery, affordability enforcement, and City oversight. Potential approaches may include, without limitation, a purchase and sale agreement for individual parcels or phases, a process for modifications within defined City sideboards, a development agreement, planned unit development, binding site plan, or another legally available entitlement or implementation mechanism. The City reserves the right to accept, reject, modify, or negotiate any proposed approach based on legal feasibility, public benefit, funding requirements, risk allocation, and implementation readiness.

Where fee title conveyance is utilized, such conveyance may occur in phases and shall be conditioned upon satisfaction of defined development milestones, demonstration of committed financing, and recording of all required regulatory instruments. Where a ground lease or other leasehold structure is used, the City shall retain ownership of the land while granting development and operational rights for a defined term, and the lease shall incorporate all affordability, performance, and compliance obligations, including restrictions on assignment or encumbrance.

Regardless of contract structure, the selected developer shall be required to enter into an enforceable agreement that consolidates all statutory requirements, funding program conditions, and City policy objectives applicable to the project. Where multiple agreements or recorded instruments are used, such documents shall be structured to function cohesively and shall establish an order of precedence. Recorded affordability and use restrictions shall run with the land and bind all successors.

Selection through this RFP does not constitute a contract award, does not guarantee conveyance of City-owned property, and does not obligate the City to proceed with negotiations or execute a final agreement. Any agreement remains subject to City Council approval, satisfaction of funding conditions, completion of required environmental and consultation processes, and compliance with applicable law.

Protest Process

A responsive, but non-selected respondent may protest their non-selection to the RFP. Protest procedures are intended to promote fairness and integrity in the process and are not a forum for delaying or disrupting procurement. Subcontractors or suppliers of responding firms do not have independent protest rights.

Protests must be in writing, state the specific grounds for protest with supporting facts, and describe the relief requested. Protests based on alleged defects or improprieties apparent on the face of the RFP must be filed prior to the deadline for responsive submissions – this allows the City to correct the issue so that all respondents have a fair opportunity. Protests based on other grounds must be filed within a week after the City sends notification of non-selection. Failure to file a protest timely constitutes a waiver of protest rights. The City Manager will review any timely protest and issue a written determination, which shall be final unless otherwise required by applicable law.

The City may proceed with, suspend, or modify the RFP process during the pendency of a protest, at the City's sole discretion.

Reservation of Rights

The City reserves all rights available under applicable law with respect to this solicitation and the selection process. Issuance of this RFP does not obligate the City to enter into a development agreement, convey property, provide funding, or proceed with any aspect of the Evans Vista Neighborhood project.

The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals; waive informalities, irregularities, or technical deficiencies; request clarifications or supplemental information; conduct interviews, presentations, and reference checks; request revised proposals or best-and-final offers; negotiate with one or more respondents; suspend, amend, postpone, or cancel the solicitation; modify the procurement schedule; enter into exclusive negotiations with a preferred respondent; terminate negotiations and initiate negotiations with another respondent; or determine that no proposal adequately serves the public interest.

The City also reserves the right to verify information provided by respondents, investigate qualifications and references, and request additional information needed to evaluate a proposal. All costs of preparing a proposal, participating in interviews, or engaging in negotiations shall be borne solely by the respondent. Submission of a proposal does not create any rights against the City.

Disclaimers

This RFP does not obligate the City to award a contract, enter into a development agreement, convey property, provide funding, or reimburse any costs incurred in preparing a proposal. The City may reject any or all proposals, negotiate with one or more respondents, request revised proposals, or cancel this solicitation at any time in its sole discretion.

The City may amend this RFP, postpone or suspend the selection process, correct technical errors, revise the scope of the solicitation, or withdraw this RFP without liability to any respondent.

If a proposer identifies any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this RFP, the proposer shall promptly notify the City in writing and request clarification. The City may issue written clarifications or amendments to interested parties as it deems appropriate.

A proposer that fails to raise a known issue before the stated deadline for questions does so at its own risk. The City is not required to respond to questions received after that deadline.

The City will not be liable for any costs, damages, or losses arising from a respondent's participation in this RFP process.

Title VI Statement

The City of Port Townsend, in accordance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 252, 42 U.S.C. 2000d to 2000d-4) and the Regulations, hereby notifies all bidders that it will affirmatively ensure that in any contract entered into pursuant to this advertisement, disadvantaged business enterprises will be afforded full and fair opportunity to submit bids in response to this invitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in consideration for an award.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information

The City of Port Townsend, in accordance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), commits to nondiscrimination on the basis of disability, in all of its programs and activities. This material can be made available in an alternate format by emailing the City of Port

Townsend ADA Coordinator, Alyssa Rodrigues at arodrigues@cityofpt.us or by calling collect 360-379-5083.

Public Inspection of Certain Records

The City will handle public records relating to this solicitation in accordance with applicable law, including chapter 42.56 RCW. Existing statutory references included in this section remain as provided in the draft.

Except as otherwise provided by law, records relating to this solicitation may be subject to public disclosure in accordance with the Washington Public Records Act.

If a respondent submits information it believes is exempt from disclosure, the respondent should clearly identify that material and state the basis for the claimed exemption at the time of submission. The City will review any such request in accordance with applicable law.

Designation of material as confidential or proprietary does not bind the City. The City will make its own disclosure determinations in response to any public records request.

If the City receives a public records request for materials submitted in response to this RFP, the City may, if appropriate, provide notice to the affected respondent before disclosure. Nothing in this section requires the City to withhold records, coordinate redactions, or assert exemptions on behalf of a respondent.

City Contact

Please submit questions by email to frontdesk@cityofpt.us. The subject line should read: Questions for Development of the Evans Vista Neighborhood — Attn: Renata Munfrada, Housing Grants Coordinator.

Proposals are due no later than **Friday, September 4, 2026, at 5:00 p.m.** Pacific Time. Tentative dates for site visits, question-and-answer activities, selection, and subsequent negotiations are included in this solicitation.

For additional information about the Evans Vista Neighborhood, project milestones, planning efforts, community engagement, and supporting documents, please visit the link below:

<https://cityofpt.us/engagept/page/evans-vista-neighborhood-master-plan>.

Renata Munfrada | Housing Grants Coordinator

City of Port Townsend | www.cityofpt.us

250 Madison St. Suite 1, Port Townsend, WA 98368

P: (360) 385-3000 | E: rmunfrada@cityofpt.us

Emma Bolin, AICP | Director of Planning and Community Development

City of Port Townsend | www.cityofpt.us

250 Madison St. Suite 1, Port Townsend, WA 98368

P: (360) 390-4048 | E: ebolin@cityofpt.us

Steve King | Director of Public Works

City of Port Townsend | www.cityofpt.us

250 Madison St. Suite 1, Port Townsend, WA 98368

P: (360) 379-5090 | E: sking@cityofpt.us