

***Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
490 South Van Ness RFQ Questions and Answers***

Questions raised at pre-submittal meeting:

Q1. 30% homeless families and not public housing replacement units should be assumed for the RFQ submission?

A1. Assume 30% homeless families and not public housing replacement units for purposes of the RFQ submission.

Q2. Does the 30% homeless set-aside include transition-age youth or other populations or just homeless families?

A2. The homeless set-aside is only for homeless families unless otherwise instructed by the City.

Q3. Will developers be dinged for not incorporating additional units and all of the desired supportive services space because the project is already designed?

A3. If additional units and supportive services space are not incorporated in the proposed project, then RFQ respondents must provide an explanation as to why additional units and service space were not incorporated.

Q4. Can developer experience prior to 2010 be considered since not a lot of development occurred in the past 6 years?

A4. Yes, development experience dating back to 2006 will be considered.

Q5. Will rehab projects be considered for development experience scoring?

A5. Yes, rehab will be considered for development experience scoring but will not receive the same weight as new construction experience.

Q6. What is MOHCD mean by "similar conditions as those presented by the Site" when considering projects for scoring Developer Experience?

A6. MOHCD will look for similar projects such as infill urban sites upon which the developer constructed a new building.

Q7. What is the benchmark for establishing if a project submitted for Development Experience was “delivered on time and on budget”?

A7. A project will be considered “delivered on time and on budget if it was developed within the development budget and construction schedule established at its construction financing closing.

Q8. Will development teams be given an opportunity to meet with the architect separately to ask specific questions about redesign?

A8. No, all questions to the architect must go through MOHCD staff.

Q9. Can the development teams have a deadline later than June 17th to raise architecture-related questions?

A9. Yes, development teams will be allowed to submit architecture-related questions to MOHCD staff until Friday, July 15th.

Q10. Who was the planner at the Planning Department that MOHCD talked to about the amended Community Plan Exemption and additional units?

A10. MOHCD will post the name of the planner at Planning about the Community Plan Exemption on Monday, July 11th.

Q11. Do respondents need to account for remediation of soil under the existing canopies into account in submitted financing plans?

A11. Yes, respondents should include an estimate of the soil remediation under the existing canopies based on the available information provided in the soil reports MOHCD posted on its website.

Questions received by RFQ question deadline:

Q12. In reviewing unit sizes and configurations, it appears that some of the units labeled as 1 bedrooms may not qualify as such per building code or minimum TCAC unit sizes and are more accurately characterized as studios. Can you please provide the unit mix MOHCD has assumed in its analysis of the site?

A12. Please assume a unit mix compliant with the TCAC regulations.

Q13. Has the MOHCD construction management team reviewed the construction drawings and, if so, have they identified any specific issues related to current codes and requirements, specifically, MOD, SFPUC and CalOSHA?

A13. MOHCD construction management staff have reviewed the drawings and have not identified any issues on the approved drawings.

Q14. What is meant by "community-managed bike share parking"?

A14. We received feedback from community groups that a community-managed bike share facility would be desired at this location. Instead of being run by property management or by the City, a local community group with bike-sharing expertise would be engaged by the selected developer to run the bike-sharing program.

Q15. Given that the City would like the selected developer to work with the existing architecture and engineering team and individual developer teams are not allowed direct access to the architect, can MOHCD ask the architect to provide a budget estimate of fees through completion of construction to all teams, reflecting at a minimum the addition of a story and some reconfiguration to accommodate some number of the additional program elements identified at the pre-submittal meeting. Can we get fees broken out between getting to a complete construction and bid set and construction administration? Related to this question, can the architect please confirm what level of completeness the current architectural drawings represent e.g., 100% DD, 50% CD's?

A15. Scope of Work

1. Add one floor to the existing building
2. Re-program the current unit mix to increase the building density
3. Eliminate the current basement level parking
4. Eliminate the first floor parking and add community and support spaces
5. Retain to the extent possible the current exterior design and planning entitlements

6. Pre-program the existing community open spaces and roof top amenities
7. Re-design the current project documents for all disciplines and submit for permit revisions
8. Planning entitlements will be addressed as revisions approved by staff and will not require additional Commission hearings.
9. Redesign current project to original 2010 code requirements and current Storm Water Retention

Status of Current Construction Documents (site permit submitted and approved-no addendums submitted)

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. Architecture | 75% CD |
| 2. Structural | 90% CD |
| 3. Mech./Elec. | 50% CD |
| 4. Plumbing/Fire | 0% CD |
| 5. Lighting | 0% CD |
| 6. Civil | 75% CD |
| 7. Landscaping | 20% CD |
| 8. Waterproofing | 0% CD |
| 9. Energy/Title 24 | 100% |
| 10. Other consultants (code, ADA, expediter, energy) | various levels of completion |

Fee Estimate (these numbers are preliminary and subject to review upon completion of a scope document with the owner.

For purposes of this summary an estimated construction cost of \$ 30 million has been used. Time for community outreach, value engineering, and extensive entitlement processing has not

been included.

1. Architecture
SD-\$60-90,000; DD/CD-\$200-230,000; Bid/Permit-\$40-60,000; CA-\$180-220,000
2. All consultants
Use estimate of 50% of Arch fee or \$240-\$300,000

Q16. It appears the previous owner did not submit any addenda applications to the Building Department? Please confirm.

A15. Correct, addenda to the site permit have not been submitted to the Department of Building Inspection.

Q17. Based on the conversations that MOHCD has had with the Planning Department, what are the parameters of the changes to the building that would not trigger planning entitlement changes?

A17. The Planning Department has indicated that anything that exceeds the current envelope will need to be examined but that a Community Plan Exemption is possible. Furthermore if any proposed increase to the project that can be measured through the use of the existing environmental reports could be address through an addendum to the existing environmental review rather than re-opening the entire CEQA process and as long as the project change is consistent with the original entitlement.

Q18. The RFQ states that "the City expects the selected developer to examine how to increase the number of units and maximize residential density while minimizing the amount of modifications to the Site's entitlements". Does the City expect this examination to be included in the proposal or after selection? If it is to be included in the proposal, does the City expect all prospective respondents to work with the existing architect through City staff to discuss and investigate options for achieving these goals?

A18. Please propose any changes you anticipate in the RFQ. MOHCD is happy to forward questions to the architect.

Q19. Please confirm income targeting for non-homeless families at 60% AMI, and not 50%.

A19. Correct, non-homeless family income targeting should be up to 60% of the HUD Unadjusted Area Median Income for the HMFA that contains San Francisco.

Q20. Can services geared to school age children and families be provided by community partners off site or do they have to be offered on-site?

<https://ssl.gstatic.com/ui/v1/icons/mail/images/cleardot.gif>">

A20. On site is preferred, but if your proposal contemplates superior services within a reasonable distance then MOHCD will examine that opportunity.

Q21. Please confirm that rehab projects count toward development experience and capacity under Selection Criteria on page 19. Also, has MOHCD determined how much further back than 2010 will count for completed projects?

A21. Please see A4 and A5 above.

Q22. Page 24 refers to a 20% homeless set-aside, not 30%. Is this a typo?

A22. Correct, Page 24 should say 30% homeless set-aside and not 20%.

Q23. On page 25, #9 refers to Section IV.C.1. Should the reference be to Section IV.E. or another section of the RFQ as section IV.C.1 is regarding services and not outreach? Please confirm what parameters apply here.

A23. Please refer to Section IV.E of the RFQ.