

Questions received between November 15 and December 15, 2017

- Can we use tax exempt bond financing as described in Section IV.C.1 of the RFP and restrict the use of the housing to only Educators as defined in Section IV.A.3 of the RFP?
  - MOHCD is aware of the potential conflict between the 4% tax credit/bond financing and the restricted use of the housing to Educators. MOHCD and bond counsel are reviewing occupancy preferences related to tax-exempt debt. For purposes of RFP submission, Respondents should follow the assumptions in Section IV.A.3 regarding financing of the development. MOHCD and the selected developer will continue to refine financing options that meet relevant regulatory constraints and programmatic goals of providing housing for Educators during the predevelopment phase.
- For the Property Manager experience of at least two Qualifying Projects (as threshold requirement), does the experience of key staff members (from experience outside the current organization) count? Related to this, in the scoring criteria (1c), are the points for any multi-family housing rental properties, or only Qualified Projects? (That is, are the 2 QP's threshold and any properties for points?)
  - See page 15, Section V.B.2 "Note Regarding Experience" – "For any Respondent team member, the experience of key staff members may be substituted....". The Property Manager is a member of the Development Team as listed in Section V.A.B.1. This applies to the minimum experience qualifications. For the scoring criteria, see Section V.C.1c. for Property Management Experience, the points awarded are for active management of 3-5 or 6-10 multifamily housing rental properties (not defined as Qualifying Projects) and also for managing a multifamily property that is targeted for teachers or School District employees.
- Can guidance be provided on the number of pages or expected level of detail to be included in the Initial Services Plan?
  - There is no maximum or minimum page requirement (see page 20, Section V.D.7 Initial Services Concept Plan). The Initial Services Concept Plan should include, but not necessarily limited to, a description of services philosophy, proposed services provision methodology, types of services proposed and how they will serve the Educator population specifically, proposed collaboration with SFUSD and MOHCD programs, general estimate of costs associated with service provision, and source identified to fund these costs. See also page 8 Section IV.A.4 Resident Services for purpose statement regarding services. As guidance, 4 – 6 page narrative should be adequate to describe the Initial Services Plan Concept, but there is no maximum or minimum page requirement. Additionally, please Q&A from the pre-submission meeting for related question and answer.
- **Can the sponsors' audited financials/tax returns that are requested as part of the submission be sent electronically only in order to reduce the amount of paper and time required to put together the submission material?**
  - **Yes, it would be acceptable to clearly identify 1 hard copy of the Proposal as the master copy and include the audited financials/tax returns in that hard copy and also in the electronic submission. The remaining 6 hard copies could include a one page memo within Tab 2 (see Submittal Checklist) Development Team to refer the reader to the master copy for the required audited financials/tax returns.**

- Regarding the RFP requirement for each developer to provide the latest two years of its tax returns and audited financial statements, can these documents be provided once under separate cover marked “Confidential”, rather than incorporated into each of the seven hard copies?
  - See answer to question above.
- Due to the holidays and many people having to be out due to cold/sickness, can the submission due date be extended by a week?
  - No. The dates as published for that proposal deadline of Friday January 12, 2018 at 4pm will remain as is.
- Can the existing Francis Scott Key Annex building be demolished?
  - As stated on pg. 6 of the RFP in Section III.D Environmental Review, the building onsite is “age-eligible” as a Category B Historic Resource. Any properties that are more than 50 years of age and proposed for demolition or major alteration will be required to do additional research to determine whether they meet the California Register criteria and qualify as “historic resources” for the purposes of CEQA. If the initial preservation analysis determines that no Historic Resource is present, then the building would be cleared for proposed demolition. If the initial preservation analysis determines that a Historic Resource is present, further preservation and environmental review to fully assess the potential impacts of the demolition or alteration on the existing building would be required.
- Does district have any information on car ownership rates among SFUSD teachers?
  - Please see posted SFUSD survey results and SPUR presentation. That is all of the available information about Educators at this time.
- Section V, B, 2 on page 14 states:  
 “For the Architect, an Architect Qualifying Project must be new, multi-family residential construction completed in the last ten years.”  
 Section V,C, 1b on page 16 states:  
 “Respondents will be scored according to the number of Architect Qualifying Projects completed or under development in excess of the minimum.  
 One Architect Qualify Project completed or under development in excess of the min required  
 AQP = 4 points  
 Additional points given for each additional AQP in excess of two AQP, with max of 6 total points  
 = 2 additional points”

Our understanding is that:

The first AQP must be completed in the last ten years (minimum required to qualify so 0 points)

The second AQP (4 additional points) can be completed or under development

- Yes, your understanding is correct. Section V.C.1b. states that 4 points will be awarded for “One Architect Qualifying Project completed or under development in excess of the minimum required AQP.” Please note that on p. 15 Section V.B.2 “Note Regarding Experience” that “For any Respondent team member, the experience of key staff members may be substituted...”, this applies to the minimum architectural experience of one AQP in completed in the past 10 years.

- For the additional AQPs in excess of two (third, fourth, and fifth), can these be either completed or under development?
  - No, Section V.C.1b. states “additional points given for each additional AQP in excess of two AQP, with maximum of six total points” – additional points are not awarded to AQPs under development. To be awarded 2 points, with a maximum of 6 points in the section, the architectural firm(s) would submit up to at least 2 AQPs completed in the last 10 years (one of which counts for minimum, another would gain 4 points), then each additional AQP completed in the last 10 years would gain 2 points (cumulative total 6, 8, 10 with each additional AQP). Considering the answer above, the architectural firm(s) could submit an AQP completed in the last 10 years and a second AQP that is under development (one counts for minimum, another would gain 4 points) and also submit 3 additional AQPs completed in the past 10 years (cumulative 6 and 8 points because one of the AQPs is unscored because it is not “in excess of two AQP” but is required for the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> AQPs to be proven as “in excess of two AQP”).
  
- **Section V, D, 3d on page 18 states:**  
**“Lead Architect Experience: Using no more than one page per project, describe at least one but no more than five completed Architect Qualifying Projects...”**  
**If the Lead Architect is a joint-venture partnership between 2 architectural firms, should we describe no more than 5 total projects (2 from one firm and 3 from the other firm) or can we describe no more than 5 projects from each firm?**
  - **As a joint venture partnership, please include an MOU that describes roles and responsibilities of the firms in Tab 3d. Architectural Experience and include two Attachment 4’s describing each firm’s projected staffing workload. As a joint venture partnership, please provide at least one but no more than five Architect Qualifying Projects as described on pg. 18 Section V.D.3d. Using your question, please provide “no more than 5 total projects (2 from one firm and 3 from the other firm)”, do not provide 10 total projects as contemplated in the second part of your question. As a note, the number of projects provided from each team of a joint venture is not described in the RFP for minimum qualifications or for scoring, so submitting 4 from one firm and 1 from another would also be acceptable.**