

## Francis Scott Key Annex – Pre Submission Questions

### Opening remarks:

- Submit everything outlined in the checklist, do not submit additional information except where specifically noted in the RFP:
  - Ex. No renderings of the design, as they will not be presented to selection panelists (p. 9 Section IV.B)
  - Ex. Respondents can submit a second proforma format, but must include MOHCD as a standard; we advise teams to use that with the notes section in MOHCD proforma template as best you can (pg 20 Section V.D.5)
- Describe a thoughtful community amenity for public use, recognizing the value of the current temporary Playland amenity that this housing will replace, in balance with excellent design that maximizes units.
- This is a family project – majority (50%) should be the 2- and higher bedroom size, with a preference for more 2-bedrooms than other larger bedroom types, but at the developer’s discretion for the mix given the development concept.
- Operating costs should be tailored to mixed income nature of this project, capturing efficiencies of scale of 100+ unit building.
- Bill to exempt teacher housing from property tax, do not assume payment of property taxes in your operating budgets:  
[https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180AB1157](https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1157)
- Construction costs are high across our current projects, we encourage efficient design to reduce costs and expect RFP submissions to be realistic in cost estimates given current market conditions for construction costs. We are not considering modular construction at this time for this project and Respondents should not rely on that construction type for proforma assumptions.
- Outreach & Services Plan will be scored within the Development Concept & Preliminary Site Plan Section.
  - An identified Service Provider is not required, but can be included, as part of the team
  - We don’t require a standalone detailed budget, like we would in typical deal. If you do have services costs that should be shown in your proforma’s operating budget or however you propose to pay for services costs.

### Question and answer:

- Can you speak to offsite construction? Is that something frowned upon or is that just specifically modular construction?
  - Pre-fabricated work like panelized construction are okay to explore. This project is not currently considering modular construction, do not base your RFP submission on a modular construction type.
- Is any information on the historical building available?
  - No, currently we do not have much historical info on the building/location. SFUSD owned since the 1920’s. (pg. 6 Section III.A describes the property as Historic Resource Category B “age-eligible”).

- Is any information on the soil conditions available?
  - No (see pg. 5 Section III.B). For your construction cost estimate, you are encouraged to note your soils assumptions which should be based on your development experience. Soils testing will be conducted as part of the predevelopment scope of work by the selected developer team.
- For the units at 50-60% AMI, the rents are based on MOHCD numbers. Are the 80-120% units based on the same standard?
  - Yes (see pg. 6 Section IV.2 for the link to MOHCD rent schedule).
- For funding the development has SFUSD considered Certificates of Participation (COPs)?
  - SFUSD has considered this in the past and decided not to issue COPs. For RFP responses purposes, do not include COPs as part of your financing plan submission.
- **Can you speak to the rezoning process? Is that something we should address in the response?**
  - **Yes, please not the zoning classification you are assuming in order to achieve your development concept. Please note this in the 1,000 page (or maximum of 2 pages) Narrative Project Concept Description (Tab 4.a on the Submittal Checklist). Please also reference how this rezoning effort will align with your Community Outreach Plan (Tab 6 on the Submittal Checklist).**
- **How does the City determine the Art fee?**
  - **Art component must be equivalent to 1% of hard costs of City investment (Gap) amount. For example if TDC is \$50M and MOHCD Gap is \$20M, of which \$10M is hard costs, then the Art component would be (\$10,000,000 x 1%) \$100,000. For RFP purposes, please include the Art fee in the proforma but do not include any art concepts in design proposal as it is premature to do so at this stage.**
- RFP mentions a member of the art commission will be on the panel is it required that the art pieces be fully baked or artist be onboard during selection phase?
  - See answer above, it is premature to select an artist or submit art concepts at this time in the RFP response. See the design concept plan submission requirements (p. 9 Section IV.B).
- **Can you speak to the ground lease terms w/ SFUSD will it be similar structure that we've seen with MOHCD deals?**
  - **For RFP purposes, you can assume the MOHCD standard structure of 75 year term with 24 year extension. Annual ground lease payments of \$15,000 with a residual ground lease payment after all hard and soft debt are repaid. Actual terms and provisions of the ground lease with SFUSD have not been determined and will be negotiated during the predevelopment stage of the project.**
- Would you consider any responses with market rate units?
  - See Section IV.A.2 for Maximum Rents allowed.
- Can you speak to the service plan requirements for this RFP? You are not requiring a budget for services with the response are you looking for us to bring in/name specific entities and programs?
  - The service plan should cater to Educators (paraeducators and teachers). See Section IV.A.4 for description. Teams could look at different models from other counties to incorporate aspects that have worked. Given the limited tenancy of 7 years for teachers aligning services like homeownership counseling, financial literacy etc. are encouraged. This area is for teams to explore and bring best plan forward. Different from other MOHCD RFP's the service plan will not have its own scoring section and will contribute to the Development Concept Plan

scoring (See pg. 16 Section V.C.2). An identified Service Provider is not required as part of the Development Team, but may be identified at the respondent’s discretion. Selection of the service provider will be subject to MOHCD procurement process during predevelopment, as they are not being publicly procured through this RFP selection.

- The idea of 7 year limited tenancy model is desired to provide more housing opportunities to more Educators, but how will this be operationalized?
  - This is a critical component of work for the selected developer, especially property manager and potential services partner, to create policies and procedures with MOHCD and SFUSD during the predevelopment process. This limit would not apply to tax credit financed units and there is no desire to exacerbate housing instability for Educators, so this programmatic component will require further development. SFUSD is aware of other Educator housing models that have a 50% turnover rate so the issue in those jurisdictions has not been particularly salient. We do however understand we need to adapt this to the particulars of San Francisco’s market.
- What happens if the teacher quits or is terminated from SFUSD?
  - For the non-tax credit units, continued employment with SFUSD will be a requirement for lease renewal. For the LIHTC units, employment with SFUSD is required at initial occupancy and only income limit restrictions for TCAC apply throughout their tenancy.
- Has any community outreach started/ been done?
  - Yes, some initial outreach and presentations have been done with Outer Sunset Parkside Residents Association and Playland groups, in collaboration with Supervisor Tang’s office. We would expect the selected teams to take over with their own outreach plans.
- Does MOHCD or SFUSD have a list of any community groups?
  - Provided below is a list of neighborhood or community groups in the Outer Sunset/Parkside that are on the Planning Department’s neighborhood notification list.

FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Anni	Chung	President & CEO	Self-Help for the Elderly	annic@selfhelpelderly.org	Chinatown, Inner Richmond, Inner Sunset, Outer Richmond, Outer Sunset
Flo	Kimmerling	President	Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association	geokimm@sbcglobal.net	Outer Sunset
Katy	Tang	Supervisor, District 4	Board of Supervisors	Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Ashley.Summers@sfgov.org; Dyanna.Quizon@sfgov.org; ray.law@sfgov.org	Outer Sunset, Parkside
Mary Anne	Miller	President	SPEAK (Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee)	speaksanfrancisco@yahoo.com	Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, Parkside

Deborah	Fischer-Brown	Association Secretary	Saint Ignatius Neighborhood Association	sisunsetneighbors@hotmail.com	Outer Sunset, Parkside
Susan	Pfeifer		Outer Sunset/Parkside Residents Association (OSPRA)	mediasusan2@gmail.com	Outer Sunset, Parkside

- **Are there surveys of SFUSD employee household sizes?**
  - **Yes, we will post the publicly available data from SFUSD on our website under the FSK RFP.**
- What are some high priority amenities? Outdoor space? Daycare?
  - From our initial gatherings the community has an interest in a meaningful publicly accessible amenity, given the importance of the current temporary use as Playland. See pg 9 Section IV.B.1.f.
- RFP calls for a majority of 2-bedroom units and a portion of 3-bedroom units. Can 3-bedroom units go towards our 51% percent of 2-bedroom or would the 3-bedroom be a separate count?
  - Yes, the 3-bedroom can be counted towards that 51% number. See opening remarks above as well.
- Do we have any historical archives/materials for Playland or surrounding area?
  - RFP included two links to sites about Playland (p. 5 Section III.A.). Discussion during Q&A about archives at the public library were in reference to the historic Playland, an amusement park built in 1928. Respondents should consider only the links in the RFP and the current park located at the site, known as Playland, and not consider the historic amusement park.
- Is experience with teacher housing a requirement?
  - No, but there are additional scoring points for experience with educator housing in the Development Experience and Property Management scoring rubrics. (p. 16 Section V.C.1.a and C.1.c).
- Do we have any topographical surveys for the area? Specifically when Playland was done?
  - This information was not available from Planning.
- **The parking ratio suggested in the RFP 1 spot:4 units is that a fixed number?**
  - **Typically with MOHCD project we have zero parking, but we understand that parking might be included given the location. See pg. 9 Section IV.B.1.b for the description, we request narrative rational be included for your proposed parking ratio (whether it's 0.25 spaces : 1 unit or anything else). This should be included in the 1,000 word (2 page maximum) Narrative Project Concept Description (Tab 4a of Submittal Checklist)**
- Can we provide alternative site plans?
  - Providing alternative/ multiple site plans it makes it difficult to score for the panel. The panel is only able to score one concept and plan, and accompanying financial plan. Alternate scenarios may be included but do not give you extra points in scoring, and should only be submitted with clear purpose in the response.

- If we can incorporate some systems to decrease construction schedule how would that factor into the scoring?
  - See Scoring description, pg 16-17 Section V.C.3 Financing, Cost Control and Innovations. Please highlight such construction efficiencies in the Financing Plan Description/Narrative (Tab 5 in Submittal Checklist).

Written questions received to date:

- Should a proposal's unit mix contain at least 51% 2-bedrooms? Or should the unit mix include a combination of 2-bdrm and larger units that exceed 51% (e.g., we could have 45% 2-bdrm units as long as we had at least 6% more units that were 3+ bedrooms? We were a little unclear in the way it was written: SFUSD on page 6 recommends that building contain a "majority of 2-bdrm units", but the end of the sentence seems to imply that any combination of 2 and 3+ bedroom units is what should be in the proposal.
  - See above questions from 11/8 pre-submission meeting. Yes, a response of 45% 2-bdrm and 6% 3-bdrm (51% total) would satisfy the requirement of majority 2-bdrm or larger.

- **Q1. (Page 10) IV.B.3. Priority Permit Processing**

The RFP states that:

*"...this project qualifies for 'priority permit processing' because 100% of the units will be affordable."*

100% of the units are not "affordable" as defined by the Planning Code.

Accordingly, the project is not eligible for a **Type 1** "Priority Processing" Application.

However, since at least 30% of the units are "affordable" as defined by the Planning Code, it would appear to be eligible for a **Type 1A** "Priority Processing" Application.

Can you please verify/clarify this understanding?

- Yes, that is likely a correct interpretation at this RFP stage, that since 40% of the units are low-income that project will receive a Type 1A priority processing. MOHCD can work with the selected developer during predevelopment to assess if there is need to request a Type 1 priority processing given the project's proposed schedule.

- **Q2. (Page 13) V.A. Selection Process**

The RFP states that:

*"The selection panel will review all qualified responses and preliminarily score each qualified submittal. The selection panel will then interview all Respondents..."*

Does this mean that even Respondents that submit "responses" that might (initially) be considered "unqualified" will still have the opportunity to be interviewed by the selection panel (and, perhaps, clarify any issues)?

- No. All responses will be pre-screened in order to determine if they meet minimum requirements. Any responses that do not meet the minimum requirements will be deemed "non-responsive" and not reviewed by the panel, nor invited to interview. Minimum requirements can be found on pg. 13-15 Section V.B.

- **Q3. (Page 17) V.D. Submittal Requirements**

The RFP states that:

*"Responses to their RFP **should** be organized as follows, utilizing Attachment 1, Submittal Checklist as a guide."*

The word "should" (rather than "shall" or "must") is utilized.

Therefore, is it OK to organize the response according the stipulated order (Tabs 1 through 9) but also add an "Appendix" (Tab 10) to accommodate, for instance, "oversize/page-intensive" materials e.g. the requested "Tax Returns" and/or the "11x17 Conceptual Design Drawings (so one can avoid having to "accordion fold" such drawings in the middle of response) and simply refer to one to the Appendix where one can find these materials?

- Yes, it would be acceptable to add Appendix and references as you suggested. We encourage you to indicate in (for example) in the Development Team experience submittal section (Tab 2) that the required 2 year tax returns are located in the Appendix (Tab 10). A table of contents that outlines the organization of your submittal is also a good practice to help the reviewers.

- **Q4. (Page 19) V.D.4.a. Narrative Project Concept Description**

The RFP states that:

*"In 1,000 words maximum (or maximum of 2 pages) describe the major qualities and features of the project design concept."*

So is it OK to submit a "Narrative Project Concept Description" that is more than "2 pages", as long as it does not exceed 1,000 words?

For instance, could the "Description" be 3 to 4 pages in total length since it might include some photos or diagrams that supplement the 1,000-word-maximum-text?

- The intention was to encourage concise, thoughtful project descriptions. We used the rule of thumb that 1 page is 500 words single spaced, so depending on spacing, one could exceed the 2 page maximum. Please do not use the narrative description section to provide additional design representations than required in the conceptual design document submission requirements and limitations (pg. 19 Section V.D.4.b). Photographs should not be included in a narrative project concept description. Please endeavor to stick to a word document description of 1,000 words or 2 page maximum.

- **Q5. (Pages 19 & 20) V.D.4.b. Conceptual Design Document Submission Requirements and Limitations**

The RFP states that:

*"Site plan at 1/32"=1'-0", in **black and white**..."*

*"Conceptual floor plans at 1/32"=1'-0"... **Color** may be used only to differentiate program areas from one another."*

*"Conceptual Facade Elevations at 1/32"=1'-0", in **black and white**... without distinguishing color or materials."*

*Sections: Two site sections at 1/32"=1'-0", in **black and white**..."*

It appears that it is MOHCD's intention that the proposed conceptual design do not specify specific building materials or specific building colors. However, in other recent RFP's (e.g. Parcels R, S & U), in addition to "differentiating program areas", color has been allowed on all drawings (site, floor plans, elevations, etc.) in order to represent landscaping/planting areas/elements (for instance, using "green") and the sky and/or windows (for instance using "blue") or the sun (for instance using "yellow").

Is it OK to use color the drawings in the aforementioned limited ways?

- Color should only be used on floor plans to delineate program areas.

- **Q6. (Page 22) VI.A.4.c. Accessibility Requirements**

The RFP states that:

*"...At least 50% of all units must be **adaptable** and a minimum of 10% of the units must be **accessible**..."*

Applicable Codes to not require this. This is a higher standard. Where is this requirement coming from? (Mayors Office on Disability?) Do the "adaptable" units have to be on an "accessible route"? For instance, per the applicable Codes, one could propose a multi-story project that does not require an elevator. In such a non-elevator building, all of the dwelling units on the 1st story (i.e., ground level) would be required to be "accessible" and would, therefore, be on an "accessible route". However, the units on the upper stories would not be required to be "accessible" and, since they are not accessed via an elevator, they are not on an "accessible route". One could make all or some of them "adaptable" (within the units) with the realization that (outside of the units) they are not on an accessible route. Is this OK? Or is one required to have at least 60% of the dwelling units (10% "accessible" + 50% "adaptable") on an accessible route? This would mean, for instance, in a non-elevator project that one would be required to have at least 60% of the dwelling units on the 1st floor (i.e., ground level) and on an accessible route?

Is this the intention?

- Yes, MOD will be reviewing this project due to the MOHCD financing. Chapter 11B code will apply for the entire project, with 5% mobility and 2% communication, depending upon the percentage of units that will be subject to TCAC regulations. If TCAC financing is utilized then pursuant to TCAC Regulations, 10% shall be Mobility units and 4% shall have Communication featured units, by Building Code, the remaining units shall be adaptable as they will all be on an elevator served path of travel. Given that requirement that the building be at least 100 units (p. 3 Section I).
- We read in the RFP that the architect, LIHTC, and San Francisco project experience should be within the past 10 years. Seeing how teacher housing has been fairly rare in the past, does the prior experience specifically for teacher housing also have to be within the past 10 years?
  - Yes, teacher housing to qualify for a Qualifying Project must have been completed in the past 10 years (see pg. 14 Section V.B.2) and see submittal requirements to fulfill experience (p.17 Section IV.D.3).