

Question & Answers
Request for Proposals
PLAN: DUDLEY SQUARE

40-50 Warren Street; 75-81 Dudley Street; 135 Dudley Street (Dudley Street Commercial); 2147-2149 Washington Street and 2159-2163 Washington Street

August 31, 2018

Q: Do projects need to be LEED certifiable or LEED certified?

A: In Section 3, in regard to Green Buildings and LEED, the RFPs incorrectly states that projects should be “certified by the USGBC within one year of construction completion.” This is an error. Projects need to be LEED *certifiable*, but do not need to obtain LEED *certification*. The community has expressed a high priority for projects that endeavor to model best practices in green building design and pursue the highest sustainability measures feasible. Respondents are encouraged to strive for LEED Platinum certifiable design, and at a minimum must be LEED Silver certifiable. In this case, the administering agency, be it DND or BPDA, will manage the “certifiable” process with the developer.

Q: Clarification on Section 5, Comparative Evaluation Criteria # 5, Financial Impact.

A: In all RFPs, an **Advantageous** ranking for financial impact should be defined as follows:

*“Proposals that include an Offer Price less than the Appraised Value and/or rely on reasonably justified sources of public funding will be ranked as **Advantageous.**”*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q: Are proposals that include adjoining parcels encouraged?

A: If a developer has site control of an adjoining parcel, DND encourages developers to consider combining this parcel with a development proposal for one of the RFP sites. Site control of an adjoining parcel is not required in order to respond to the proposal.

Q: The RFPs state DND has the right to award to multiple proposers. What does this mean?

A: In the past, DND has received multiple proposals on a single site and has occasionally asked developers to work together for the final selected proposal. This selection decision will be made through the community process. Such a recommendation would be done after review by the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan Oversight Committee and the Project Review Committee. Such an approach is not the planned solution for any site, but the language is included to preserve the City’s ability to do so depending on the proposals received.

Q: If a proposal has both a rental project and a homeownership project component, does the developer have to comply with affordability restrictions on both components separately or as one single project? How would this be evaluated?

A: Each component will be evaluated as a stand-alone component. In the scenario described above, the “rental project” should be at least 2/3 income-restricted affordable housing and the “homeownership project” should be at least 2/3 income-restricted affordable housing. Details on these affordability restrictions can be found in Section 3 of the RFPs under the heading **Affordable/Income-Restricted Housing**. However, if the proposers believe that an alternative approach supports the possibility for deeper affordability or a higher percentage of affordable units in either component, DND is open to considering such approaches. For example, if a developer could demonstrate that creating a market-rate “homeownership project” would cross-subsidize a 100% affordable “rental project,” DND would be interested in understanding this approach. Developers can send specific questions about these ideas to DND before the 4:00 pm on October 10, 2018 question deadline.

Q: Has there been soil testing done?

A: Yes, there have been some environmental testing. Reports on this testing are attached to this Addendum, and can also be requested by email to Donald Wright, donald.wright@boston.gov.

Q: Can the City share the appraisals for these properties?

A: The appraised value for each site is described in the beginning of Section 6. The appraisals ordered by the City took into account the unspecified future use of the parcels and were based on a fee-simple sale with a 5% cap rate. Appraisals are attached to this Addendum, and can also be requested by email to Donald Wright, donald.wright@boston.gov.

Q: Can the City share the titles for these properties?

A: All titles are in good order. Titles are attached to this Addendum, and can also be requested by email to Donald Wright, donald.wright@boston.gov.

Q: What is the process and timeline for the proposal review?

A: The City will work closely with the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan Oversight Committee and the Project Review Committee (PRC) established for these RFPs. There will be one PRC for the 4 sites. A call for PRC nominations will be posted in September. This process design allows one PRC to fully review all RFPs to account for developers that submit a response for multiple sites. DND will follow the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan guidelines about forming the PRC. The City anticipates a series of developer presentations to the PRC before granting tentative designation. It is difficult to predict the time period between the RFP deadline and tentative designation, but the City anticipates that it will take several months.

Q: Will developers be required to do a joint presentation to the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan Oversight Committee and the PRC or two separate presentations?

A: This has not been determined, but developer presentations will be open to the public. Eligible applicants will be asked to make a presentation at a community meeting as part of the PRC proposals evaluation, to enable the PRC to obtain public comment. DND envisions that members of the RSMPOC and PRC will be in attendance, in addition to members of the public.

Q: Does the RFP require 51% women hiring for construction employment?

A: In Section 3, the RFP states that proposals must describe a planned approach to meet the Boston Resident Jobs Policy on *Construction* Employment, which includes a requirement that 12% of the total construction work hours are performed by women. The RFP also requests that developers must present a narrative plan for meeting Good Jobs Standards on *permanent* jobs on the site after the development process is complete. Good Jobs Standards priorities include a goal that at least 51% of the total employee work-hours performed on the Parcel, and for each employer occupying the Parcel, shall be by women.

Q: How will employment requirements for commercial tenants be monitored and/or enforced?

A: The City does not have an existing system for monitoring and enforcement. However, as a part of the RFP we are requesting a narrative from developers about how they would prioritize the Good Jobs Strategy explained in Section 4. The City will evaluate this component based on the strength of the narrative. The enforceability of the strategies proposed in this narrative will be part of the City's evaluation.

40-50 Warren Street

Q: With parking for 40-50 Warren St, the RFP states that the developer has to continue to operate the existing parking. Once a developer is designated, who will be responsible for paying for the parking operations and enforcing parking policies?

A: Developers should include parking lot operating costs in their development budgets. Public Facilities regulations require that the City not sell an operating parking lot, which is why the RFP describes a leasing structure for this parking lot. Information on operating costs can be found attached to this Addendum, and can also be requested by email to Donald Wright, donald.wright@boston.gov.

75-81 Dudley Street

Q: For 75-81 Dudley Street, can the City provide more clarity on what is most important? Multiple priorities are mentioned in the RFP, including housing, fitting into community, rental, homeownership, land trusts, and senior housing.

A: The priorities referenced all came out of the PLAN: Dudley Square community process. Proposals should explain how their idea addressed any (or all) of the elements expressed in the RFP. In community meetings, participants expressed

specific interest certain elements (notably senior housing and 3-4 story building height), and this RFP tries to accommodate that expressed interest. Different community members may prioritize the goals for this site in different ways.

Q: *The RFP states that the Highland Park Project Review Committee (HPPRC) will be a part of the proposal review. What will their role be in the selection?*

A: HPPRC designees will be included on the overall Project Review Committee during the selection process.

Dudley St. Commercial

Q: *On the Dudley St. Commercial, what will be the term of the land lease?*

A: Dudley St. Commercial is the only parcel that will be structured as a land lease. The other sites will all be conventional conveyances. The longest possible term for a land lease is 99 years, which is the proposed term the City currently assumes it will put in place for Dudley St. Commercial. Typically a 99 year land lease states that the property will revert back to the City after 99 years. These land leases are usually renegotiated and extended around year 59.

Q: *For Dudley Commercial, can the City share information about Boston Police Department's existing use of the parking lot and projected parking demands?*

A: The police department currently has 86 spaces on the site. The RFP is asking for a conceptual plan for how the BPD could obtain more spaces on the site if the station's parking needs increase in the future. Developers should present what kinds of increases would be reasonable to accommodate on the site in the future, given the developer's proposed site plans.

Q: *Are step backs in building design recommended for all parcels, including Dudley Commercial?*

A: For this site, developers are encouraged to consider using setbacks to concentrate higher massing towards the middle of the site. If developers have a concept for a higher building that would address community interests, they should include this in their proposals.

2147 Washington Street

Q: *On 2147 Washington Street, the RFP says 6-12 stories is desired but the streetscape is 4 stories?*

A: The concept for this site is that massing could be greater as long as the design fits within the neighborhood context. For example, it could be stepped back at 4 stories at the street, but still look at creative ways to go higher towards the middle of the building to deliver more of the priorities expressed in the RFP in the building. The City expects building heights to be respectful of existing conditions but also wanted to leave room for developers to propose creative ways to deliver on more priorities and create greater density.

Q: Can the City provide clarity around what easements are associated with the property for access to rear parcels?

A: Titles for all properties are attached to this Addendum, and can also be requested by email to Donald Wright, donald.wright@boston.gov.

Q: There is a ramp entrance to the City on a Hill basement/Kool Smiles is in middle of Gary Street. How does that access relate to this parcel?

A: The city's records indicate that Gary Street is a private way. The abutters therefore each own halfway to the middle, subject to all abutters' rights to cross and recross. If the ramp does not interfere with access, it is allowable. If it does interfere with access in a way that is an impediment to the planned development, the designated developer may need to work with the ramp owner to provide access to the ramp and/or move the ramp. Development teams should develop an approach for how to address this existing condition in their RFP responses.

Q: Is Point # 5 on p 17 of RFP indicating that any spaces that are perceived as public spaces should be accessible and open to the public?

A: Point # 5 is requesting that if the development proposal includes any new open space that it remain accessible to the public in perpetuity. This is a community preference, not a requirement for this site.

Q: The RFP says Gary Street and Dade Street should be considered for providing vehicular access into the site, but Gary Street is locked and Dade Street is usually blocked with cars. Are they public streets? Can they accommodate through traffic in the future?

A: Both are private ways, with abutters owning to the center line of the way with rights to cross and recross the other half. The development team can propose new use and access for these streets for vehicular access to the site. They do not need to provide through traffic, only access to the site. Whether there will be able to accommodate through traffic is an issue for the applicants working with the other abutters in the future.