

425 Grand Concourse RFP Addendum 2
RFP issue date: June 29, 2015
Addendum 2 issue date: September 4, 2015

Questions and Answers – Enclosed is a summary of questions and answers submitted to the 425 Grand Concourse email address following the release of Addendum 1.

Finance

Q1. We've analyzed numerous building designs/envelopes with our architect, trying to situate the high density allowed by a C6-3 zoning. It may not be possible to incorporate the FAR in a low- or mid-rise building, which is more typical of affordable and mixed-income projects and helps contain costs. This may lead to a more costly construction. Is HPD aware of this? Not sure if others have asked about this. With the higher density and potentially taller structures, construction costs may be higher than typical affordable and mixed-income projects.

A1. HPD has financed affordable and mixed-income projects recently that have incorporated designs outside of those typically found in low- or mid-rise buildings. We are aware that construction costs may be higher in taller structures and will favorably rate proposals that contribute to the economic diversity, maximize available FAR, and propose financing with the least amount of subsidy possible.

Q2. Given the site configuration, if workforce coops were proposed as part of the overall plan, can we include them in one building but as a separate condo unit?

A2. Given the logistical issues and associated administrative challenges of mixing homeownership and rental units in the same building, HPD prefers that if rental and homeownership are contemplated that they are in physically separate buildings.

*Please note that this is a refinement of the response to a similar question in Addendum 1.

Design/Garrison Playground Walkway/ MTA

Q3. Is the landscape design allowed to encroach onto the walkway (formerly mapped E.146th Street), allowing the walkway would be incorporated into the project as part of the Landscape Design?

A3. Proposals may include a landscape design of the walkway that promotes a holistic approach, but it should be clear that the walkway is in Parks' jurisdiction and is accessible to all potential users.

Q4. If there is access to community spaces on site from the walkway (formerly mapped as E.146th Street) between Garrison Playground and the site – does the RFP allow for this as part of the design?

A4. A door is permitted; however, any primary or secondary egress into the walkway is not permitted.

Q5. We found these two maps showing the subway routes around the RFP site. One shows that the subway 5 train route goes underneath the site and the other shows it doesn't. We would like to know

if you have any information in regards to that and if you can confirm the 5 train goes or do not underneath the RFP site.

A5. HPD does not have any additional information regarding the route of the train. If applicable, the Development Team may be required to coordinate with the MTA.

Q6. Are there any soil borings or a geotechnical report available for this site?

A6. Please see Addendum 1.

Submission Requirements

Q7. Regarding the Enterprise Green Communities Certification Overlay, should we use the 2011 or the 2015 version?

A7. HPD will accept 2011 Overlays for the purposes of RFP review. Some teams may have already started their designs based on the 2011 assumptions.

Q8. Can Forms required for the 425 Grand Concourse RFP submission be prepared online. If so, please furnish instructions for accessing the online fillable Forms?

A8. Forms for the RFP submission cannot be prepared online. Forms must be downloaded from the RFP page <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/hpd/developers/request-for-proposals/425-grand-concourse-RFP.page> , completed, and then submitted electronically and in hard copy with the rest of the Proposal.