

Next Gen NYCHA RFP Addendum 2
RFP issue date: July 1, 2015
Addendum 2 issue date: August 31, 2015

Contents of the Addendum

Enclosed are answers to questions that were sent to the Next Gen NYCHA email address.

Questions and Answers

RFP

Q1. I am working with a group that wants to acquire properties and create homeless shelters and rehabilitation centers. Could we work something out with groups like this and actually use these buildings for a good cause?

A1. The purpose of this RFP is to develop permanent, affordable housing. If you are interested in developing homeless shelters, please reach out to the NYC Department of Homeless Services.

Q2. Can NYCHA provide demographic data (breakdowns by age of residents, family size, etc.) for the developments at which the RFP sites are located?

A2. Demographics are attached.

Q3. As we are a not-for-profit that provides social services to seniors, as well as builds affordable senior housing, we are being pursued by a number of potential partners. Are we permitted to be part of separate development teams that are submitting proposals for each of the Ingersoll and Mott Haven sites? Are we allowed to be part of multiple development teams per site?

A3. If your organization has an ownership stake in a development proposal, you may only be part of one development team and submission. If your organization is only providing social services, then yes, you may be part of multiple development teams. To clarify, Applicants may submit a proposal for more than one site (Ingersoll, Mott Haven, or Van Dyke). However, teams may not be part of multiple submissions for one site if they have a percent interest in the entity. (See Form C-1 in Composition of Applicant Entity).

Q4. The 2015 Enterprise Green HPD overlay document was just released. Should this new version of the HPD overlay for the Enterprise Green Criteria be used for the RFP?

A4. We will accept 2011 Overlays for the purposes of RFP review. Some teams may have already started their designs based on the 2011 assumptions.

Threshold Criteria

Q5. The RFP defines "Comparable Development Experience" as the successful completion of the construction of at least one new construction project of at least one hundred (100) residential units within the past seven years.

A5. At least one Principal of the Applicant must have completed at least one project with at least 100 units within the past 7 years.

Q6. Do the 100 units have to be from one project?

A6. Yes

Q7. Would multiple projects that total 100+ units qualify?

A7. No

Q8. The RFP does not limit this experience to NYC. This means that all development experience qualifies, correct?

A8. Yes, correct.

Finance

Q9. If we use HPD's SNH SARA subordinate financing, should we assume Federal HOME funds requiring prevailing wages?

A9. The SARA program may include HOME funds, which requires prevailing wage construction.

Q10. If we combine HDC ELLA and HPD SARA financing, must we comply with HDC ELLA's 30, 40 and 50% AMI rent tiers as well as HPD SARA 30% Homeless Set Aside requirement?

A10. If a project uses the SARA Term sheet, there must be a 30% Homeless Set Aside. As per Option 2 on the HDC ELLA Term Sheet, 30% of the units must be set aside for formerly homeless households, which will meet the requirements of the SARA program.

Q11. Per the Addendum, we are submitting a primary and secondary financing scenario. Must the second scenario include letters of interest for each funding source as well?

A11. Yes, please provide letters of interest for each funding source.

Q12. Can HPD SARA funds be combined with any HDC subsidy program/ Can we assume any level of HDC subsidy if we use HPD SARA funds?

A12. Yes, HPD SARA funds are typically combined with HDC ELLA term sheets. Please refer to HDC term sheets for subsidy limits.

Q13. For the purposes of this RFP, is DFTA funding considered "non-competitive" or competitive?

A13. A funding source is considered "non-competitive" if it is an as-of-right source.

Q14. Given HPD's policy that all senior units above 50% AMI have rental subsidy and given the lack of rental subsidy available for the project, should respondents assume 100% of units be underwritten at or below 50% AMI?

A14. Please see answer to Q. 18 in the RFP Addendum 1.

Q15. Can respondents propose a small number of units at 60% AMI (with no rental subsidy) if a case can be made for the absorption of these units?

A15. Yes, units at 60% AMI (with no rental subsidy) may be proposed, accompanied by case for absorption. All financing scenarios should meet HPD and HDC Term Sheet requirements.

Q16. Can respondents assume the use of VASH vouchers (for veterans), and if so, how many?

A16. Please refer to Section V.I. Obligations of the Developer: Marketing, Sales and/or Leasing regarding the NYCHA Preference and Community Board Preference. Additionally, please see answer to Q. 18 in the RFP Addendum 1. This response is also applicable to VASH project-based vouchers.

Q17. Should respondents assume a prevailing wage requirement when estimating construction costs?

A17. Please see answer to Q. 18 in the RFP Addendum 1.

Marketing

Q18. How do the marketing preferences for CB residents and for NYCHA residents intersect with one another? If an applicant is both a CB resident and a NYCHA resident (or on the waitlist) does that household count towards both preferences, or one or the other?

A18. NYCHA residents residing in the community district where the proposed project is located will count towards meeting both preferences when they are admitted into the new affordable housing development.

Q19. There is a 25% NYCHA Preference. Can we assume these households will receive rental assistance?

A19. NYCHA Preference Tenants include eligible public housing residents and residents currently holding Tenant Based Section 8 Vouchers. NYCHA residents do not necessarily receive a voucher when they move out of public housing. Recent projects completed on NYCHA campuses have filled the NYCHA Preference Units with public housing residents (without rental assistance). For example, one 84-unit project has admitted 16 public housing residents and 5 Tenant Based Section 8 voucher holders. It is not advisable to assume any rental assistance for the NYCHA Preference Units in the NextGen NYCHA RFP.

MILL BROOK

Q20. Has the location of the replacement parking been determined?

A20. No, please include parking replacement location in your proposal.

Q21. Should we assume that the 12 spots will need to remain adjacent to or near the site?

A21. Yes, please select an existing parking lot that can easily be enlarged to accommodate 12 spaces within the subject block or the adjacent block of Mill Brook Houses.

Q22. If so, should it be indicated in the plans?

A22. Yes

Q23. What should be the assumed total SF for this new parking area?

A23. An area between 3,600 sq. ft. and 4,000 sq. ft. is typically required for a 12 space parking lot.

Q24. Please clarify whether the requirement is for a “senior center” or a “senior community facility center”, what specifically the space is to be used for and how it is to be equipped.

A24. The terms “senior center” and “senior community facility center” are being used interchangeably. The space must serve residents of the building, as well as all residents in the Mill Brook NYCHA campus. Applicants will propose how the community facility will be used, equipped and operated.

Q25. Does the Center need to provide lunch on a daily basis?

A25. The Center does not need to provide lunch on a daily basis. Pages 24 and 33 of the RFP outline the requirements for a community facility plan. Applicants will indicate use and services, staffing or service partners, budget and funding sources in the plan for the community facility.

Q26. Can we offer a geriatric medical clinic for the Mill Brook Houses Community Facility space? Would that comply with the RFP?

A26. The RFP calls for a 6,200 sq. ft. senior community center on the ground floor of the proposed senior building. The senior community center cannot be substituted by a geriatric medical clinic. However, you may fit a medical clinic into the remaining building footprint after accommodating the senior center.

Q27. Does the 110,000sf Total Zoning Floor Area stated in the RFP exclude or include the 6,200sf for the Senior Center?

A27. The total floor area of 110,000 sq. ft. includes the 6,200 sq. ft. senior center.

INGERSOLL

Q28. In the Addendum 1 zoning analysis, what do C-1, C-2, C-3, and A-1 refer to?

A28. They are plans and drawings by NYCHA’s zoning consultant.

Q29. In the Addendum 1 zoning analysis, the “Proposed Lot Coverage” is less than the “Available Lot Coverage.” Is it possible to use all or more of the “available lot coverage”?

A29. The zoning analysis template covers both quality housing and height factor scenarios. Height factor regulation for R6 does not prescribe a lot coverage maximum. The building footprint can be larger subject to the requirement for open space.

Q30. The proposed lot coverage in the analysis (6,592 SF), and the proposed zoning floor area in the RFP (104,000 SF), result in an approximately 17 story building. Can the proposed lot coverage be revised to create a building that has fewer floors and a larger footprint, to be more contextual with the neighborhood and also use more efficient and cost –effective building methods (i.e. block and plank)?

A30. Please see answer to Question 29.

Q31. The RFP says a ULURP process will be pursued to relax height and setback restrictions in order to yield 104,000 SF. In our proposal, can we assume the special downtown Brooklyn district zoning for the buildings under construction across the street?

A31. No, Ingersoll is not a part of the Special Downtown Brooklyn District.

Q32. We are architects and are working on the NYCHA Ingersoll site. We are finding the zoning requirements for setbacks to be particularly difficult in planning an efficient building on this relatively small site. The upper floors become too narrow for viable apartments. In the RFP, it indicates that flexibility will be considered on setbacks. We need to understand the degree of flexibility and if setback requirements may be waived entirely, which would make for the most efficient building possible.

A32. The Ingersoll building may be designed as a 13-story building with a footprint of approximately 8,000 sq. ft. on the 11,500 sq. ft. site. Modification of building height and setback will be allowed to achieve a total floor area of approximately 104,000 sq. ft.

Q33. Typically, the ground floor can be built to the full footprint of the site for community use. Will this be allowed at Ingersoll?

A33. Yes, subject to the minimum distance between buildings on the same zoning lot. For Ingersoll, proposals must include an accessory community room on the first floor for residents and the surrounding NYCHA community. Please see Section III.B in the RFP.

Q34. I am writing to inquire about the Ingersoll NYCHA NextGen RFP site. In plotting out the site, it appears that an existing pathway crosses the site's property line. Is there any information that you can provide about this pathway? Should we assume that the pathway will remain, and if so, is there some type of setback rule for this internal path?

A34. The walkway will be affected and its use will be interrupted by the proposed development. The selected developer will be required to restore the walkway in its present location or along a new alignment following development. There is no required setback for its realignment, but its design is subject to approval by NYCHA.

Q35. Should our zoning only consider the Block: 2034 / Lot 1 column and disregard the other columns (Block 2025/Lot 150 and Block 2050/Lot1) on the analysis?

A35. Yes, please see zoning column for Block 2034 only.

Q36. The "Available Floor Area" (345,362 SF) is larger than the approximate floor area indicated on the RFP for this site (104,000 SF). Should we consider 104,000 SF from the RFP to be the proposed maximum SF?

A36. Yes, 104,000 sq. ft.

Q37. Is the difference in SF numbers in the above question going to be used elsewhere on the site by NYCHA? If so, this would seemingly affect the open space ratio, and thus the zoning analysis.

A37. NYCHA does not have current plan to develop the remaining floor area.

Q38. Using the proposed SF from the RFP (104,000 SF) and the proposed lot coverage from the zoning analysis in Addendum 1 (6,592 SF) results in a different Height Factor than the

proposed HF shown in the zoning analysis (HF-11). Can an alternate height factor be used based on the proposed RFP floor area?

A38. Please see answer to Question 29.

Q39. Will commercial uses be permitted on the ground floor?

A39. No, commercial uses are not permitted on the ground floor. The Site does not have the required commercial overlay and no such overlay is being contemplated as part of the project.

Q40. Would a proposal which assumes 50% (or more) of units as studios be problematic?

A40. Please refer to the term sheet for the funding program. As indicated for the SARA program: "Within the unit size guidelines, project should seek to meet HPD Design Guidelines for New Construction as best possible":

<http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/hpd/downloads/pdf/developers/new-constr-guidelines.pdf>

Q41. In the interest of maximizing unit count, can proposals assume the entire building is CF Use Group 3 with sleeping accommodations allowing for some units to be less than 400SF (assuming all units are ADA compliant)?

A41. No. Applicants should assume the zoning floor area provided in Section III. Site Descriptions and Program Requirements of the RFP.

Q42. Is there an expectation by the City that the project sponsor furnish on-site social services for the residents as they age in place?

A42. Yes, please see answer to Q.25 in the RFP Addendum 1 and Page 34 of the RFP for requirements of a Resident Services Plan.

Q43. Can you provide a survey of the area immediately surrounding the proposed site? We are trying to locate the footpath, the adjacent church, and the adjacent Ingersoll building?

A43. No, NYCHA does not have a current survey of the site and its vicinity.

VAN DYKE

Q44. For the RFP should our zoning only consider the Block: 3777 / Lot 1 column and disregard the other columns (Block 3760/Lot 1 and Block 3794/Lot1) on the analysis?

A44. Yes, please see zoning column for Block 3777 only.

Q45. The original RFP states that approximately 191,000 zoning floor area is available for the project. However, the Addendum 1 zoning analysis provides different numbers for "Available Floor Area" and for "Proposed Floor Area." Which number should be assumed for the project?

A45. 191,500 sq. ft.

Q46. Page 6 of the RFP states that approximately 191,500 SF of floor area is available for the Van Dyke site. Is there a NYCHA zoning analysis available for this?

A46. Please see RFP Addendum <http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/nycha/downloads/pdf/nextgen-RFP-addendum-1.pdf> for zoning calculations.

Q47. Based on a quick look at existing QWEB plans and Oasisnyc data for Block 3777 (337,075 SF), the R6 residential FAR based on a height factor of 9 should be 2.35, which allows @ 792,000 SF. Subtract existing residential FA @ 477,000 leaves @ 315,000 unused FA. As the Community Facility FAR is 4.8, its area should not affect this calculation. Does this appear correct, and if so, is the difference in available FA allocated for another location?

A47. The required housing development for the Van Dyke site will use approximately 54% of the available development rights on Block 3777 Lot 1. NYCHA does not have current plans to develop the remaining floor area.

Q48. Are the existing and new parking requirements being waived now, or anticipated under the proposed transit zone for affordable housing?

A48. For the purposes of the RFP, applicants can assume no requirement of parking spaces for the Development Sites.

Q49. Please note that the proposed lot coverage of 8970 sf, and the 191,500 sf zoning floor area set forth in the RFP, results in a 21 story building. Can the proposed lot coverage be revised to create a building that has fewer floors and a larger footprint, and thus is more contextual to the neighborhood?

A49. The zoning analysis template covers both quality housing and height factor scenarios. Height factor regulation for R6 does not prescribe a lot coverage maximum. The building footprint can be larger subject to the requirement for open space.

Q50. Can we assume that the "available lot coverage" of 10,988 SF listed for Block 3777, lot 1 can be used for the RFP project, or should we assume that we can only use the "proposed lot coverage" of 8,970 sf?

A50. Please see answer to Question 49.

Q51. At Van Dyke there are easements on two sides of the site. For those two sides to have legal windows that are more than 10% of the façade and do not need sprinklers, the tax lot line would need to include the 30' easements as part of the tax lot. This is per a recent memorandum by the Department of Buildings. Can we plan on the easements being part of the tax lot to give greater flexibility in fenestrations?

A51. No, please follow the site dimensions in the RFP.

Q52. Will NYCHA or HPD make available a site survey for the Van Dyke RFP location?

A52. No, a site survey will not be provided.

Q53. Do we need to consider the "proposed" quantities given in the zoning tables?

A53. No, please ignore "proposed" and do your own zoning calculations using lot area, existing lot coverage and floor area.

Q54. Can we deduct floor area from air rights?

A54. Yes, air rights are additional floor areas for the development site to accommodate a building of up to 191,500 sq. ft.

Q55. If we are planning a building which complies with height factor zoning for the Van Dyke Site, do we need the whole site to comply with the Proposed Open Space area of 276,117 SF, or can we maximize the footprint of our building and comply with the minimum open space area given 274,100 SF?

A55. There must be sufficient open space for all buildings in the block (i.e. zoning lot) including the proposed 191,500 sq. ft. building.

Q56. Should the existing open space area minus the open space we will take away with our building equal the minimum open space area or the proposed open space area?

A56. Zoning lot area must be greater than lot coverage of all buildings plus their required open space.

Q57. Will NYCHA provide additional information on the two 30' easements referenced on the site map in "Appendix A" of the RFP for the Van Dyke location?

A57. No, NYCHA does not have further information on the existing 30' easements for the 36" sewer.

Attachment: Demographics

	Mill Brook	Ingersoll	Van Dyke*
No. of Families	1247	1620	1585
Population	2923	4067	4028
Average Family Size	2.3	2.5	2.5
No. of Senior Households	395	474	361
Average Years in Public Housing	22	20	20
No. of Minors <18	862	1159	1332
18-20	205	253	293
21-49	1013	1455	1517
50-61	388	607	475
62+	455	593	411

* Van Dyke does not include the senior-only building on campus