

**Re-Vision Prospect Plaza RFP  
Addendum 3**

RFP Issue Date: December 20, 2011  
Addendum 3 Issue Date: March 8, 2012

---

**CONTENTS OF THE ADDENDUM**

- A) RFP Questions and Answers – summary of questions and answers submitted to the Prospect Plaza RFP email address from February 3, 2012 through March 1, 2012.
- 

**A) RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Development Program

Q: We have noticed from the Re-Vision Prospect Plaza Community Planning Workshop materials that there is a preference for a walkway from Prospect Place to Park Place and from Park Place to Sterling Place. On a recent site tour, however, we noticed that the walkway on Site B (on Park Place) was never completed (there is a locked gate on Park Place and the walkway doesn't continue to Prospect Place). Is there a plan to have this walkway on Site B completed?

**A: There are no current plans to provide a mid-block pedestrian walkway from Prospect Place to Park Place. Site plans should address only the Prospect Plaza sites.**

Q: Can you provide further clarification on the operating expectations for the park? Is it expected that we would be required to fund the park from the residential buildings' operating budgets (which would be counter to the goals of minimizing HPD subsidy), or would it be acceptable to put forward an operating budget for the park and identify external potential sources and operators?

**A: Developers may propose to fund the operations of the recreation area from any non-City source they believe to be realistic and viable. An operating budget should be provided and funding sources should be identified; external sources and operators may be included.**

Q: There seem to be multiple, sometimes conflicting goals in the RFP. It would be very useful if we could get a sense of the City's priorities. For example, is it more important to use less than the \$17M in HPD subsidy or to provide more public housing units? Is it more important to have an amazing park or community facility?

**A: As stated on Page 3, the RFP seeks balanced proposals for a high-quality mixed-use development. Within the requirements of the RFP, developers should propose a development that they believe is most likely to be feasible and successful. Development teams should use the least amount of City subsidy, and provide additional Public Housing units if financially feasible. Development of the Community Facility is a required component of the RFP, and the development of the Recreation Area is an optional part of the RFP.**

**ADDENDUM 3**

### Financing

Q: Also can we use Replacement Housing Factor Capital (in addition to the HOPE VI \$15,500,000) for public housing units above the 80 units?

**A: Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) funds should not be assumed for the development of Public Housing units at Prospect Plaza. Refer to pages 23-27 of the RFP for available sources of financing.**

### Environmental Review

Q: Are topographic surveys available? Some of the sites have major grade changes?

**A: UPDATED ANSWER FROM ADDENDUM #2 – NYCHA will provide topographic surveys for the Prospect Plaza sites as part of Addendum #3. The topographic surveys are available on the HPD website for download as a separate PDF.**