



RFQ ADDENDUM #1

To: All Bidders

From: Rita V. Brousseau, Chief Procurement Officer

Date: July 12, 2023

Re: RFQ 2023-2 Architectural Zoning & Yield Analysis

This Addendum modifies and forms a part of the Bid Set documents dated June 28, 2023.

This Addendum consists of the following: Two (2) typed pages.

Where any items called for in the RFQ documents are supplemented here, the supplemental requirements shall be considered as added thereto. Where any original item is amended, voided, or superseded here, the other provisions of such items not specifically amended, voided, or superseded shall remain in effect.

Answers to Proposer's Questions

1. **Question:** Given the schedule, should we assume that our zoning analysis be based on the current/existing zoning code, or should we base it on proposed changes that may come into effect next year?

Answer: Analysis should be based on current code, the urgency in the tight turnaround is to hopefully have numbers to present to public officials for financial consideration. The proposed code change would save us money should they be approved. We can factor in any code changes once we get into design development.

2. **Question:** Should the zoning analysis be based on what is allowable "as-of-right" or do you want us to consider options for variances?

Answer: Zoning analysis should be based on what is allowable "as-of-right" but should include any applicable housing affordability bonuses such as density, FAR or height bonuses. Potential variances may be assessed during schematic design.

3. **Question:** Do we need a development consultant on the team or will TAG serve as LHA's development consultant?

Answer: TAG will serve as LHA's development consultant.

4. **Question:** What is driving the schedule and is the mid-October deadline flexible or not?

Answer: The need to secure additional funding is driving the urgency in scheduling. RENU will meet with funding providers in November. There may be limited flexibility with the production of drawings and graphical representation in Deliverables,



which will be required at the November meetings and is to be further coordinated by RENU.

However, by the October 12 deadline, absolute requirements include all Deliverables in RFQ sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 and at least one draft illustration in 2.1.4.

5. **Question:** As discussed, we will be required to provide you with construction costs on a per square foot basis. Should we assume that the buildings will be required to just meet the Stretch Code, or should the costs be based assuming the buildings will be Passive House and/or Net Zero compliant?

Answer: Please use Stretch Code compliance as the basis for construction cost estimates. During schematic design, RENU may consider pursuing Passive House certification for one or more buildings, subject to feasibility studies, energy modeling and incentive structures provided by the Mass Save program.

6. **Question:** Given that there are no site surveys or environmental testing available, we will use available GIS data to base our zoning/yield analysis and put a contingency in the estimate to cover hazmat abatement; is this approach acceptable?

Answer: Yes, please provide line items included in contingency as opposed to one lump sum.

7. **Question:** Minimum unit sizes can be affected based on funding sources. Should we base unit sizes on any particular funding source EOHLC, HUD, CBH, typical market-rate?

Answer: Funding sources for these developments may include LIHTC equity (Mass. EOHLC), Section 8 project-based vouchers (HUD), and Section 221(d)4 debt financing (HUD). Therefore, units must be compliant with EOHLC and HUD minimum standards in terms of square footage and accessible unit set-asides. Please use the most stringent (i.e., largest) of these standards when assessing development yield.

END OF ADDENDUM