

## Woodlawn | 63<sup>rd</sup> Street RFQ

### QUESTIONS FROM 8-15-22 PRE-SUBMISSION MEETING:

1. Can a national architecture firms with an office in Chicago, licensed in Illinois, submit as a prime?

Yes. Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 34.

2. Is a housing component required for all the buildings within this development, or are the RFQ guidelines for any housing proposed within the development?

Yes. Housing should be a primary program element for each site on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street.

3. What is the City's intent with the pre-teaming of "engineer and other partners" for the Stage 1 Architect RFQ given that the developer's economic proforma, experience and vision may influence the design team's composition of AE team

DPD does not intend to "pre-team" designers, developers and/or consultants. Teams will be formed on a voluntary basis from shortlisted firms. Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, pages 34 & 38

4. Do you have specifics on how different qualifications will be weighted? For example, is there a specific weighting scale for local developers and/or developers of color?

Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 32 (for Developers) and page 37 (for Designers).

5. What is the process for non-lead designers (e.g. landscape architects) to be involved? Should those firms submit individually or pre-team with an architect for the Round 1 submission?

Please refer to the revised RFQ; page 34.

6. If the National Firm has the local office established but the corporation papers are held elsewhere, can they submit as the prime?

Please refer to the revised RFQ; page 34.

7. It seems a shortlisted architectural team may or may not be paired with a developer and then would not make it past the teaming round?

It is possible that more design firms will be shortlisted than developers and that in the process of forming Developer-Design Teams some design firms will not be included.

8. Please elaborate on what is meant or expected by "Peer reviewed design excellence of open space, public realm improvements?" The City of Chicago has only recently had this as a formal process, is the City looking for this experience.

DPD is looking for evidence of design excellence vis a vis awards and/or recognition from design peers and professional associations such as the American Institute of Architects (AIA).

9. Should respondents be site specific in their proposals? Do we assume 1 parcel or the other, both or neither? In other words, do we pick which parcel we would develop, or do you?

Step 1 of the RFQ does not require a proposal or response. DPD has included both Site 1 and Site 2 as potential options for development to allow for flexibility. The first site to be developed will be determined during Step 3 (Initial Concept Design).

10. Will the attendee list today be shared/posted online?

Yes, the list of individuals will be posted to [www.chicago.org/rfps](http://www.chicago.org/rfps)

11. Out of the 3 development teams that are selected will 2 of the teams be selected since there are only 2 sites.

One Developer-Design Team will be selected for first development site. Please refer to the revised RFQ, Section VI, page 41.

12. Will that one developer do both sites in a single LIHTC deal, or one deal in the next LIHTC round?

One Developer-Design Team will develop a proposal for one site that will then apply for a competitive LIHTC funding round. Please refer to the revised RFQ, Section VI, page 41.

13. To clarify; only 1 of the 2 sites that are fully controlled by the city will be selected to be developed by the chosen development team?

Yes, please see answers to questions 9, 11 and 12.

14. Does the 30% affordability requirement expire after a certain time - for example, after 10 years.

LIHTC funded projects are required to maintain affordability restrictions for 30 years. The Woodlawn Housing Preservation applies to all development on City-owned land and requires that affordability restrictions remain in place for 20 years after the final unit of a development is leased.

15. Does the city have surveys or Phase I ESAs or any other DD that can be shared

DPD does not have any surveys of Site 1 or Site 2. Environmental Assessments were previously conducted on these parcels with sampling in 2007 and 2017. Assessments included numerous other parcels in the vicinity. Excerpts from relevant assessment reports are attached as an addendum.

16. The slide deck shows 7-story buildings. Are you looking for that kind of scale?

Based on DPD's initial analysis the targeted zoning designation of B3-3 + a bonus for transit and affordable housing will allow for development up to a -4 FAR. This may allow for up to 7 story buildings on 63rd Street. DPD is not requesting or requiring buildings of this height. Ultimately the scale and square footage of the buildings will be determined by the Development Team's proforma.

17. The RFQ notes a desire for respondents to "outline their vision for the development" as part of the Round 1 submission. Is this directed towards developers or designers? If designers, what kinds of materials are you looking for at this stage?

Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 37. A narrative may help the Jury to evaluate submissions and arrive at a shortlist of respondents for Step 2 (Team Pairing).

18. can you post the slide deck?

Yes, the slide deck will be posted to [www.chicago.org/rfps](http://www.chicago.org/rfps)

#### EMAILED QUESTIONS:

- Three References: Can you clarify the nature of the references needed for the **Lead Design Architects**? Can they be from Client Representatives of the built projects? Do we need to include letters of reference, or is contact information only required?

Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 37.

- Project Scope and Narrative: The RFQ asks for a vision and approach to the site and a preliminary redevelopment strategy, however, on the pre-proposal call today it sounds like we will not select a site until stage 2. Could you please clarify?

Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 37. DPD acknowledges that Site 1 and Site 2 are quite similar but has left them both open to consideration for flexibility. If your firm feels that one maybe more advantageous than the other, such reasoning should be included in the Narrative.

- If we no longer need to identify consultants, does that mean we also should not identify the other members of the development team listed in Part 2 on page 21 of the RFQ (attorneys, construction managers, leasing/management companies etc.)?

No. For Developers please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 28. Members of the developer team specifically should still be identified as applicable. For Designers please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 34

- Do we need to submit EDS forms as a part of our RFQ response? This is mentioned in part 3 on page 22 of the RFQ.

Yes.

- Can you clarify the definition of developer lead entity? Our understanding is that if our developer team consists of a to be formed joint venture, the developer lead entity is the organization with the greater participation percentage.

Correct.

- For part 4 the headline is labeled "Portfolio of the Respondent's Comparable Completed Projects", however it is noted in the list of criteria that we should include the current status. The language reads as follows, "Current status (completed and being held by the development entity, completed and sold by the development entity, under development, etc.)." Should we include only completed projects for this section?

Yes.

- What is the rationale behind not allowing Design Architects (DA) and local Architects of Record (AOR) from submitting as a team or a joint venture? The written RFQ text encourages nonlocal

architects to partner with local architects in multiple locations. From the Lake + Kedzie presentation, it was very clear from the tone of the meeting that the intent behind the DA shortlist will be national, not local firms. In addition, it was stated that firms will only be able to self-select in one role or another. In the Woodlawn presentation, this was not stated as strongly. Both contradict the RFQ language. Part of the proposed goal of these RFQs is to elevate BIPOC and emerging firms but ends up potentially sidelining them by preferencing local AORs with extensive housing experience, which is already a shortlist. This also creates a potential situation where the three main entities in a team (DA, AOR, and Development) have no track record of working together. Please clarify and/or reconsider.

Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 34 and page 38. A joint-venture option is available under conditions so noted. DPD is opening the RFQ to national design firms in order to promote design excellence and encourage national firms to build relationships locally. We will not be forcing anyone to pair with each other. DPD supports BIPOC firms and will prioritize diversity in team formation.

- Confirm that subconsultants are not required for this stage of the RFQ submission.

Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 34.

- Clarify the Three References criteria. In the RFQ document, it seems to be written more towards developer references rather than design firm references, especially the items related to financing.

DPD is not asking for financial information from Design firms. Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section VI, page 37.

- Confirm and state the allotted stipend for the three shortlisted development teams prior to RFQ deadline.

Please refer to the revised RFQ; Section I, page 8.

- Are respondents allowed to submit for both the Woodlawn 63<sup>rd</sup> Street & Lake & Kedzie RFQs? Can a firm be shortlisted for both?

Respondents are welcome to submit qualifications for both the 63<sup>rd</sup> Street & Lake & Kedzie RFQs. Respondents will have the opportunity to indicate which RFQ they prefer on a cover sheet provided by DPD. Firms are only eligible to be shortlisted for one RFQ.