

# ***Request For Proposals***

---

For the development of new affordable housing on the vacant property on the southeast corner of Sansome & Broadway, known as:

**Broadway Parcel I**  
(Assessor's Block 165, Lot 21)

Issued December 1, 2006 by:

City and County of San Francisco  
Mayor's Office of Housing  
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Responses due by close of business Friday, March 2, 2007

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. IMPORTANT DATES AND SUBMISSION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. IMPORTANT DATES .....	1
B. PRE-SUBMISSION MEETING.....	2
C. QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION .....	2
D. REGISTRATION FOR RFP PACKET REQUIRED .....	2
E. SUBMISSION TIME, PLACE, DATE, CONTACT .....	3
<b>III. BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>3</b>
A. SITE HISTORY .....	3
B. THE SITE .....	4
C. SOIL CONDITIONS .....	4
D. ZONING/LAND USE RESTRICTIONS .....	4
<b>IV. DEVELOPMENT PLAN .....</b>	<b>5</b>
A. DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.....	5
B. AFFORDABILITY RESTRICTIONS AND TERM/FINANCING PLAN.....	5
C. GROUND LEASE .....	6
D. OCCUPANCY PREFERENCES AND RESIDENT SELECTION.....	6
E. COMMUNITY OUTREACH.....	7
<b>V. SELECTION CRITERIA AND PROCESS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
A. SELECTION PROCESS .....	7
B. SELECTION CRITERIA AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS .....	7
1. <i>Development Concept and Financing</i> .....	8
2. <i>Massing Drawings</i> .....	8
3. <i>Community Outreach Plan</i> .....	9
4. <i>Developer Team Description</i> .....	9
5. <i>Team Experience and Demonstration of Qualifications</i> .....	10
<b>VI. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
A. DEVELOPER RESPONSIBILITIES .....	13
B. ERRORS AND OMISSIONS IN RFP.....	14
C. ADDENDA TO RFP .....	15
D. SUNSHINE ORDINANCE .....	15
E. RESERVATIONS OF RIGHTS BY THE CITY .....	15
<b>VII. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS.....</b>	<b>16</b>

## I. SUMMARY

The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Mayor's Office of Housing ("MOH") is seeking a qualified non-profit developer or a qualified for-profit developer working in partnership with a non-profit developer to work with the City to develop affordable family housing and commercial space on a vacant parcel currently owned by the Redevelopment Agency. The parcel is on Broadway between Battery Street and Sansome Street (Block 165, Lot 21), the former site of the Broadway on-ramp of the Embarcadero Freeway, and is referred to in planning documents as "Broadway Parcel I." Broadway Parcel I (the "Site") is a single, 17,846 square foot lot. The Site is currently zoned C-2 with a 65-foot height limit. A map showing the location and configuration of the Site is attached as **Attachment #1**.

The intent of this Request for Proposals ("RFP") is to select a single corporate entity or partnership whose function will be to develop affordable family housing units on the Site, and to carry out that proposal through community outreach, planning, design, financing, construction, ownership, and operation of the development. This RFP describes the general type of development sought by the City on the Site, the process and criteria that will be used to select a developer and transfer to the developer an interest in the Site, and the submission requirements to be followed by those responding to this request.

In accordance with the City's priorities for the development of affordable housing as described in the Consolidated Plan and priorities for use of surplus City property, MOH has determined that the preferred use of the Site is a combination of rental housing affordable to low and very low income families, particularly families who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, together with ground floor commercial activities. MOH is interested in transferring the Site (subject to final approval by the Redevelopment Agency Commission) to a qualified developer for this purpose through a long-term ground lease, as further described in this RFP.

**The Mayor's Office of Housing must receive written responses to this RFP no later than 5:00 p.m. March 2, 2007. Facsimile responses will not be accepted.**

## II. IMPORTANT DATES AND SUBMISSION PROCESS

### A. Important Dates

Proposals are due by 5:00 p.m., Friday, March 2, 2007

RFP available at MOH <sup>1</sup>	<b>Friday, December 1, 2006</b>
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

---

<sup>1</sup> Packets are available for pick up after this date. However, Developer teams may not receive responses to requests for information that were issued prior to the date a Developer team picks up an RFP package.

Pre-submission meeting at MOH	Monday, December 18, 2006, 10:00AM
Deadline for questions and requests for additional information	Friday, December 22, 2006, 12:00PM
Proposal Submission Deadline	<b>Friday, March 2, 2007, 5:00PM</b>
Notification to Developer teams who failed to meet submission requirements	Wednesday, March 21, 2007
Developer team interviews	<b>Weeks of March 26<sup>th</sup> and April 2<sup>nd</sup></b>
Redevelopment Agency Commission review/approval of recommended development team	TBD 2

**B. Pre-Submission Meeting**

A pre-submission meeting will be held at MOH, located at 1 South Van Ness Avenue, in San Francisco on the fifth floor, on December 18, 2006 at 10:00AM. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that all teams understand the programmatic design, financing, and target population requirements. Questions raised at such a pre-submission conference may be answered orally. If any substantive new information is provided in response to questions raised at a pre-submission conference, it will also be memorialized in a written addendum to this RFP and will be distributed to all parties that received a copy of the RFP. No questions or requests for interpretation will be accepted after Friday, December 22, 2006. Although attendance is not mandatory, it is highly recommended.

**C. Questions and Requests for Information**

All questions and requests for additional information regarding this RFP must be received in writing by MOH, by hand, overnight delivery, mail, fax, or e-mail on or before the date and time shown in Section IIA. Questions received after the deadline may not be answered. All addenda, responses and additional information will be distributed to all registered RFP holders. MOH reserves the sole right to determine the timing and content of the response, if any, to all questions and requests for additional information. Questions and information requests should be submitted to the contact person listed in Section IIE.

**D. Registration for RFP Packet Required**

Responses to this RFP will be accepted **only** from those Developer teams who have completed and timely submitted to MOH the RFP Registration Form (**Attachment #2**). RFP packets are available at the Mayor's Office of Housing, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 or on the MOH website at [http://www.sfgov.org/site/moh\\_index.asp](http://www.sfgov.org/site/moh_index.asp).

**E. Submission Time, Place, Date, Contact**

Submission of one original plus five (5) copies of the Proposal must be received by the MOH receptionist no later than:

**Friday, March 2, 2007, 5:00 p.m.**

**Mayor's Office of Housing  
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94103  
Attn: Joel Lipski  
Phone: (415) 701-5510  
Fax: (415) 701-5501**

**III. BACKGROUND**

**A. Site History**

In 1991 the California Legislature and the Governor signed Senate Bill 181 that required the California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") to remove the freeway structure known as the Embarcadero Freeway following damage from the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, and convey the land the City and County of San Francisco at no cost to the City. Senate Bill 181 was codified in Streets and Highway Code section 72 and required the City to provide an alternative system of local streets that would provide motorists accessibility comparable to the Embarcadero Freeway. The City's Department of Public Works ("DPW") was responsible for designing and constructing that alternative system of roads known as the Mid-Embarcadero Roadway Project. The City used a few of the former right-of-way parcels to mitigate the economic impacts to the Chinatown and North Beach communities of the demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway by designating them as open space and affordable housing sites. The City used revenues from interim uses (such as parking leases) of the former right-of-way parcels to help fund construction of the Mid-Embarcadero Roadway Project. DPW also received Proposition B funds from the San Francisco Transportation Authority to build the Mid-Embarcadero Roadway Project and promised to repay those funds from proceeds generated by the sale of former right-of-way parcels including Broadway Parcel I.

In May 2004 the Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance 96-04, which authorized jurisdictional transfer of Broadway Parcel I from DPW to the Mayor's Office of Housing in accordance with Surplus Property Ordinance, Chapter 23A of the San Francisco Administrative Code. However, DPW had an outstanding obligation to repay Proposition B funding for the Mid-Embarcadero Roadway project despite passage of the Ordinance 96-04 and the site's jurisdictional transfer to MOH.

At the Mayor's direction the Redevelopment Agency (the "Agency") made the request to purchase the site in May 2006 to further the City's affordable housing efforts in collaboration with MOH. The Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance 93-06, which authorized the sale of Broadway Parcel I to the Redevelopment Agency for \$1,500,000 and appropriating that

\$1,500,000 of the sale proceeds to DPW for the Embarcadero Roadway project. Although the City's Director of Property determined the fair market value of Broadway Parcel I to be greater than \$1,500,000, Section 23.3 of the Administrative Code authorizes the sale of real property for less than fair market value if the Board of Supervisors determines the lesser sum will further a proper public purpose. The Board found the development of affordable housing to be a proper public purpose under Ordinance 93-06. The Agency has entered into a letter agreement with MOH to fund and manage the development of the site. The letter agreement requires MOH to issue a RFP mandating the selected developer to build the maximum number of units on the site at the deepest affordability level(s) for the maximum number of years that is financially feasible, and for the selected developer to enter into a 99-year ground lease with the Agency.

**B. The Site**

The site is a rectangular lot of 17,846 square feet in size. Half of the site is currently leased to owner of the adjacent property, 735 Battery Street, for surface parking for its building tenants. The other half of the site is vacant and is occasionally used by nearby contractors under a use agreement with the Agency. The site has a steep grade change from Sansome to Battery.



**C. Soil Conditions**

A Phase I report commissioned by the Agency found potential environmental hazards from nearby sites. Although Phase II testing has not been conducted on the site, petroleum hydrocarbons are expected on the site due to the site's past use as a freeway on-ramp. Geotechnical studies on the Broadway Parcel II affordable housing site across Battery Street found extensive concrete footings from the former Embarcadero Roadway still on the site. Similar conditions are expected on Broadway Parcel I.

**D. Zoning/Land Use Restrictions**

The site is zoned C-2 (Community Business District). The height limit is 65-feet and housing is a permitted use. It is not located in the Northeast Waterfront Historic District but is immediately adjacent to that district. Consequently the Planning Department will want to review the design of any proposed project on the site for the compatibility of its massing, scale and materials to the surrounding neighborhood.

#### **IV. DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

##### **A. Development Program**

The development should maximize the number of units that may be developed on the Site while remaining consistent with existing development in the surrounding area and contribute to the quality of life of the residents of both the development and the surrounding neighborhood. The development must include new permanent rental housing for low and very low-income families and should include a mixture of targeted incomes including at least 20% of the units targeted to families who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. At least thirty percent (30%) of the units must be three bedrooms or larger so that the project can qualify as a large family project under the California Low Income Housing Tax Credit program. Smaller units may be included for smaller households.

The development must include supportive resident services on the Site designed to facilitate community building and stability for residents.

As a minimum qualification, MOH is requiring that property managers have at least 36 months experience managing an affordable family housing project. Developers should provide a narrative description of their property manager's operating and management experience and of their specific experience with developments designed for the target population. See Section V.B.5, below.

Ground floor commercial space will be encouraged along with minimum to no parking for the commercial or housing. This is consistent with the Department of City Planning's desires for the area.

##### **B. Affordability Restrictions and Term/Financing Plan**

All RFP respondents should incorporate the following terms into their financing plans and submit a detailed Sources & Uses budget accordingly:

- Primary capital funding sources that include 9% low income housing tax credit equity or tax exempt bonds / 4% tax credit equity, City subsidy, Federal Home Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program funds, and any other funding developers deem applicable.
- Rents set at affordability for households earning up to 60% of AMI for the SFPMSA (as established by the Mayor's Office of Housing. Please note that due to differences in how they are calculated, the AMI for the SFPMSA and associated affordable rents are approximately 19% lower than the eligible income levels and rents published by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee for San Francisco. Consequently, this affordability restriction would cap rents at approximately "49%" levels as calculated by TCAC.
- Average affordability must be 50% of AMI for the SFPMSA or lower.
- 20-35% of the units must be for families who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness as defined in Section IV.D below.

- The minimum term of affordability required for all units will be 55 years, subject to any greater affordability terms that may be required by any financing for the development.
- An operating budget that includes all expenses necessary to properly operate and maintain the building but that excludes support services.
- Construction cost estimate should reflect current construction costs and exclude escalation assumptions.
- A 65-year ground lease agreement (with a 34-year renewal option) with the Redevelopment Agency for the Site. Developers may assume a \$15,000 annual base land lease payment, to come from surplus cash, if any. Residual and/or contingent ground lease payments would also come from surplus cash, if any.

All proposed financing will be subject to underwriting using the most current version of the Mayor's Office of Housing Underwriting guidelines, available on the MOH website (see [www.sfgov.org/moh](http://www.sfgov.org/moh)). All respondents should use these guidelines in preparing their financing plans.

### **C. Ground Lease**

Because the land is owned by the Redevelopment Agency, the Agency will provide the selected developer with an option for the ground lease of the Site. Exercise of the option will be conditioned on satisfaction of certain conditions including the following:

- MOH and SFRA Commission approval of a development plan for the Site;
- Commitments of all financing necessary to construct and operate the proposed development;
- Issuance of all required permits and approvals necessary to construct and operate the proposed development; and
- Satisfaction of any other conditions imposed by the City in a timely manner.

The SFRA intends to transfer the Site to the selected developer through a long-term ground lease of the Site "as is" with respect to the physical, environmental and regulatory condition of the Site, including but not limited to any liabilities for remediation of toxic materials that may be found on the Site. Phase I environmental assessment has been performed on the Site and is available upon request from the Mayor's Office of Housing.

The Redevelopment Agency's grant of an option and execution of a long-term ground lease is subject to approval of the Redevelopment Agency Commission, in its sole and absolute discretion.

### **D. Occupancy Preferences and Resident Selection**

For the 20-35% of the units targeting families who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, those households must meet the definitions below.

Definition of Homeless Families: Families who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence and who have a primary nighttime residence in one or more of the following categories: a shelter, the street, a vehicle, a makeshift structure, doubled up or transitional housing.<sup>2</sup>

Definition of Families At Risk of Homelessness:

- Households with incomes below 20% AMI with no rental subsidy available to the household; or
- Households with incomes at or below 30% of AMI who:
  - face immediate eviction and have been unable to identify a subsequent residence;
  - face imminent release from an institution (i.e.; jail, hospital or foster care system);
  - resides in an overcrowded setting (more than two persons per living/sleeping area) such as families living in Single Room Occupancy (SRO) hotels in which the household does not hold a lease;
  - reside in substandard housing subject to a current official vacation notice;
  - are fleeing from domestic violence and/or awaiting a Housing Authority Priority Transfer;
  - pay more than 50 percent of income in housing costs.

**E. Community Outreach**

It is critical to the success of the Broadway Parcel I development program that the selected developer establish positive links with surrounding neighbors and the larger community. Developers must demonstrate their ability to achieve these goals, through submission of a “Community Outreach Plan,” discussed in greater detail below in Section V.B.3.

**V. SELECTION PROCESS, SELECTION CRITERIA AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Selection Process**

A selection committee appointed by the Director of the Mayor’s Office of Housing will review all responses and submit to the Director a list of all respondents ranked according to the selection criteria described below, together with any background information deemed relevant by the selection committee or requested by the Director. The Director will then select a developer for recommendation to the Agency Commission. MOH, upon approval of the developer by the Agency Commission, shall exclusively negotiate an option to lease the Site for purposes of its development in accordance with the terms of this RFP.

**B. Selection Criteria and Submission Requirements**

---

<sup>2</sup> San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board Continuum of Care Five Year Strategic Plan 2001-2006

All applications that meet the minimum criteria listed below and will be rated and ranked according to the following scoring criteria (see Scoring Criteria details below):

Category	Potential Points
Development Experience & Capacity exceeding minimum qualifications	40
Management Agent Experience exceeding minimum qualifications	20
Service Provider Experience exceeding minimum qualifications	15
Architect Experience	25
<b>TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS</b>	<b>100</b>

The Developer team must submit an **original plus five (5) copies** of the Proposal containing the information requested in this RFP. Developer teams are encouraged to provide the requested information in the order indicated below, to include a table of contents, and to index the Proposal. The Proposal should be submitted to MOH, on or before the time, date and at the place shown above in Section II.A. Hand delivery is advised. Late, incomplete or faxed submittals will not be considered. If two or more firms combine as a joint-venture for the purpose of responding to this RFP, each joint-venture partner must include the requested information.

On or before the submission deadline in Section II.E., at least one member of the Developer team must also complete and submit **Attachment #2**, an RFP Registration Form. Registration normally takes place at the time the RFP is picked up but will be accepted at any time prior to the submission deadline. NOTE: Developer teams who do not register will not receive answers to Developer team requests for information, and submissions from Developer teams who have not registered will not be considered.

The Proposal must contain all of the following information:

**1. Development Concept and Financing**

Provide the following documents:

- a. Not more than one (1) page narrative describing the proposed project.
- b. A residential sources and uses
- c. A commercial sources and uses (if applicable)
- d. A 20-year cash flow projection

**2. Massing Drawings**

The intent of the drawings is not to develop an architectural design for the Site, but to illustrate unit mix and the massing implications of the proposed development program. **Note: No other drawings or models of any kind are required or will be accepted at the time of submittal.**

- a. Provide a narrative description of the design concept including the team’s approach and the description of construction type, building materials, and green building

strategies and elements.

b. Provide the following drawings:

- Site plan at 1/32" = 1'-0" showing building massing and the relationship of buildings, open space, streets and parking areas. Indicate locations of commercial space (if any), community space, lobby entrance, main residential entrance, housing layout, elevator, auto ingress/egress (if any), etc.
- Two site sections at 1/32" = 1'-0", one longitudinal and one transverse, that best describe the development concept.
- Plans of all floors at 1/32" = 1'-0", showing proposed uses. Floor plans should indicate the number of bedrooms per unit, but not show unit layouts of any of the uses except for parking (as applicable).
- Building elevations at 1/32" = 1'-0'.

### **3. Community Outreach Plan**

a. Describe up to three (3) comparable projects for which the Developer successfully conducted community outreach prior to construction commencement.

b. Submit a preliminary community outreach plan of not more than one (1) page describing proposed actions to successfully achieve community acceptance for the Broadway Parcel I development.

### **4. Developer Team Description**

The Development Team should consist of Developer (and co-Developer if a joint venture), Architect, Property Manager and Social Services Provider. Please provide the following for each of the development team members:

1. List the business name, primary contact person, street address, telephone number, fax number and email address. Please also include the name and contact information for the Developer's project manager.

2. Submit a copy of the certification of corporate good standing from the California Secretary of State. If a team member is a non-profit organization, please submit a copy of their 501(c)(3) certification from the Internal Revenue Service and the California Franchise Tax Board.

3. Identify the type of organization and the length of time the organization has been in business (if a partnership or joint venture, length of time of that entity's existence as well as those of the individual entities involved).

4. Submit résumés for all “Key Personnel”, including but not limited to: executive directors and/or principals of all team members, the project manager, project architect(s), property supervisors, and social service provider(s) who will be involved in the development, design, operation and management of the Site.

5. Complete and submit **Attachment #3**, “Staffing Workload Form”. Provide the existing workload and the percentage of time expected to devote to the Site for Key Personnel actually working on the project.

6. Submit the latest two (2) years of either: signed federal income tax returns (including schedules or attachments, if any) or audited financial statements (with management letters, if any). Submit for each co-Developer, if applicable.

## **5. Team Experience and Demonstration of Qualifications**

The selection of the Developer team will be based on each team member’s experience and demonstration of qualifications. Scoring criteria and minimum qualifications are also provided.

### **Developer Experience and Capacity:**

1. **Scoring.** Developer (and co-Developer’s if a joint venture) will be scored on recent experience with and capacity to undertake the planning and successful development of mixed use, multifamily housing under similar conditions as those presented by the Site particularly with respect to the number of buildings developed, size and complexity of the developments, experience with the financing sources proposed in this RFP, type of construction, targeted population, design and timely completion; demonstrated financial stability; and the physical and financial condition of the comparables and prior projects listed in Section V.B.3 and V.B.4. **(40 points)**

2. **Minimum Qualifications.** **As a minimum qualification, Developers must have completed within the last five years and currently own or have under construction at least one (1) multi-family capital project that is comparable to the proposed project (i.e., a project serving low-income families).**

3. **Comparable Projects by Developer.** Describe in detail one (1) to three (3) projects completed by the Developer (and co-Developer if a joint venture), preferably in San Francisco, that are comparable to the proposed project in terms of construction type (e.g. Type I, III, V; new construction vs. rehabilitation), financing method(s) and population served (i.e., very low and low income families). Please include, separately, for each project:

- Project name and address
- Total number and type of units (i.e. number of bedrooms)
- Construction type
- Population served including average affordability level

- All financing sources with contact names and phone numbers for each
- Last fiscal year's net operating income and operating expenses (separating residential and commercial)
- Date of construction commencement and date of completion
- Total development cost (with breakdowns of cost per unit, per bedroom and per square foot)
- Total residential building area (in square footage) including parking and open space
- Total commercial area (in square footage) if applicable
- Green building elements, if any

4. Developer Experience and Capacity. Provide a complete list of all Developer's (and co-Developer's if a joint venture) completed projects within San Francisco starting with the most recently completed project. Include the following information:

- Project name and address
- Total number and type of units (i.e. number of bedrooms)
- Population served
- Primary sources of development funds
- Year completed

**Property Manager Experience:**

1. Scoring. Property managers will be scored on experience and capacity to manage affordable rental housing in similar contexts with respect to location, size, population served, and associated uses such as child care and/or small scale neighborhood serving commercial uses; the number of buildings in its management portfolio and years successfully managed; demonstrated competence and experience working with the target population; experience meeting the reporting requirements of the financing sources proposed in this RFP; and the physical and financial condition of the prior projects listed in Section VI.C.5. **(20 points)**

2. Minimum Qualifications. **As a minimum qualification, Property Managers must have been actively managing two (2) multi-family projects serving low-income families for the last 36 months.**

3. Property Manager Experience. For the Property Manager, describe all comparable projects currently managed, preferably in San Francisco. Please include:

- Project name and address
- Total number and type of units (i.e. number of bedrooms)
- Population served, including average affordability level

- Financing-related reporting requirements
- Contract start date
- Number of on-site staff and their duties
- Provide contact information for any owner who has terminated a contract with the Property Manager as well as property name and address.

**Resident Services Experience:**

1. Scoring. Service providers will be scored on experience with and capacity to undertake the programmatic planning, financing and provision of supportive services for residents. **(15 points)**

2. Minimum Qualifications. **As minimum qualifications, Social Service Providers must have been in operation for the last five years, and have been actively providing services to low-income families in a residential development for at least 36 months.**

3. Social Services Provider Experience

a. Describe up to three (3) projects for which the Social Service Provider is currently providing services to a population comparable to the target population proposed in this RFP (i.e., very low-income families; household composition; and income level). Provide contact information for any public agency providing services funding for these projects.

b. Submit a preliminary services plan of not more than one (1) page describing types of services to be provided.

c. Submit an operating budget and 15-year cash flow projection for the social services plan.

**Architect Experience:**

1. Scoring. Architects will be scored on prior experience and demonstrated understanding of affordable housing goals. **(25 points)**

2. Architect Experience

a. For the Architect, describe at least one, but no more than three (3), completed comparable developments including dates completed and client contact information for each. If the Architect was not the sole architect, please describe the Architect's role in the project.

b. Submit photos of the interiors and exteriors of the comparable projects listed in Section V.B.5.a, above, to display architectural design features, relationships of buildings and relationships with adjacent uses (other developments, streets, etc.).

- c. Describe green building design experience.
- d. Describe experience designing affordable housing funded by federal, state or local funding sources.

## **VI. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

### **A. Developer Responsibilities**

The selected developer will be responsible for all aspects of development of the Site, including but not limited to the following:

- Investigating and determining conditions of the Site and the suitability of the Site for the proposed development.
- Securing all required development approvals, including but not limited to any necessary permits or approvals from the City's Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection, and from federal and State agencies associated with environmental and historic preservation reviews as applicable.
- Obtaining adequate financing for all aspects of the proposed development, including predevelopment, construction and operation
- Designing and building the development in a manner that produces a high-quality, enduring living environment.
- Owning, managing, and operating the development in a manner that ensures its long-term financial viability and the ongoing satisfaction of residents.
- Complying with the requirements of any financing for the development, including but not limited to:

- a. **Equal Employment Opportunities** – The selected developer will be required to comply with local and federal procurement requirements, including the provision of equal employment opportunities for disadvantaged business consultants, architects, contractors, and other potential development team members to participate in the project. To ensure that equal opportunity plans are consistent with City and Federal procurement requirements, sponsors should meet with MOH and San Francisco Human Rights Commission staff prior to hiring their development team to develop a plan for such compliance.

- b. **Environmental Review** - Depending on conditions at the project site and on project plans, proposed developments may be subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and specifically the Section

106 historical resources preservation review. Department of City Planning review may also be required.

c. Accessibility Requirements - Project sponsors will be responsible for meeting all applicable accessibility standards related to publicly-funded multifamily housing development under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Architectural Barriers Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and certain statutes and regulations of the City and County of San Francisco. At least 50% of all units must be adaptable and a minimum of 10% of the units must be accessible.

d. Prevailing Wages – This project will be subject to applicable local, state or federal requirements with regard to labor standards. Developers should take prevailing wage requirements and labor standards into account when seeking estimates for contracted work, especially the cost of construction, and other work to which the requirements apply, and when preparing development budgets overall.

e. Employment and Training – The selected development team will be required to work with the CityBuild initiative of the Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development to comply with local and federal requirements regarding the provision of employment opportunities for local and low-income residents and small businesses during both the development and operation of the project.

f. Sustainable Design - The Mayor’s Office of Housing seeks to maximize the overall sustainability of financed projects through the integrated use of “green” building elements in partnership with the Green Communities Initiative established by Enterprise and Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) (see <http://www.greencommunitiesonline.org>). The selected development team will be required to pursue Green Charette grants from Green Communities, as well as additional funding that may become available to help pay for the cost of planning and implementing green building components.<sup>3</sup>

## **B. Errors and Omissions in RFP**

Applicants are responsible for reviewing all portions of this RFP. Applicants are to promptly notify MOH, in writing, if the applicant discovers any ambiguity, discrepancy, omission, or other error in the RFP. Any such notification should be directed to MOH promptly after discovery, but in no event later than five (5) working days prior to the date for receipt of proposals. Modifications and clarifications will be made by addenda as provided below.

---

<sup>3</sup> Programmatic goals for projects should focus on durability, energy efficiency, indoor air quality and recycling. MOH has outlined local sustainable building strategies in the *Materials Handbook* available at <http://www.andnet.org/materials>. Respondents may obtain more information about “green” building strategies and resources from Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program, described at <http://www.usgbc.org>. Additional information on “green” affordable housing initiatives can be found in Alameda County’s *Multifamily Green Building Guidelines* at <http://www.stopwaste.org/home/index.asp?page=291>, and at <http://www.greenaffordablehousing.org>.

**C. Addenda to RFP**

MOH may modify the RFP, prior to the response due date, by issuing written addenda. Addenda will be sent via regular, first class United States mail to the last known business address of each firm listed with MOH as having received a copy of the RFP for proposal purposes. MOH will make reasonable efforts to notify applicants in a timely manner of modifications to the RFP. Notwithstanding this provision, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that its proposal reflects any and all addenda issued by MOH prior to the proposal due date regardless of when the proposal is submitted.

**D. Sunshine Ordinance**

In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.24(e), contractors' bids, responses to RFP's and all other records of communications between the City and persons or firms seeking contracts shall be open to inspection immediately after a contract has been awarded. Nothing in this provision requires the disclosure of a private person's or organization's net worth or other proprietary financial data submitted for qualification for a contract or other benefits until and unless that person or organization is awarded the contract or benefit. Information provided which is covered by this paragraph will be made available to the public upon request.

**E. Reservations of Rights by the City**

1. The issuance of this RFP and the selection of a developer pursuant to this RFP are in no way a limitation of the discretion of any City board, commission, department, employee or official with respect to any review or approval required in connection with the proposed development. The City's selection of a developer is in no way deemed to be the final approval of any project proposed by the developer.

2. The information in this RFP is provided solely for the convenience of respondents.

3. The City expressly reserves the right at any time to do waive or correct any defect or technical error in any response or procedure, as part of the RFP or any subsequent negotiation process; reject any or all responses, without indicating the reasons for such rejection; reissue a Request for Proposals; modify or suspend any and all aspects of the selection procedure, the scope of the proposed project or the required responses, or the processes indicated in this RFP; request that respondents clarify, supplement or modify the information submitted; extend deadlines for accepting responses, or request amendments to responses after expiration of deadlines; negotiate with any, all or none of the respondents to this RFP; make a selection based directly on the proposals, or negotiate further with one or more of the respondents; during negotiation, expand or contract the scope of the proposed project, or otherwise alter the project concept in order to respond to new information, community or environmental issues; if at any time prior to the execution of binding agreements with the developer MOH, in its sole discretion, determines that the selected developer will be unable to proceed with a timely and feasible development in accordance with this RFP, MOH may terminate negotiations with the highest

ranked respondent and begin negotiations with the next highest ranked respondent; or determine that no project will be pursued.

4. The issuance of this RFP does not obligate the City to pay any costs whatsoever incurred by any respondent, including but not limited to costs incurred in connection with the preparation or presentation of responses or negotiations with the City. Developer teams responding to this RFP do so at their own expense. The foregoing notwithstanding, MOH will reimburse the cost for architectural drawings required by this RFP as set forth below.

MOH is requiring the submittal of a number of architectural drawings as part of this RFP. In order to mitigate some of the design costs to the Developers submitting Proposals, MOH will reimburse the architect from the selected Developer team whose principal office is located in San Francisco and whose Proposal, in the sole discretion of MOH, has met each of the minimum qualifications described in Section VI, Submission Requirements of this RFP. The total aggregate payment for architectural reimbursables by MOH shall not exceed \$30,000. Reimbursement requests may be made upon a Developer's receipt of notice from MOH that their Proposals were complete and met the minimum qualifications and upon submission of invoices from their Architects.

5. The issuance of this RFP is only an invitation to submit qualifications, and does not constitute an agreement by the City that any contract will actually be entered into by the City. This RFP does not in any way limit the discretion of any City board, commission, employee or official with respect to any review or approval of any aspect of a proposed project.

6. The City will not approve any ground lease for the Site that would allow for its development until there has been compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and, as applicable, the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). If the proposed development is found to cause significant adverse impacts, the City reserves absolute discretion to require additional environmental analysis, and to: (a) modify the project to mitigate significant adverse environmental impacts; (b) select feasible alternatives which avoid significant adverse impacts of the proposed project; or (c) reject or proceed with the project as proposed, depending upon a finding of whether or not the economic and social benefits of the project outweigh otherwise unavoidable significant adverse impacts of the project.

7. The City reserves the right to disqualify any respondent to this RFP based on any real or apparent conflict of interest that is disclosed by the responses submitted or on the basis of other information available to the City. This City may exercise this right in its sole discretion.

## **VII. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

1. Map of the Site
2. RFP Registration Form
3. Staffing Workload Form
4. RFP Submission Checklist

Attachment #1

Map of the Site



Copyright (C) 2005, City and County of San Francisco

**Attachment #2**

**RFP Registration Form**

[Name of your RFP]

Name of Organization:

Address:

Contact Person:

Phone:

Fax:

Email:

**Attachment #3**

**Staffing Workload Form**

Staff Name/Position Title	Total FTE %	% FTE by Task		
		Projects	Admin	Misc

## Attachment #4

### RFP Submission Checklist

Must submit one (1) original and five (5) copies of complete proposal

	<b>Attachment #2, "RFP Registration Form"</b>
	Not more than one (1) page narrative describing the proposed project.
	Residential sources and uses
	Commercial sources and uses (if applicable)
	20-year cash flow projection
	Narrative description of the design concept including the team's approach and the description of construction type, building materials, and green building strategies and elements
	Site plan at 1/32" = 1'-0" showing building massing and the relationship of buildings, open space, streets and parking areas
	Two site sections at 1/32" = 1'-0", one longitudinal and one transverse
	Plans of all floors at 1/32" = 1'-0", showing proposed uses
	Building elevations at 1/32" = 1'-0'
	Describe up to three (3) comparable projects for which the Developer successfully conducted community outreach prior to construction commencement.
	Preliminary community outreach plan of not more than one (1) page
	Business name, primary contact person, street address, telephone number, fax number and email address. Please also include the name and contact information for the Developer's project manager.
	Copy of the certification of corporate good standing from the California Secretary of State and copy of their 501(c)(3) certification from the Internal Revenue Service and the California Franchise Tax Board if team member is a non-profit.
	Identify the type of organization and the length of time the organization has been in business
	Résumés for all "Key Personnel", including but not limited to: executive directors and/or principals of all team members, the project manager, project architect(s), property supervisors, and social service provider(s) who will be involved in the development, design, operation and management of the Site
	<b>Attachment #3, "Staffing Workload Form"</b>
	Latest two (2) years of either: signed federal income tax returns (including schedules or attachments, if any) or audited financial statements
	Describe in detail one (1) to three (3) projects completed by the Developer (and co-Developer if a joint venture), preferably in San Francisco, that are comparable to the proposed project in terms of construction type (e.g. Type I, III, V; new construction vs. rehabilitation), financing method(s) and population served
	Complete list of <u>all</u> Developer's (and co-Developer's if a joint venture) completed projects within San Francisco starting with the most recently completed project
	For the Property Manager, describe all comparable projects currently managed, preferably in San Francisco
	Describe up to three (3) projects for which the Social Service Provider is currently

	providing services to a population comparable to the target population proposed in this RFP
	Preliminary services plan of not more than one (1) page
	Operating budget and 15-year cash flow projection for the social services plan
	Describe at least one, but no more than three (3), completed comparable developments including dates completed and client contact information for each
	Photos of the interiors and exteriors of the comparable projects listed for architect's experience
	Describe green building design experience
	Describe experience designing affordable housing funded by federal, state or local funding sources