



**Vital Brooklyn RFP Sites E, F, G & H, I, J, K, and L Addendum 6**  
**RFP Issue Date: November 29, 2018**  
**Addendum 6 Issue Date: March 21, 2019**

**Contents of the Addendum**

**A. Questions and Answers-** Enclosed is a summary of questions and answers in response to questions sent to the HCR Vital Brooklyn RFP email address.

**A. Questions and Answers-** Enclosed is a summary of questions and answers in response to questions sent to the HCR Vital Brooklyn RFP email address.

**All Sites**

- 1. Should Form F also be used if one is planning on structuring their deal as a 9% LIHTC project? The form would need to be altered to accommodate a traditional construction loan and 9% credits.**

A: Yes, Form F should be used for a 9% LIHTC project proposal, with modifications made as necessary. As a reminder, a 9% LIHTC proposal is considered competitive financing, and a non-competitive financing proposal must also be submitted for review, or the proposal will be considered incomplete.

- 2. Addendum 3, Question 1, stated that OPWDD Supportive Housing rental and supportive service subsidies through the ESSHI program are not considered competitive, for the purposes of this RFP. Can you please confirm that subsidies through the ESSHI program are not considered competitive funds – whether the ESSHI contract is through OPWDD, OMH, OTDA, or other state contracting agency -- as a general rule for this RFP?**

A: ESSHI awards for services and operating (rental subsidy) for supportive housing are not considered competitive for the purposes of this RFP. Capital financing from OPWDD, OMH, OTDA, or another state or City agency (i.e. financing that would be listed in the capital stack) are considered competitive.

- 3. Form G, “Credit Report,” requires submission of Principals’ personal social security numbers, including those in non-controlling and non-ownership roles. Please clarify if credit reports and Lexis Nexis reports will be run on all parties and individuals listed, and whether those reports are run on all applicant development teams, or only those selected as finalists? The concern being that an increased number of credit checks run can negatively impact an individual’s personal credit score. Based on past experience with HCR-funded projects, that individual SSN information is not required/used until an award is pending rather than at the initial application stage.**

A: Applicants may submit just the last four digits of their Principals’ social security numbers. Lexis Nexis reports are only run on finalists.

- 4. If possible at this time, please provide the Disclosure Statement forms referenced on page 43 of the RFP.**

A: These documents are not available to RFP Applicants.

**Site K**

- 5. What are the accurate dimensions of Site K? Or is it suggested that we refer to the tax lot dimensions?**

A: Proposals should refer to tax lot dimensions for the dimensions of Site K.

- 6. Is Block 4603, Lot 22 part of Site K?**

A: Block 4603, Lot 22 is not part of Site K.

- 7. Attachment 4, Addendum 1 shows the inclusion of a small portion of Block 4603, Lot 5 in the drawing for site K. Based on google maps this would**

**appear to be a small building on the adjacent gas station lot. Is this drawing correct?**

A: Site K only includes Block 4603, Lot 1.

- 8. For the proposed R7 rezoning on Site K, can we assume additional bulk allowances for Affordable Independent Residences for Seniors (AIRS)?**

A: If the proposal meets all qualifications for AIRS, then proposals may assume AIRS allowances.

- 9. Will the 270 required onsite parking spaces be attendant-operated? It would appear that the existing parking on Site K is attended, and therefore we expect the same scenario moving forward.**

A: Attendant parking is not required; Respondents should propose a parking scenario that is most efficient and useful for the Project.

- 10. For the Site K rezoning can we assume a designation of R7-1 or R7-2?**

A: Proposals can assume a designation of R7-2.

- 11. As stated in Section VI. Financing Information and Conditions, we should assume parking income of \$275/monthly per space for all 270 spaces. Is this a contract between the Hospital and Developer, with a guaranteed payment? For how many years? Can we assume annual escalators?**

A: The parking income of \$275/monthly per space for all 270 spaces is a placeholder number; no annual escalators should be assumed.

- 12. As stated in Sect. IV.F. Parking Lot (Site K), we should assume an R7 zoning with a C2-5 commercial overlay. Does the overlay apply to the whole site?**

A: The C2-5 Commercial Overlay applies to the entire site.

- 13. Can we propose additional waivers and discretionary approvals given the complications of the site, specifically with regards to increasing the maximum building height?**

A: No, proposals need to meet R7-2 zoning regulations.

#### **Site L**

- 14. What assumptions can be made about a partnership with 1199 SEIU for the Community Hub? What rent can we assume they can pay? Square footage requirements? What programs do they want to bring? Are we expected to reach out to them directly?**

A: As stated in *Section V. Development Objectives G. SUNY Clarkson (Site L)* of the RFP, the focus for the Community Hub is to include any tenant(s) who can provide the services specified, open to the community at-large. In addition, community facility space should generate rents supported by market comparables. The Development Objectives for the Site L Community Hub include community facility services that provide childcare, adult education, employment training, financial literacy, small business support, and youth-centric services. Additionally, the Development Objectives state that the community facility space should connect the community to affordable healthy food options, work to address the shortage of community gathering spaces, and provide amenities

such as gyms and activity areas, including youth spaces. A partnership with 1199 SEIU as one of the tenants in the Community Hub is optional, and not required.

**15. Has NYSDEC and/or National Grid provided a timeline for additional investigation and remediation of Site L? If so, can you provide those anticipated milestones?**

A: No timeline has been provided.

**16. Has NYSDEC and/or National Grid concluded whether the site investigation and remediation will be concurrent with site development, or is it anticipated that developer will close on the deal after remediation has been completed? Will National Grid remediate Site L, or will the Developer remediate the site and be reimbursed by National Grid? If remediation is to be conducted by the Developer, have reimbursable cost categories been established with National Grid? If so, can you provide? If developers carry out any environmental remedial work prior to closing, will HCR reimburse these costs? The SMP/Consent Order does not make explicitly clear whether National Grid as Responsible Party will necessarily be responsible for the cost of demolition of the existing building. For the purposes of this RFP, should development budgets submitted for Site L include the cost of demolition or not?**

A: All costs of remediation are the responsibility of the responsible party. Addendum 2, Question 26 provides all additional relevant information: "All aspects of the remediation of Site L will be governed by Attachments 5 and 6, the Order on Consent and Administrative Settlement and subsequent modification, of which National Grid is the subject and which will expediate the investigation and remediation of the Site. The Order specifies that National Grid (previously the Brooklyn Union Gas Company) is the Respondent responsible to investigate the site, develop a cleanup plan, and remediate the site in accordance to Department of Environmental Conservation-approved work plans."