

CLARIFICATION NO. 5

Request For Proposals for TOD Development – Capitol Hill Properties Redevelopment RFP # RTA/RP 0010-14

This document is issued in response to properly submitted Requests For Information and is intended to provide clarification to the above referenced Request for Proposals (RFP). When possible, the questions are provided in the form they were submitted, including any grammatical errors, so as not to change their meaning. Changes to the RFP will be made only by formally issued addenda, specifically amending the RFP.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
1.		The ground lease terms currently do not provide a rate of return required by Sound Transit, in order to determine equivalency to the appraised Fair Market Values provided for the sites. Will this be provided?	Sound Transit does not have an established rate of return.
2.		Will you be making the appraisals public?	The appraisals will be available to proposers via e-bid
3.		The housing tool requires Net Residential SF to be 80-85%. Please define what counts for the residential area in the determination of the 15-20% load factor? For example, does the load factor calculation include vertical circulation? Does it include required residential amenity areas?	Hallways, elevator shafts, stairwells, group residential amenity areas (gyms, lobby etc) are included in the 15 – 20%. 80-85% of the residential square footage should be rentable square footage.
4.		Are the buildings required to be LEED certified or LEED designed?	LEED certified
5.		Are the townhouses required along 10 th Avenue considered live/work units? If so, how do they count in the housing tool?	The townhouses required along 10 th are not considered live-work units. The housing tool treats live-work units as commercial square footage that is not included in the residential unit count.
6.		Can you reuse the existing tower crane footing?	The crane footing will be left as detailed in the station restoration plan. It will be at the discretion of the developer to determine whether the existing crane footing is appropriate for your use.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
7.		How is a residential floor defined?	There is not a minimum unit count required to meet an existing definition of “residential floor” however, a residential floor is a floor that is dedicated to residential units and support services for those units (ie: laundry facilities, etc.)
8.		What is the definition of an open bedroom?	An open bedroom is a room that is intended to count as a bedroom but is not separated from other living spaces by floor to ceiling walls.
9.		How is a bedroom being defined – is it the Building Code definition?	yes
10.		What conditions will the sites be delivered in? Are the sites being brought to grade?	The sites are not being brought to grade please refer to the site restoration plan included in the project requirements documents for complete information.
11.		Scoring sheets currently only provide points for LEED certification. What number of ESDS points are you considering as equivalent to LEED – Silver, LEED – Gold, and LEED – Platinum, respectively? Does this vary by site?	50 ESDS points = LEED Silver 70 ESDS points = LEED Gold 85 ESDS points = LEED Platinum
12.		Currently, there does not appear to be points allocated for the community center in the development score sheets for the eligible sites. Is there a separate community center scoring sheet? When will this be provided?	Points for the community center will be issued with this set of RFI clarifications.
13.		What amount of variability is being assumed as the projects move through design review and the community engagement process? What sensitivity (or lack of) will be given to this reality in considering potential disqualifications after award?	This is something the agency weighs on a case by case basis. We don’t have a hard and fast rule, but we understand that there can be variance between proposals and permitted projects based on funding availability and other realities that may present themselves during the project. At minimum, a project must comply with development agreement and a proposer must not substantively change their proposal.
14.		For Site A, does the appraised value per square foot apply to the land for the plaza and Nagle Place Extension?	The appraisal for Site A takes into account that Nagle Place Extension and the plaza are not buildable. The price per square foot quoted in the RFP is applicable only to the buildable sqft.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
15.		Does retail height have to be uniform across Broadway to qualify for points?	<p>The design team should strive to design the retail floor to floor height to meet the specified height for as much of the story as possible. Recognizing that the presence of slope presents challenges, the evaluation team may consider awarding full points even though a minor portion of the retail floor to floor height is less than the specified amount.</p> <p>In terms of varying the height from bay to bay, the points for height will be given based on the average height across all bays with 15' being the minimum height allowed. If heights between retail bays vary, there must be a compelling reason that can be explained in the narrative of the retail approach.</p>
16.	RFP, Attachment A, No. 3 Project Approach; RFP, Section 1.03 Background Conditions and Constraints	<p>How strictly must the parking access diagram in the CDP (pages 15-17) be adhered to?</p> <p>a. The access ramp shown for Site A looks like it was designed without consideration of Sound Transit's Tunnel Easement Envelope and is therefore not achievable. Similarly, the garage plans shown on Sites B-South and B-North look like they encroach on the station box and Site A below ground.</p> <p>b. The garage access for Sites B-North and B-South is shown right on the property line. Can this access point be moved to be entirely within Site B-North or Site B-South instead? The buildings won't necessarily abut one another at the property line (Building and Fire Codes would require a minimum of 10' separation b/w the buildings if units with windows were to be provided on that wall, for example).</p>	<p>The parking access diagram in the CDP is illustrative. Access ramps and garage access should be designed with ST's tunnel easements and can be moved, so long as the number of access points and the streets they originate from remain.</p> <p>You cannot encroach on the envelope without ST's written permission; we may consider allowing specific encroachments to the station box on an individual basis.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
17.		<p>Are habitable portions of buildings (levels 2 and above) allowed to project into the NPE (which is not a public street according to the document) and 10th Ave E setback areas, provided that the listed elements are provided and that code-required minimum horizontal and vertical clearances are maintained?</p> <p><i>The Development Agreement states:</i></p> <p><i>Section 7.2 “The buildings shall be set back five feet from the property line along 10th Avenue East, to make room for stoops, private gardens, and entry courtyards within this setback. Stoops must be provided on the east building facade.”</i></p> <p><i>Section 7.4 “On the west [of Sites B North and South], each building shall be set back 11 feet from NPE to provide for amenity areas, including a five-foot wide sidewalk, and to make room for entries, private courtyards, private gardens, and stoops, if the developer chooses to include stoops on the west facade.”</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.3 “The east-west building depth for all floors not partially below grade shall be a maximum of 80 feet.”</i></p> <p><i>Section 7.1 “... the maximum building depth shall be 72 feet.”</i></p>	<p>DPD would regard both the 10th Ave. E. and Nagle Place setbacks as building setbacks as described, in SMC subsection 23.47A.014. Certain structures are allowed to project into building setbacks.</p>
18.		<p>The CDP shows a 5’ “Bay and Balcony” zone on the east and west sides of the building on Sites B; this zone is mentioned in the RFP as a required “Amenity Area”, but it is not mentioned in the DA. What is considered a “bay” or a “balcony”? Are there maximum or minimum dimensions for a bay or balcony? Is the 5’ dimension of the “zone” a maximum projection from the envelope, a minimum projection, or an average?</p>	<p>The five foot dimension is a maximum projection. Bays and balconies are both projections from the exterior wall of the façade. Balconies provide outside amenity space while bays are enclosed space that can be counted in the total sqft. Bays and balcony zones were included to provide a tool for façade modulation.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
19.		Site B – 72’ max building width was regulated before the Lot Boundary Adjustments. Given the LBA plus required setbacks the max building width possible is 71’. From where to where is this measured? Exterior wall to exterior wall? Do “bays” impact this building width? How many bays can you have before the bays become a part of the building width?	Allowed projections into a building setback would not be included in a measurement of maximum building depth. Exterior wall to exterior wall would be the basis for the measurement.
20.		How is height of ground floor retail measured? From lowest retail space at grade, from average grade, etc.” If the ground floor retail floor-to-ceiling dimension varies, for example in relation to a sloping ground plane, how shall the measurement be taken (at all points along the slope at the greatest height or some other way)?	Measurement should be taken at all points along the slope at the greatest height.
21.		In evaluating the number of floors in each building, will mezzanine levels be counted? If so, what is the definition of a mezzanine? Per Building Code or land use code?	DPD relies on the Building Code to determine if a full story is present or if the area is a mezzanine. If the Building Code required ceiling height is not present, DPD would regard the area as a storage loft, or mezzanine for both Building Code and Land Use Code purposes.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
22.		<p>The scoring metrics indicate a desire to see materials and finishes and detailed budgets, but the reality of the upcoming design process, which will include City Design Review and community engagement, not to mention a possible redesign for Master Developers awarded all sites who can then benefit from efficiencies of shared amenities, precludes a <i>final</i> design at this stage. The RFP makes a couple mentions of the possibility of being rescored or disqualified during negotiations and updates to the proposal, which would suggest changes to the design. To what degree are specific design ideas considered set-in-stone commitments at this stage, given the potential changes, particularly in relation to the risk of disqualification?</p>	<p>If you examine the program elements that receive scores, the language in the RFP is meant to hold developers to the spirit of their submitted proposal. While ST understands that some changes may occur as a result of award or financing requirements, any substantive change will lead to the proposal being rescored. If that rescoring results in a different ranking of the submitted proposals it may trigger a best and final offer with the competing proposer. Any adaptations must still comply with the development agreement or a proposer may be disqualified.</p>
23.		<p>For teams intending to propose as a master developer, and thus submit on all sites, how are these submissions scored in relation to proposals that are solely for an individual site?</p>	<p>All sites are scored independent of one-another on the elements listed in the RFP. There are a variety of ways to increase a proposal's competitiveness and we anticipate that while a master developer may distribute elements between sites, they will pay attention to the bettering the elements they propose on each site to make their proposal most competitive.</p>
24.		<p>Shared benefits across sites can only be realized in Master Developer schemes if all sites are considered together – For example, residential amenity areas or parking can be pooled across sites, but only if they are planned together. So if a Master Developer proposes on each individual site with consideration to a design that utilizes all sites together, only one site may have a required amenity (community center, shared parking, heightened green factor) and the others will not. In the current scoring mechanism, the site that did not have such element would not be eligible for the points for such element, thus disadvantaging the proposal when compared to a submission that provided all the elements on each site.</p>	<p>ST would expect master developers who are dispersing programmatic elements between sites to increase the competitiveness of each set of elements they propose for each site to improve their project as it compares to proposers who are competing on a single site. Based on the constraints of the sites, requirements that could be pooled ie: green factor, parking and amenity areas were spread over the sites strategically in the CDP.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
25.		<p>A similar challenge would exist if a team proposing on all sites with a shared amenity approach is awarded less than all sites, so a redesign would likely be necessary to retain services and amenities previously planned across all sites, however this seems as though it could lead to a disqualification of such site.</p> <p>a. (similar) How will the Community Center approach be assessed between individual proposals and master developer proposals? There appears to be no mechanism for a Master Developer to coordinate providing a community center on one site and still compete with individual developers.</p> <p>b. (similar) How will the residential amenity areas be assessed between individual proposals and master developer proposals? The unit mix and total number of units earn the greatest percentage of points in the RFP Evaluation Criteria (25%). In order to maximize total unit counts relative to building GSF, some private residential amenity areas may suffer relative to market demand/expectation. A Master Developer has the opportunity to spread out the amenity areas across sites, whereas an individual developer may not have the same opportunity. How will this be assessed?</p>	<p>ST would anticipate that a proposer whose project approach was based on four sites might need moderate flexibility if awarded less than all sites, however, awards will be made on the basis of what is proposed in response to the RFP, and any substantive change to that proposal may warrant reconsidering the pool of proposals to determine the most responsive proposal.</p> <p>a. The community center approach will be assessed per the narrative included in the RFP. Each site will be assessed separately and therefore, if a community center is included in a proposal, it will be evaluated. The community center is only one component of any site’s development program and proposals can be competitive with or without a community center.</p> <p>b. Each site has a minimum of 15% and a maximum of 20% gsf of the residential areas that are not counted in the residential sqft. Each site’s residential amenities will be assessed individually.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
26.		<p>The Site A Evaluation Scoring Sheet and Attachment C, Site A – Amenity Areas approach seem to have some cut-and-paste typos. The requirements and considerations for the “Narrative and visual depiction of the pedestrian link along the east façade of the building between the Denny Way plinth and the building pass through” are listed twice. The second occurrence list four different requirements/criteria at the end. To what do these refer? Should it be about an “upper floor bay and balcony zone” like on the other sites?</p>	<p>The second list of requirements/criteria are meant to refer to the “upper floor bay and balcony zones” similar to the other sites.</p>
27.		<p>(all Evaluation Scoring Sheets and Attachment C, Green Factor & Sustainability Approach) How will green factor and sustainability strategies not listed on the scoring sheet or in the Development Program Requirements and Priorities be scored? There are some specific strategies listed, but what if you propose other strategies not listed? How are they scored? The documents say that “Other discretionary sustainability elements may be proposed” but don’t indicate how they’ll be scored.</p>	<p>For the purposes of scoring green factor, Sound Transit is most concerned with meeting the Green Factor requirement spelled out in the Development Agreement per each site. Alternative solutions to the green factor requirement may be proposed as long as they comply with code requirements. The evaluation team will determine whether the solution meets the requirement outlined in the DA. Within the remaining points available for green factor, alternative solutions will be qualitatively scored.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
28.		<p>(RFP, Section 1.11.B Proposal Submittal + Section 4.02.C General Proposal Format) Does Sound Transit have a requirement for the organization of the “Body of the Proposal” for teams presenting “multiple sites under a single cover”? Since it is unclear how these master developer proposals will be scored in relation to individual proposals it is unclear whether or not they should be organized to facilitate a site-to-site comparison or not.</p> <p>The preferred approach to reduce duplication of non-site specific submittal criteria (such as financing strategies, coordination plans, engagement strategy, etc.) would be to organize the body of the proposal could be organized by Evaluation Criteria first and by Site second:</p> <p>For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. No. 1 Development Program: Site A, Site B-North, etc. ii. No. 2 Financial Capacity and Project Financials: Financing Plan: Site A, Site B-North, etc. iii. No. 3 Project Approach: Implementation Approach: Site A, Site B-North, etc. iv. No. 4 Transaction Structure: Sale Proforma: Site A, Site B-North, etc. <p>Also, If a team were submitting only on one site this would be the default organization.</p>	<p>Your proposed organization is sufficient. In order to evaluate proposals on a site by site basis, we need to have each element of the proposal stand alone. All proposals for site A will be evaluated together, site B, and so forth. However, responding site by site, organized by section of the RFP (as you proposed) would be responsive to that need.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
29.		RFP, Section 4.02.B General Proposal Format states that “No more than two (2) single-sided 11x17 sheets are allowed” per proposal. For teams that are submitting “proposals for multiple sites under a single cover” (as per RFP, Section 1.11.B) what does this mean? Would it be two (2) single-sided 11x17 sheets per site, and therefore potentially eight (8) single-sided 11x17 sheets?	2 11 x 17” single-sided sheets are allowed for each development site.
30.		RFP, Section 4.02.B General Proposal Format states that “Proposers may use 11” by 17” sheets for figures, drawings or tables to enhance legibility” and then limits the number of 11x17 sheets that can be used (see RFI above). Would you consider removing the limit? Given the submittal requirements, there are likely not enough sheets for figures or drawings, since the Housing Tool spreadsheet for each site will require at least one (1) 11x17 sheet per site, and the Gantt Chart schedule will likely require one (1) 11x17 sheet per site.	2 11 x 17” single-sided sheets are allowed for each development site, in addition to sheets needed to complete the housing tool and project schedule.
31.		RFP, Section 4.02.C General Proposal Format indicates that “Financial Capacity Submittals” and “Project Financials Submittals” should be in the Appendix – What are these? And, how are they separate things? The names potentially correspond to submittal requirements in two Evaluation Criteria Categories: “No. 2 Financial Capacity and Project Financials” (audited financial statements; bank/credit references; Funding Plan by Site; Simultaneous Development Financing description; financial strategies for market weathering; detailed examples of financing similar projects) and “No. 4 Transaction Structure (proformas)? In all cases, the submittal requirements listed do not indicate whether or not they should appear in the Body of the proposal or the Appendix. Can you clarify?	<p>Financial Capacity Submittals refer to the financial documents you were asked to submit as a part of the RFQ process. Many did not submit complete sets. This is an opportunity to do that and respond to weaknesses the evaluation team identified in the RFQ process.</p> <p>Project Financials are a list of sources and uses for the site you are proposing to develop as well as the pro forms we are asking for as a part of the transaction structure. The Financial capacity submittal should be in the appendix. The sources and uses list and pro forma should be discussed in the body of the proposal but should be included in the appendix.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
32.		<p>Our firm is considering making a substitution to one of the team members presented in our qualifications for the TOD sites. Does a substitution require approval from Sound Transit and if so, can you please let us know what we need to do to obtain approval?</p>	<p>Firms should notify Sound Transit in their proposal of any such substitutions and provide a justification for the substitution. Sound Transit will determine if a substitution is acceptable prior to making final selections.</p>
33.	Arch	<p>Can Site C's and/or Site A's retail connect into the transit station entries?</p> <p>We understand that station wall has been built already, but we want to clarify if there is any portion of the station that can connect directly to the adjacent retail space. The CDP shows CHS-North with a connection via door, is this the case?</p>	<p>No, Site C's and/or Site A's retail cannot connect to the transit station entries.</p> <p>No portion of any station entry can connect directly to any TOD. The door that appears to connect CHS-North entry with Site A serves Sound Transit station-specific functions only.</p>
34.	ROW	<p>Is there an easement for the CHS on the sites, do the sites have air rights over the stations?</p> <p>In Section 1.6 of the Development Agreement it mentions that all sites must conform to dimensions and locations depicted in CDP. Also CDP TOD Site Dimensions says "site dimensions fixed due to... ..the agency's decision to limit construction over the top of the station tunnel and box..."</p>	<p>If ST chooses to sell a TOD site then ST will convey the property subject to some reserved 3 dimensional easements that will envelope the underground and aboveground portions of the station structure including certain footings and pilasters that intrude into the TOD lots.</p> <p>However, if ST chooses to lease out a TOD site then, in lieu of easements, ST will have lease restrictions in the lease that perform the same function of protecting the station elements and giving the station elements a right to exist.</p> <p>Generally speaking ST will retain air rights above all aboveground station elements.</p>
35.	Arch	<p>Can the plinths on the sites be removed or altered so that the plaza side of the buildings can be ground level or, are they part of the design because the height and location of the station box requires them? We are concerned that as specified, the height of the plinth at the plaza will discourage connection between building A and the Plaza.</p>	<p>The plinths indicated in the CDP are not, nor will they be, constructed by Sound Transit. They reflect one possible solution to the grade change challenges along Denny Way east of Broadway. Other creative solutions to the grade change are encouraged and would be considered.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
36.	Arch	What is the Station Vent used for? What is the content of what will come out of it? How frequently will it be used? What is the sound decibel level when in use?	The Vent Structure identified as # 17 on Sheet 13 of the CDP contains emergency exhaust fans for the station. These fans are part of the station emergency smoke evacuation system. They only operate in the event of a station fire. The fans are typically tested monthly for 30 minutes. Note that the vent design includes mitigating measures to contain and reduce noise from these fans.
37.	Arch	What is the relationship between buildings B-North and B-South buildings? Will there be a party-wall and they will be treated as two separate buildings, or will they function as a single building reading as two separate buildings?	Buildings B-north and B-south can be two separate buildings if desired. Connecting buildings B-south and B-north by a party wall as seen in the CDP was ST's solution to provide the largest building footprint. ST believes that B-north and B-south represent an opportunity for a single parking podium if desired. Building(s), including party walls, are to be designed to address UDF goals, Land Use codes, Building codes and any other applicable codes of AHJ's (Authorities Having Jurisdiction).
38.	Arch	What is the space between Site A and CHS-North Entry and how do they interact, especially adjacent to the CHS-North escalators which is shown as about a 10' gap? Is this a setback or fire-rated wall issue? How does Site A's upper floors interface with the Station, must it be a fire rated wall on that side?	This is not a fire-rated wall issue. The north/south exterior wall of the North Entry (adjacent to Site A) is a 10" thick concrete wall with no openings. Due to the height of the wall (approximately 41' from the top of the station box), there are structural pilasters perpendicular to the wall. As the North Entry does not align precisely with the station box below there is a footing for the wall and pilasters within the 10' gap.
39.	Arch	Is tree planting allowed over the tunnel and along Nagle Street between Site A & B? The festival street plan 2013 shows trees in other locations, but not on Nagle between Site A & B.	Tree planting is allowed over the tunnel. Trees and other landscape elements within the site and in the ROW adjacent to the Plaza are to be designed to address COS Green Factor requirements and other applicable City of Seattle codes.
40.		Is a partner who may execute an MOU or lease with the development team but not part of the team putting together the RFP response also excluded from speaking with Sound Transit staff or board during the RFP response period?	Proposers and/or their team members and prospective partners may communicate with Sound Transit staff or board members regarding the RFP only if it is within the regular job duties of the staff member or board member.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
41.		What is the impact to the scoring if the proposed program cannot support the appraised land value and an alternative land value is provided?	Per the score sheets disclosed in the RFP, each element has a different point value, if you are unable to meet the proposed program, your score will be docked accordingly. If these programmatic changes constitute violating the Development Agreement, your submittal may be disqualified.
42.		Will a proposal be disqualified if the appraised land value is not reached in the submitted transaction structure	Yes, a pass/fail requirement of the RFP is agreeing to pay fair market value or greater determined by ST's FTA approved appraisals.
43.		When will the appraisals be released?	The appraisals are expected back from the FTA in early to mid-October. They will be released at that time.
44.		When will we see the community center scoring?	This has been provided via Addendum #1.
45.		<p>The zoning code definition for 'customer service office' is as follows: <i>"Customer service offices are uses in which services are provided to individuals and households in an office setting in a manner that encourages walk-in clientele and in which generally an appointment is not needed to conduct business, including but not limited to uses such as branch banks, travel agencies, brokerage firms, real estate offices, and government agencies that provide direct services to clients."</i></p> <p>Given the highly visible and public nature of the plaza, why is a 'customer service office' specifically excluded from being located in Site B-South directly adjacent to the plaza?</p>	The development agreement was a multi-party, multi-year negotiation. Finding out why that specific exclusion was included would require an extensive amount of research. Sound Transit does not intend to open the development agreement to renegotiate that item.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
46.		<p>The development agreement allows a 6 story building within the 74'11" height limit. However, DPD does not restrict the number of floors within a given height limit, but requires affordable housing over the given height limit.</p> <p>a) If a framing system other than Type 5 over Type 1 were designed to fit within the 74'11" height limit, and could accommodate an additional floor while maintaining a 15' ceiling height on level 1 and a market acceptable ceiling height on upper floors, would this additional floor allowed and not subject to the affordable requirement?</p> <p>b) If 2 additional levels were able to fit within the 85' height limit, would both floors be allowed, subject to the affordability requirements?</p>	<p>a) Any additional floor within the 74'11" height limit would need to participate in the Multi-family tax exemption program.</p> <p>b) Both floors would be allowed subject to the affordability requirements as long as they complied with city code.</p>
47.		Do we have flexibility to suggest creative solutions for site A's grade issues, instead of the tall podium?	Yes
48.		Do we have flexibility to modify the streetscape that the Sound Transit station design indicates?	The streetscape must comply with the requirements laid out in the MUP 240.
49.		Is there an overhead clearance requirement for the fire lane? Is so, what is the height?	Comply with applicable Seattle Municipal and Fire Code requirements.
50.		The Sound Transit Farmers Market document indicates that we need 20' of space between vendor stall rows, however, The Coordinated Development Plan is using 13' spacing between stall rows. Please clarify the requirement.	The coordinated development plan was amended to the development agreement and therefore is the spacing to use.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
51.		<p>Concerning bays and balconies on Building A’s west façade (along Broadway): A section drawing on pg. 4 of the CDP show a 4’ “Balcony/Bay Zone.” However, SMC 23.53.035.B5 (see below) says the maximum allowable encroachment into a public right of way is 3’. Is the maximum encroachment 3’ or 4’, and if there was a negotiation with the city and a 4’ encroachment is allowed, are there additional changes to 23.53.035 concerning the dimensions of encroachments or the allowable percentage of facade?</p> <p>(SMC 23.53.035.B5: “Depth: The maximum horizontal projection for a structural building overhang, measured to the furthest exterior element, shall be 3 feet, and the projection shall in no case be closer than 8 feet to the centerline of any alley (see Exhibit B for 23.53.035).”)</p>	<p>Due to the additional dedication of 4’ to the sidewalk on Broadway, the bay and balcony zone shall be as shown in the CDP. There are no additional changes to 23.53.035</p>
52.		<p>Concerning bays and balconies on Building A’s east façade: A section drawings on pg. 4 of the CDP show a “Balcony/Bay Zone” for the west façade of building A, but not the east façade. Are balconies and bays allowed to project on the east façade in the same way as the west?</p>	<p>Bays and balconies are not allowed over the vent shaft.</p>
53.		<p>Concerning Bays on Building B’s east and west facades: According to Sound Transit’s Clarification 1, No. 17 “DPD would regard both the 10th Ave. E. and Nagle Place setbacks as building setbacks as described, in SMC subsection 23.47A.014. Certain structures are allowed to project into building setbacks.” Those “certain structures,” according to the SMC 23.47A.014, include “decks and balconies,” but not bays. However, the section drawing on pg. 4 of the CPD indicates a “Balcony/Bay Overhang Zone” on the east and west facades of Building B. Are bays allowable projections into Building B’s east and west setbacks? SMC section cited does not address this.</p>	<p>Structures projecting into building setbacks on the east and west facades of Building B shall comply with applicable requirements of the SMC. Bays are allowable per SMC section 23.45.518H3.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
54.		Concerning Stoops: Stoops are “allowed at the developer’s discretion” according to pg. 7 of the IDP, but required according to 7.2 of the Development Agreement. Are Stoops required or discretionary?	Stoops are required on the east façade of buildings B-north and B-south and they are allowed at the developer’s discretion on the west façade of buildings B-north and B-south.
55.		In the Sound Transit issued Clarification No. 1 dated August 27th, 2014, Sound Transit Clarification Response to item number 2. states that “The appraisals will be available to proposers via e-bid.” When can we expect to have access to these appraisals?	See #43.
56.		Response to item number 12. states that “Points for the community center will be issued with this set of RFI clarifications.” We don’t see where this document has been issued? When can we expect it to be released?	This has been addressed via addendum #1.
57.		At the Pre-Proposal Meeting on August 11th Sound Transit representatives informed the group that feedback would be provided on the scoring of the developers during the RFQ process. When can we expect to receive this?	This information was distributed on 9/16/2014.
58.		All developer questions are due to Sound Transit by September 5th at 5pm. How soon can we expect to receive clarifications to these and other questions?	This deadline has been extended via addendum #1.
59.		With the proposal deadline of October 13th quickly approaching we are concerned with having not yet received the pertinent information listed above. The delay of releasing information is impacting our ability to progress with our proposal and design development. Is Sound Transit considering extending the Proposal Due Date?	This has been addressed via addendum #1.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
60.	On page 8, section C. of the original RFP	<p>“The proposal shall be organized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cover sheet 2. Table of contents 3. Body of proposal 4. Appendix <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Financial Capacity submittals b. Project Financials submittals c. Site specific scoring tools <p>Does “site specific scoring tools” refer to the housing tool for each site?</p>	Yes. Site specific scoring tool refers to the housing tool for each site.
61.		We are encouraged to develop a relationship with Capitol Hill Chamber of Commerce, and scored on this. How would you like us to document this relationship?	You are scored on your neighborhood engagement strategy and also for your retail approach. If there is a relationship with the Capitol Hill Chamber of commerce it should be reflected in these two sections.
62.		<p>The Coordinated Development Plan references a 17,000 square foot “rooftop amenity area” for Building A. What is Sound Transit’s definition of a “rooftop amenity area?” Is this the same as the Seattle DPD definition as written in Seattle Land Use code 23.84A.002 for “amenity area”?</p> <p><i>“Amenity area” means space that provides opportunity for active or passive recreational activity for residents of a development or structure, including landscaped open spaces, decks and balconies, roof gardens, plazas, courtyards, play areas, and sport courts.</i></p>	Yes. Sound Transit is requiring a green roof on site A, but it should also comply with the DPD definition of an amenity area.
63.		Does an unoccupied green roof comply with Sound Transit’s definition?	An unoccupied green roof would count towards your green factor, but would not perform well against the amenity area approach, unless your proposal met that requirement in another creative way.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
64.		When will you be providing the Developer Lists of deficiencies from the RFQ?	This information was distributed on 9/16/2014.
65.		Can you attach anything to the Vent structure?	No. The vent structure contains electrical and mechanical equipment and is a component structure of Sound Transit's Capitol Hill Station.
66.	<p>RFP, Attachment A – RFP Evaluation Criteria, 1.03 Evaluation Criteria, No. 1 Development Program, Submittal Requirements 2. (page 12)</p> <p>+ Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Capitol Hill RFP Project Elements – Quantitative Evaluation: Housing Approach Site X</p> <p>+ Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, RP 0010-14 Housing Tool All Sites</p>	<p>In the description of the No. 1 Development Program evaluation criteria there is a list of “approaches” that should be responded to in the proposal. Included in the list is the “Housing Program” (page 12). Since the “Housing Program” does not have any points allocated in the score sheet, can you clarify if it is to correspond to points under the Submittal Requirement (1) or to points under the Housing Tool Submittal Requirement (2)?</p>	<p>The “Housing Program” included in the list refers to the Housing Tool Submittal Requirement (2)</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
67.	RFP, Attachment A – RFP Evaluation Criteria, 1.03 Evaluation Criteria, No. 3 Project Approach, Submittal Requirements 2. (page 14) + Attachment D – Technical Documents, General Guidelines for Design Review	<p>In order to respond to how our team’s proposal addresses the “General Guidelines for Design Review” we do not expect to provide actual submittals under these Guidelines at this time.</p> <p>Please confirm that the provision of any of the drawings and/or descriptions of the construction means and methods as listed under the "Minimum Submittal Requirements – Prior to Final Review"? are only required post award, once the project is actually before Design Review.</p>	Submittals under the design guidelines are required post award.
68.	RFP, Article 4 Contents of Proposals, 4.02 General Proposal Format, C.4.c (page 08)	“Site specific scoring tools” is listed as a submittal requirement for the Appendix. Does this refer specifically to just the two scoring tools that were provided by ST with the RFP: 1) Development Program Scoring spreadsheets, and 2) RP 0010-14 Housing Tool All Sites?	This refers to the Housing Tool only. The development program scoring spreadsheets are provided for the proposer’s information only. They are not intended to be filled out or submitted by the proposers

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
69.	<p>RFP, Attachment A – RFP Evaluation Criteria, 1.03 Evaluation Criteria, No. 1 Development Program, Submittal Requirements 1. (page 12)</p> <p>+ Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Development Program Scoring spreadsheet (aka SITE X EVALUATION SCORING SHEET), Green Factor and Sustainability Approach</p>	<p>Under the submittal requirements for the Green Factor and Sustainability Approach for each site, teams are asked to provide a “Narrative and visual depiction (as necessary) for Sustainability Elements: On-site treatment and/or use of Site A’s stormwater runoff (ST approval required).”</p> <p>Can you please provide clarification of what is expected by this qualification around “ST approval required”? Is it expected that Sound Transit will need to provide approval for a team’s proposed approach prior to submittal?</p>	<p>There is no need for ST approval before submitting proposals. ST approval is needed as the selected developer advances designs prior to applying for permits.</p>
70.	<p>Site B-North</p>	<p>Affordable Housing is often developed with no parking on site. Has this been considered in the evaluation, i.e. can you confirm that the site is not penalized if no parking is offered?</p>	<p>There is no penalty if no parking is included on B-north.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
71.	<p>Sites A & C RFP, Attachment A – RFP Evaluation Criteria, 1.03 Evaluation Criteria, No. 1 Development Program, Submittal Requirements 1. (page 12)</p> <p>+ Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Capitol Hill RFP Project Elements – Quantitative Evaluation: Site X Retail Approach: Broadway</p> <p>+ Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Development Program Scoring spreadsheet (aka SITE X EVALUATION SCORING SHEET), Retail Approach: Broadway</p>	<p>For the “Broadway” Retail Approach on Sites A & C the Evaluation Scoring Sheet and Quantitative Evaluation criteria both list the following as a scored submittal requirement:</p> <p>“Continuous retail/commercial frontage,” with values ranging from 3 (acceptable) to 15 (good) to 25 (excellent) points.</p> <p>Please clarify how “continuous” frontage will be evaluated: is it focused on consecutive or total linear feet? Percentage of frontage? Does a residential lobby/entry frontage or egress stair along the frontage preclude an “excellent” evaluation?</p>	<p>Continuous retail frontage is evaluated based on consecutive linear feet. A residential lobby or egress stair may still be awarded an excellent rating, but would diminish the quality of the retail frontage on Broadway and therefore would have to have a very compelling case to avoid impacting the scoring.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
72.	Site C	<p>The South Station Entry portal adjacent to Site C is a built element intended for long term use, and has blank walls setback approximately 17' from the east internal lot line, which go up approximately 25' high. Given this, would ST consider an easement that would allow the new development to have unprotected openings along the east internal lot line?</p> <p>SBC requires setbacks (per section 705.8) from the lot line in order to provide unprotected windows for dwelling units along the east side of the building, which reduces the developable building area for Site C. An easement as described above would allow more extensive development of Site C.</p>	Yes, ST will consider an easement that would allow unprotected openings along the east internal lot line.
73.	Development Agreement, Section 2. Uses, 2.4 (page 04)	Would a daycare use be allowed on B-South where “live-work units” and “offices other than customer service offices” are permitted?	If a daycare center complies with the city code’s definition of live-work, than yes.
74.	Development Agreement, Section 2. Uses, 2.5 (page 04)	Would a daycare use be allowed on B-North where “live-work units that do not include a retail use” are permitted?	If a daycare center complies with the city code’s definition of live-work, than yes.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
75.	<p>RFP, Attachment A – RFP Evaluation Criteria, 1.03 Evaluation Criteria, No. 1 Development Program, Submittal Requirements 1. (page 12) + Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Capitol Hill RFP Project Elements – Quantitative Evaluation: Site X Green Factor and Sustainability Approach + Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Development Program Scoring spreadsheet (aka SITE X EVALUATION SCORING SHEET), Green Factor and Sustainability Approach</p>	<p>In the Attachment C Development Program documents, under “Green Factor & Sustainability Approach”, one category where teams can earn RFP points is “Application of site and building energy savings beyond City incentives”. Is there a specific incentive program that Sound Transit is considering in this category or does this apply to any city program that offers a bonus for savings?</p>	<p>It applies to any city program that offers a bonus for savings.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
76.	Coordinated Development Plan (pages 7) + Development Agreement, Section 6. Development Standards Specific to Site A, 6.12 + RFP Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Site A – Amenity Areas	<p>“The Capitol Hill Transit Oriented Development project uses a “pooled” approach in calculating the provision of Amenity Areas.” (page 7)</p> <p>Please explain how the “pooled” approach is consistent with the amenity area requirement of City of Seattle’s Land Use Code for individual sites.</p> <p>In a master developer approach, does this “pooled approach” allow for the provision of roof top amenity area on other sites that thus reduces the 17,000 sf rooftop requirement for Site A and is acceptable for signoff per Land Use Code?</p>	<p>Rather than the standard .302 requirement on all sites, we looked at each site’s size and number of encumbrances that would make meeting that requirement challenging. We then assigned green factor requirements to each site so that when green factors are added together the five sites governed by the development agreement cumulatively meet .302 for the total sqft of the five sites combined. Under the current development agreement green roofs on other buildings are not precluded, but would not diminish the green factor requirement on Site A.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
77.	Coordinated Development Plan (pages 7 and 11) + Development Agreement, Section 6. Development Standards Specific to Site A, 6.12 + RFP Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Site A – Green Factor and Sustainability Approach + Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Development Program Scoring spreadsheet (aka SITE X EVALUATION SCORING SHEET), Green Factor and Sustainability Approach	<p>The Development Agreement requires a green roof on Site A, but an area is not prescribed.</p> <p>The CDP suggests a 17,000 sf green roof on Site A (page 11) to meet Green Factor, but allows for “alternative methods to achieve an equivalent [Green Factor] score.” This same 17,000 sf area is also mentioned on page 7 of the CDP as required “Amenity Area” for Site A. [but Green roof and Amenity Area are not the same element]</p> <p>In the RFP Scoring criteria: “Alternative (increased size) green roof between 2”and 4” of growth medium (>17,000 s.f.)”</p> <p>Since it is not clear from these three documents, is a 17,000 “Green Roof” required on Site A? If so, is it all planted area (ie green roof that qualifies for green factor) or is it also allowed to be accessible to residents (thus qualifying for residential amenity area?)</p>	<p>A green roof is not required on Site A, however, it is a major component of both the green factor requirement and if accessible to the residents, the amenity area requirement. Proposing an alternative solution would result in having to make sure you both meet the green factor requirement on site and meet the amenity area requirement in some other capacity.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
78.	RFP Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Site A – Green Factor and Sustainability Approach + Attachment C – Development Program Requirements and Priorities, Development Program Scoring spreadsheet (aka SITE X EVALUATION SCORING SHEET), Green Factor and Sustainability Approach	<p>Scoring criteria: “Alternative (increased size) green roof between 2” and 4” of growth medium (>17,000 s.f.)”</p> <p>Is increased size referring to the depth of growth or to the SF of covered roof?</p>	Increased size refers to increased SF of the covered roof.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
79.	<p>RP 0010-14 CLARIFICATION NO 1, No. 14: “The appraisal for Site A takes into account that Nagle Place Extension and the plaza are not buildable. The price per square foot quoted in the RFP is applicable only to the buildable sqft”</p>	<p>What does ST consider the “buildable sqft” of Site A?</p>	<p>Sound transit considers the useable or buildable sqft to be 22,585, which is sited in the appraisal</p>
80.	<p>RFP, SIP drawings for Nagle Place, Development Agreement DA 6.8</p>	<p>The SIP drawings show Nagle Place Extension at 22’ wide of paved surface from face of curb to face of curb, with developed grading, east of the vent and north station box. The Development Agreement (6.8) states a required 28’ wide private street for NPE. Can the paved width be different than 28’ wide and include planting on the east side? Is there an acceptable minimum width, i.e. 22’ as designed currently? Can the grading/drainage on NPE be modified, east of the station box or vent, to accommodate a different design?</p>	<p>In order to maintain a 20’ fire lane through Nagel Place Extension and accommodate the required operations parking, the paved width must be 28’ with the 20’ fire lane reinforced to support the weight of a fire truck. The 28’ may not include planting as the fire lane must be paved and available at all times whether or not ST operations trucks are parked in the spots off Nagle Place Extension. See Addendum #3.</p>
81.	<p>Site A, Green Factor & Sustainability Approach</p>	<p>What is the size & shape of the bike cage on Site A, for which the proposer is required to provide a green roof (“bike cage green canopy”)?</p>	<p>The capacity of the bike cage has been identified in the CDP (Plaza Bike Parking, Page 9). The size and shape of the cage will be determined by the bike storage system selected and the cage layout proposed.</p>
82.	<p>RP 0010-14 CLARIFICATION NO 1.pdf, RP 0010-14 Clarification No 2.pdf, Question #11</p>	<p>Why did the response to Question 11 change between Clarification 01 and 02? What is the ESDS requirement?</p>	<p>This was a drafting error that has been corrected in subsequent clarification documents. The requirement is 50 points minimum. See question 11 for the point scale.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
83.		We understand there is a parking maximum of 0.7:1 for residential uses. Are there any parking maximums for retail/commercial uses?	There is no maximum parking ratio for retail/commercial uses however each site as a maximum parking stall number that includes residential and retail that cannot be surpassed based on limitations related to excavating additional parking levels adjacent to the station box.
84.		Why are there no points for the community center on B South? Is that use precluded in that location and if so, why? If not, can we propose a community center use on that site as long as we reach minimum unit counts and if so, will ST allow for community center points on Site B South?	A community center is not an allowed use on Site B-south. It is precluded because it takes away residential units on that site and through our development agreement with the city a transfer of development rights from B-north was placed on that site and the agency felt it was best served by maximizing the site's capacity for residential units. A community center on that site would not be allowed despite meeting residential minimums because it would require a change to the Development agreement.
85.		On Site B North, can we propose a ground floor use that is not residential, but not retail (more of a community serving use but not the community center) as long as we can still reach minimum unit counts?	If the use is permitted in the city's definition of live-work, then yes.
86.		The scoring for all sites with a Retail Approach proposes 25 points for a relationship with the Capitol Hill Chamber. Please describe the criteria for scoring those points Will you involve the Chamber in setting those criteria?	The chamber is not involved in setting those criteria. We want to see a robust retail approach and given the community's interest in the tenant mix, having the chambers involvement is beneficial. How they are involved is up to the proposer, but evidence of their involvement in a meaningful way within the retail strategy will result in the best outcome.
87.		In our view, effective plaza management will depend on a community relationship, but we didn't see that included in the scoring spreadsheet. How will you ensure that the plaza is managed in a way that benefits the community?	The developer of Site A will be responsible for programming of the plaza. In the RFP, proposers will include a plaza activation plan that will be scored for content, but ultimately, the plaza will be privately owned and managed.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
88.		We appreciate the commitment to the Broadway Farmers Market, as reflected in the scoring for Site A. However, we were surprised that non-market activation has just 9 points assigned. The success of the plaza depends on activation throughout the week and evenings, not just when the farmers market is present. With only 9 points assigned to that item, how will you ensure plaza management meets the community's requirement for a vibrant, safe, welcoming plaza?	We require a plaza activation plan outside of the Broadway Farmers Market. The point value does not detract from the requirement. More thoughtful plans will be awarded an excellent score.
89.		You clarified that the appraisals themselves will be posted sometime in October, after the deadline for RFI's has passed. Will you post the appraisal instructions? Can you post the appraisal instructions immediately?	The appraisals will be available once they've been approved and received from the FTA. We expect them later this month.
90.		What is the exact buildable square footage of Site A - is this a set number, or does it depend on design, building code, etc?	See #79.
91.		Please outline the process for the ST Board to weigh in on approval of the purchase and sale agreements/leases. When does that review happen?	This information is not necessary for shortlisted firms to develop and submit their proposals.
92.		At what points in the process is the Sound Transit Board briefed? At what points are there opportunities for public comment?	This information is not necessary for shortlisted firms to develop and submit their proposals.
93.		Please explain exactly how increased FAR for a community center can be used by a proponent given the mandates and limitations on building dimensions and height in the Development Agreement and Sound Transit's CDP?	This information is not necessary for shortlisted firms to develop and submit their proposals.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
94.		<p>Our organization has a concern that the requested specificity of proposals will require developers to expend resources that could be better spent in the end on building good projects. Designs will still have to go through City's design review and developers will be taking the risk of revisions to designs that are too fully-baked. <i>Could responses to the RFP be scored based on demonstrable commitment to provide certain items, rather than on the specific details of the design?</i></p> <p>Please describe the interaction between Sound Transit, the awarded developers and any design review recommendations which might require changes in the design approved by Sound Transit?</p> <p>The Community is interested in the spirit of the development and the awarded developer(s) and expects to be engaged in the Design Review process with the awarded developer(s).</p>	<p>The specificity of the information requested in the RFP is required for projects on these sites due to the complex nature of their interaction with ST's facilities and the aggressive development program the community asked for through the Urban Design Framework and what was ultimately mandated through the Development Agreement.</p> <p>Sound Transit will review design documents before proposers submit their applications for their MUP and again before they submit for their building permit. These projects will proceed through design review in the same manner as all projects subject to design review.</p>
95.		<p>Who at ST will be scoring the design elements that bidders are required to address? Will you be bringing in outside consultants for this?</p>	<p>This information is not necessary for shortlisted firms to develop and submit their proposals.</p>
96.		<p>The Broadway Streetcar Extension is in the early planning stages, and it will continue the streetcar from East DennyWay north beyond the TOD area. How are you accounting for streetscape interaction with the streetcar in the development along Broadway for Sites A and C?</p>	<p>This information is not necessary for shortlisted firms to develop and submit their proposals.</p>
97.		<p>Once the purchase-and-sale or lease agreement is approved and the projects enter the MUP/design review process with the city, does Sound Transit have the ability to review, revise, or disqualify an awarded developer at any point?</p>	<p>Sound Transit will have review privileges before the submittal of the MUP application and Building Permit submittal. At those times, ST approval is required to proceed. ST will not close on these properties until building permits are issued and therefore if a developer is not in compliance or is not performing ST can take corrective action.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
98.		Who at ST will be scoring the proposed leasing structures? Will this be done with third-party review? Will any scoring be done by a third party?	This information is not necessary for shortlisted firms to develop and submit their proposals.
99.		If Sound Transit enters into a ground lease with a developer, what happens at the end of the lease? Do the buildings and other improvements on the properties revert to Sound Transit ownership? If this is the case, of what benefit is this to the community?	This is addressed in the lease terms attached to Addendum No. 1.
100		Our agency was surprised to see no mention of the Capitol Hill Eco-district in the RFP. There are points for stormwater runoff handling (with ST's approval) and for energy savings beyond current city incentives. Will other Eco-district priorities be rewarded in the scoring process? If so, where?	There was no mention of an eco-district in the RFP because there is no city code or definition that lays out a set of requirements for a developer. Sound Transit has stated that it has a preference for sustainable development. Any elements of an eco-district that increases the sustainability of the project will be evaluated in the appropriate section of the development program.
101		You have shortlisted mostly master-development teams for multiple sites. Staff has stated you do not wish to disadvantage master developers in the proposal phase, and staff made a commitment to Seattle City Council not to preclude a master development approach. You have directed proposers to compete individually for each site, even as master developers. Please clarify how you plan to actually review a master developer proposal so as to not disadvantage that particular developer and not cause them to spend more time and money in providing two proposals, one for master developer and one for each site.	All proposing developers will prepare one proposal for each site for which they are short-listed.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
102		<p>Sound Transit has expressed a preference for ground lease transactions for some sites. What is Sound Transit's plan to provide for ongoing community benefit if the properties are leased? How will the community benefit from the ongoing cash flow to Sound Transit over the term of the lease? Is Sound Transit willing to provide tenant improvements or property management services as landlords generally do? How would this benefit the community? Is Sound Transit willing to engage with the community over the definition and make-up of any such community benefit?</p>	<p>The community benefits at the capitol hill TOD project are built into the development program outlined in the RFP. Ground leases can be structured in many ways and the eventual outcome of any ground lease is strictly between Sound Transit and the developer. Cash flow generated by a lease would be treated as operating income to the agency and would support the transit system.</p>
103		<p>Our organization would like to clarify that the major concern for the Community is the overall nature and function of the development, not the specifics of any particular site. For instance, how housing and the housing mix are accommodated across all the sites matters more to the community than the actual minimum residential unit count on any individual site. If a better outcome is generated by an overall proposal for multiple sites, does Sound Transit's evaluation team have flexibility to consider that rather than awarding each site to the highest scorer for that site?</p>	<p>Sites will be scored individually. The project approach section gives developers the opportunity to discuss optimization across multiple sites etc.</p>
104		<p>Success of the development requires thoughtful tenanting as well as good retail and residential property management in collaboration with the community. How are these addressed in the RFP and scoring system?</p>	<p>This is addressed in the retail strategy.</p>
105		<p>Success of the development requires excellent design. In the RFP and scoring system, we see points assigned to a collection of details that don't speak to excellent design overall. How can this be addressed in the RFP and scoring system?</p>	<p>Excellent design is a product of excellent functionality and the design review process. We chose to stay outside of design review, letting that process happen how it does, and score the projects based on exceptional functionality.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
106		<p>Will Sound Transit defer to City staff and Community member input via the Design Review process if Design Review guidance is in conflict with an initial proposal approved by Sound Transit? Is there a way for the proposal process to be more flexible about final design details being requested in order to let the final design evolve through the permitting process?</p>	<p>Selected proposers will go through the design review process as all projects subject to design review do. Sound Transit staff will have review privileges before the MUP and building permit submittals to confirm that designs submitted are not in conflict with easements and other necessary station functions.</p>
107		<p>The area surrounding the Capitol Hill station is currently dealing with some serious safety and security concerns in the Pike/Pine corridor, Cal Anderson Park, and Nagle Place. Our organization is aware of concerns from local businesses and East Precinct officers that when the Capitol Hill Station opens it will exacerbate the current issues as a vector for crime - creating a place for 'bad actors' to loiter and providing easy access and get away for criminals. How are these concerns addressed in the RFP, and how will Sound Transit evaluate design proposals for public areas such as the plaza, the pass-throughs and Nagle Place Extension in light of safety concerns?</p>	<p>The RFP addresses defensible space design in its preference for pass-through designs that incorporate lighting and are activated through windows/ doors on the pass-through. Similarly the plaza is scored both for activation plans and for lighting and wayfinding design. Outside of those design mechanisms, the security of the plaza and pass-throughs will be the purview of developer of site A. Sound Transit has standard approach to providing security at its underground stations that it will employ at the Capitol Hill station.</p>
108		<p>How is Sound Transit dealing with the security at the Station itself? Will that security transfer to the public areas above ground?</p>	<p>This information is not necessary for shortlisted firms to develop and submit their proposals.</p>
109		<p>Is Sound Transit willing to share the referenced deficiencies and weaknesses of the shortlisted developers with the community? Are those primarily financial considerations, or are they more substantive? Are these public documents?</p>	<p>Answers to these questions are not necessary for shortlisted firms to develop and submit their proposals.</p>
110		<p>If the only proposals received are from master development teams submitting proposals for multiple sites, is Sound Transit willing to evaluate the proposals as master development proposals rather than as proposals for individual sites?</p>	<p>Sound Transit will review proposals as we've previously stated. On a site by site basis.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
111		<p>Will you issue a list of the teams who submitted proposals? Are the proposals public documents?</p>	<p>Sound Transit typically does not issue such a list. See Article 5 of the RFP document.</p>
112		<p>Does each clarification supersede the previous one?</p>	<p>Yes, however, the answers to previously answered RFIs should not change from one clarification to the next. See clarification #82.</p>
113		<p>The Sound Transit Answer to RFI #46 in the recent Clarifications seems to contradict the Development Agreement:</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT: 3.3 Buildings on Sites A, C, and D shall be built to a minimum height of 74' 11 ", with a maximum six floors excluding parking, and a developer may request to build up to 85' in height in order to add an additional floor as provided in Section 5.4 [MFTE/affordability].</p> <p>It seems The answers to RFI #46 should be:</p> <p>a) A maximum of 7 floors are allowed on Site A and Site C per the Development Agreement (3.3), regardless of framing system or floor to ceiling heights.</p> <p>b) Only 1 additional floor (in addition to the maximum 6 floors) is allowed on Site A and Site C within the 85' height limit. This additional floor is subject to the affordability requirements of section 5 of the Development Agreement. You cannot develop two additional floors, or "both" floors.</p> <p>Can you please confirm this is the case?</p>	<p>Per section 3.3 in the development agreement:</p> <p>a) A maximum of 7 floors are allowed on Site A and Site C per the Development Agreement (3.3), regardless of framing system or floor to ceiling heights.</p> <p>b) Only 1 additional floor (in addition to the maximum 6 floors) is allowed on Site A and Site C within the 85' height limit. This additional floor is subject to the affordability requirements of section 5 of the Development Agreement. You cannot develop two additional floors, or "both" floors.</p>

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
114		We assume that Sound Transit will provide easements to allow for residential window openings facing the internal lot lines at the Sound Transit stations on Site A abutting the North Station entry and abutting the Vent shaft and on Site C abutting the South Station entry, above the existing station buildings. Is this correct?	Correct, Sound Transit will consider granting no-build easements in those locations in order to allow residential window openings.
115	For Section 2 Financials, Submittal Requirement #6	How does the information requested here differ from the RFQ requirement in Firm Capacity that required a detailed description of five projects that demonstrated experience with projects of similar type and complexity?	While it is similar to the request in the RFQ, we are particularly interested in the sources and uses of funds for the projects you include and how that relates to this project specifically.

No.	Reference	Proposer Request For Information	Sound Transit Clarification Response
116		<p>Our firm is working with a potential community center partner on our RFP response, and as we've dug into the proposal minimum requirements further, it is proving very difficult for us to accommodate the total programming needs for this particular community partner on any of the sites. Our partner has thereby asked us to submit the following question to Sound Transit:</p> <p>The Community Center option that is written into the RFP has been a part of the community discussion around the TOD project since 2009. It has always been the intent of the community group organizing this effort that the community center would not be a standalone center or merely community conference space, but that it would be supported by the co-location of financially sound non-profit community organizations that are already paying market rate for office space on Capitol Hill. The collective organizations advocating for the community center did a survey of space needs paid for by a grant from the City of Seattle's Department of Neighborhoods in 2012. The results of the survey, which to our understanding have been previously shared with Sound Transit, showed a need for 140,078 Sq. Ft. of office space, including the community center, conference spaces and offices for 15 non-profit organizations. It has always been the intent and vocalization that the community center groups that they wanted to be located on Site A fronting Broadway, Denny Way (Festival Street), and the public plaza on Nagle Place in order to activate that plaza during times when not occupied by the Farmers Market for community events and functions. While space required has and can be shrunk down to approximately 80,000 Sq. Ft. from the survey, the minimum housing unit requirement imposed on Site A has an adverse impact on the inclusion of the community center. Can there be an exception for the housing minimum requirements for Site A if proposing the Community Center Option in order to also accommodate commercial office space as described above?</p>	<p>No, per the development agreement, there is a minimum residential unit requirement of 132 units on Site A. Any change to that number would require a change to the development agreement that the agency is not interested in pursuing.</p>