



# St Elizabeths East

## Response to Questions (1) St. Elizabeths East Phase I Master Developer RFP

### 1. Will the list of attendees be published?

- a. Yes. To see who attended 1- the Pre-Response Conference on April 30, 2014 and 2- the May 13, 2014 Informational Session on the Microsoft Innovation Center, please refer to [www.stelizabethseast.com/phase-one/](http://www.stelizabethseast.com/phase-one/).

### 2. How does St E's fit into DC's plans for stormwater and low-impact development?

- a. Stormwater work at St. Elizabeths East is to be developed in compliance with the District's storm water management regulations outlined in D.C. Municipal Regulation Chapter 5 of Title 21 and Chapter 31 of Title 20. Specific design criteria are also stated in the Storm Water Guidebook (available online at <http://ddoe.dc.gov/swregs>) and dates for Storm Water Management Training Sessions can be found at <http://ddoe.dc.gov/node/619262>.

St. Elizabeths East shall also be developed in compliance with the District of Columbia's Green Building Act of 2006 at a minimum. The Green Building Act of 2006 can be found online at <http://ddoe.dc.gov/publication/green-building-act-2006>. Respondents are encouraged to exceed these minimum requirements however as higher ratings will be given to proposals that have minimal impact on the historic fabric, the environment, and achieve LEED certifications. Refer to the Sustainable DC Plan at <http://sustainable.dc.gov/finalplan> for goals and targets the District is currently pursuing to ensure it is the healthiest, greenest, and most livable city in the nation.

### 3. Section 5.0 of the RFP contains eleven (11) separate content requirements. However, the RFP, as currently configured, does not contain significant submission requirements related to CBE or SD/CBE Participation. Does DMPED plan to amend the RFP to correct this deficiency? If so, when? If not, why not?

- a. Pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 10-801(b)(6) and D.C. Official Code § 2-218.01 et seq., the selected Master Developer is required to have at least 20% equity and 20% development participation of Certified Business Enterprises ("CBEs"). The selected Master Developer is also required to contract with CBEs for at least 35% of the contract dollar volume for the entire project. When detailing Team Information and Qualifications, Respondents are to identify which team members are CBEs.



Respondents are encouraged to exceed these minimum requirements however as higher ratings will be given to proposals that include Ward 8 team members, and exceed the aforementioned requirements of CBE participation. Further preference will also be given to teams whose CBE members are verified by the Department of Small and Local Business Development as the following:

- Small Business Enterprise,
- Resident-Owned Business,
- Longtime Resident Business,
- Local Business Enterprise,
- Local Business Enterprise with its principal office located in an enterprise zone,
- Disadvantaged Business Enterprise,
- Veteran-Owned Business Enterprise, and/or
- Local Manufacturing Business Enterprise

**4. Section 5.0 of the RFP also described the Evaluation and Selection Process. There are 23 Evaluation Criteria. There is not one major Evaluation Criterion for CBE or SD/CBE Utilization. Not one. Does DMPED plan to amend the RFP to correct this deficiency? If so, when? If not, why not?**

a. Please see previous answer to Question 3.

**5. The RFP, as currently configured, contains no requirement whatsoever for the submission of an acceptable CBE and SD/CBE Utilization Plan. Does DMPED plan to issue an Amendment correcting this oversight? If so, when? If not, why not?**

a. Respondents receive higher ratings for the inclusion of Ward 8 businesses and CBEs in their submitted responses (please see previous answer to Question 3). Therefore, it is in the interest of Respondents to identify such team members and outline the level of CBE participation in their submitted proposals, though it is not a requirement.

**6. History has already taught us that if a firm does not come to the table – at the RFP Stage – with an impressive Plan for CBE Utilization, that firm is NOT qualified to prime a project such as this. Does DMPED disagree with that Lesson Learned? If so, on what basis?**

a. Please see previous answer to Question 5.

**7. It can be argued that, after a Master Developer is selected, DMPED will then discuss the details of CBE participation with the selected Team. This approach has already proven to be total nonsense, because it never works. Does DMPED agree that an acceptable CBE and SD/CBE Utilization Plan MUST be a condition of selection, and not an afterthought? If not, why not?**

a. Please see previous answer to Question 5.



- 8. If a Respondent has a poor Track Record in the area of CBE and SD/CBE Participation (as many potential bidders do), that Respondent is clearly and totally unqualified to prime this job. Yet, the current RFP contains no major evaluation criterion for the Respondent's Performance Track Record in CBE Utilization. Does DMPED plan to amend the RFP to correct this oversight? If so, when? If not, why not?**
- a. When submitting their proposals, Respondents are asked to provide outcomes of previous projects, including job creation and other economic development impacts, as well as any "lessons learned" that could be relevant to St. Elizabeths East" (see Section 5(2) of the St. Elizabeths East RFP: Phase I Master Developer). Showcasing the successful use of CBEs on past projects would be viewed favorably by the District.
- 9. Given that the District may hold a separate solicitation to determine the Academic Anchor, should I include one on my team?**
- a. Yes, twelve Universities responded to the Academic Request for Expressions of Interest in the Spring of 2013 (please find interested Universities online at <http://dmped.dc.gov/release/deputy-mayor-hoskins-announces-respondents-st-elizabeths-east-request-expressions-interest>). Although the District reserves the right to hold a separate solicitation to select an "Academic Anchor", it is the District's preference for Respondents to include an academic institution in their submitted proposals.
- 10. The RFP notes that the District intends that the Microsoft Innovation Center (MIC) will occupy approximately 10,000-12,000 SF in Building 100. Can respondents propose alternative locations for the MIC?**
- a. Yes, Respondents may propose alternative locations for the MIC throughout the Phase I footprint. This includes the Demonstration Center, which is scheduled to open in the Summer of 2014. The Demonstration Center will feature 14,000 square feet, which includes a 50 person Digital Inclusion Center (computer lab) on the lower level, flexible meeting rooms and conference areas. Similar to Gateway DC, Respondents may propose licensing and managing the Demonstration Center.
- 11. Where is the new United Medical Center (UMC) planned to be located on the campus and is the hospital part of the Phase 1?**
- a. The District plans for the proposed new UMC to be located outside of the Phase I footprint.
- 12. How do we find out additional information on interested Respondents?**
- a. Respondents are encouraged to reach out to attendees of the Phase I Pre-Response Conference and Microsoft Informational Session. The list of attendees can be found online at [www.stelizabethseast.com/phase-one/](http://www.stelizabethseast.com/phase-one/).



**13. Is the District looking for a single developer or teams?**

- a. Developers may respond as a single entity or form an interdisciplinary team to accomplish the full program for Phase I, which includes housing, retail, tech space, an interim-use Gateway DC and Demonstration Center (see Question 16), and office space. Developers without specific experience in the development and operation of technology or research parks should consider including an individual or firm on their team with such expertise. The role of each team member must be clearly identified in the response.

**14. Do all of the parcels need to be developed at the same time?**

- a. No, the District is willing to permit the redevelopment of Phase I in phases. If done in such a manner, the preference is for the Master Developer to begin the development in the historic structures and to proceed with as much ground-up development as is feasible as quickly as possible. In addition, the District does not anticipate transferring parcels until the Master Developer has obtained all necessary funding and is ready to commence construction on those specific parcels. Therefore, no real estate taxes will be due during the pre-development phase.

**15. Will the Master Developer have the ability to develop additional parcels outside of Phase I?**

- a. Yes, the District is interested in a long-term relationship with the selected Master Developer for Phase I. The District reserves the right to provide the Master Developer with a right of first offer on future development parcels or to offer such parcels through a subsequent solicitation process.

**16. Can teams propose development on the interim use parcels?**

- a. Yes, initially the District would lease these parcels to the Master Developer on an interim basis. Development teams will have an option to obtain development rights over the interim use parcels once **some or all of** Parcels 8, 9, 11, 12, and 15 are developed. The District will accept and review proposals that include early development of the interim use parcels, although preference will be given to proposals that both create a sense of place and place priority on the redevelopment of the historic properties. Such proposals should also address how the parking needs on the site will be addressed.
- b. As with Gateway DC, Respondents may also propose uses for the Demonstration Center, which may include, but is not limited to, special programming, licensing/management rights, and/or the permanent location for the Microsoft Innovation Center. Since the Demonstration Center is on the site of the proposed Congress Heights Town Center, the District has only agreed to use the chapel as the Demonstration Center on an interim basis (10 years) in response to the community's preference to retain the chapel.

