

Question: Are off-site renewable credits permitted to meet net-zero requirements if it can't be accommodated onsite, to meet the Greener Government Buildings Amendment? If offsite is possible, can the credits come from outside DC, MD, VA?

In line with the District's Carbon Free DC strategy to achieve carbon neutrality, any off-site renewable purchases should be power purchase agreements / bundled RECs from Tier 1 renewable sources meeting the minimum percentage of the District's Renewable Portfolio Standard, and limited geographically to the PJM Interconnection region, which also aligns with the RPS requirements.

Question: Affordable Dwelling Unit (ADU) requirement: based on our analysis, the Development Parcel is not within ½ mile of a Metro station or within ¼ mile of a Priority Corridor Network Metrobus Route, as a result the baseline ADU requirement seems to be governed by DC Code §10-801(b-3)(1)(B) which calls for a minimum 20% ADU set aside for dispositions that do not meet the transit proximity requirements outlined in §10-801(b-3)(1)(A). Is our assessment of the Development Parcel's location and the baseline ADU requirement accurate?

The above assessment is correct. DMPED provided during the OurRFP process that a minimum of 30% affordable housing is expected as part of any Proposal.

Question: The RFP states under Part 7 of the Submission Requirements: "In no event shall Respondent identify any specific direct or indirect public subsidy as a source of funds, including, but not limited to, competitive or non-competitive federal or District funding programs, TIFs (tax increment financing), PILOTs (payment in lieu of taxes), or tax abatements;" However, Part 9. iii. seemingly contradicts this by suggesting inclusion of "a description, in narrative and/or table form, of the type of public financing subsidy(ies) for which Respondent anticipates applying to fill the Project financial gap inclusive of the timeline for such application(s) and the amount of funds by each source required." Can we identify public subsidy for affordable housing in our Sources budget?

In *Part 7: Project Budget Sources and Uses*, it states that no specific direct or indirect public subsidy as a source of funds, including, but not limited to, competitive or non-competitive federal or District funding programs, TIFs (tax increment financing), PILOTs (payment in lieu of taxes), or tax abatements shall be identified. Rather, a line in the sources identified as 'gap' should be included. In *Part 9: Proposed Financing Strategy*, the narrative and/or table can include any public subsidy sources the Respondent intends to apply to fill any Project financial gap.

Question: Could the City provide additional capital funds for the Library and Civic Center to build the requested size of the library and civic center? Can the development team size the library and civic center to utilize the capital dollars outlined in the RFP in lieu of requesting additional funds?

To the extent a Respondent identifies a financial gap to deliver the New Community Center and New Library, the financial gap should be specifically identified in *Part 7: Project Budget Sources and Uses*.

Question: Which specific social services DMPED would like to see integrated into the development, beyond meeting the current rec center and library offerings?

Any specific social services that are required to be integrated into the Project are identified in the RFP.

Question: For the RFP Submission Deposit, will DMPED accept a \$50,000 check from the Respondent in lieu of the irrevocable standby letter of credit ("Letter of Credit")?

No.

Question: With reference to the following in Amendment 3: “A permanent non-exclusive easement or dedication will be considered to widen the alley on the eastern edge of the Development Parcel.” Is this intended to involve an easement or dedication of land on the parcel of 3750 Northampton St NW such as through purchase or eminent domain? On what basis has this been authorized in order to be included in the RFP Amendment?

A permanent non-exclusive easement or dedication to widen the alley utilizing 3750 Northampton St NW may not be included in a Proposal without the written consent of the owner(s) of 3750 Northampton St NW, which should accompany such submission to DMPEd.

Question: Can any previous schematic level designs for the civic center be circulated?

Prior designs on the Development Parcel did not consider redevelopment of both the Library and Community Center with housing, so any prior designs will not be circulated.

Question: Are the overhead utility lines expected to be undergrounded? If yes, what is the extent?

The determination of whether overhead utility lines are expected to be undergrounded is not made by DMPED. A Pepco point of contact related to this question is Amir Al Khatib, whose email address is amir.alkhatib@exeloncorp.com and telephone number is (202) 834-5437.

Question: Could you share the appraisal with Bidders?

DMPED doesn't publish its appraisals as a matter of policy.

Question: Part 4 asks for a "Letter authorizing each reference to respond to inquiries regarding the design, financing, development, disposition, or management of prior projects" - is this a letter from the applicant authorizing our references to speak about our past projects, or letters from the references?

The letter should be from the Respondent to the reference authorizing the Respondent's reference to speak to DMPED about the Respondent's past projects.

Question: How will the proposed minimal parking suffice for library and community center patrons in Chevy Chase, most of whom by necessity drive to the site?

See the First Amendment to the RFP, which clarified the parking requirements.

Question: When has it ever been contemplated that there could be a hotel on the site? Does the proposed new zoning accommodate this potential use or would further zoning be required?

The RFP does not require a hotel use. Questions about zoning should be directed to the Office of Zoning.

Question: The Community Center and Library co-located as a shared space?

The RFP provides that one of the OurRFP community preference relate to a world-class library & community center and states the following: "drawing from both hyperlocal and global best-practices, this facility should set the standard for co-located civic integration and engagement, in design, delivery, operation, and maintenance."

Question: Are there currently any Environmental and/or Resource Impact Studies to determine exactly what is feasible for this site?

RFP Proposals will provide suggested redevelopment options. The selected Respondents shall comply with Applicable Laws.