

## 505 W. Chapel Hill St. Disposition | Post Pre-Submittal Conference Q&A

---

**1. Will the City send the list of attendees from the pre-submittal meeting?**

- A list of meeting attendees is included at the end of this Q&A document and is also posted to the project website.

**2. Does the City have targets for Minority/Women Business Enterprises (M/WBE) participation?**

- There are no assigned M/WBE targets for this project at this stage, but respondents must submit all of the M/WBE forms included in the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) as part of their submission.
- The City is committed to M/WBE participation and may include participation targets in the Request for Proposals (RFP) stage of the process.

**3. Does the City have targets for participation from locally based firms?**

- There are no assigned targets for local firms for this project at this stage.
- The City places value on firms that are able to demonstrate an understanding of the Durham community and the local market context.

**4. Does the City plan to use or have gap funding resources available to achieve affordability goals?**

- No, at this time the City does not envision providing subsidies to support the project.
- The RFQ is focused on pre-qualifying teams, so respondents are not required to submit financial models demonstrating project feasibility at this stage.

**5. Does the City have Tax-Increment Financing or other infrastructure funding resources to contribute to the project?**

- No, at this time the City does not envision providing subsidies to support the project.
- The RFQ is focused on pre-qualifying teams, so respondents are not required to submit financial models demonstrating project feasibility at this stage.

**6. Acknowledging that the Council's priorities are ranked, is there any weighting assigned to establish more or less importance to each of the stated priorities on Page 14?**

- No, there are no assigned weights as part of the RFQ stage.

**7. Should the priorities summarized on Page 14 of the RFQ be the only priorities informing our Development Approach or should the responses from the public workshops referencing a possible Museum Park, Little Neighborhood, Durham Gateway, or Urban Catalyst also be considered?**

- As stated in the RFQ, City Council has articulated five priorities for site redevelopment. These should be the priorities that inform respondents' Development Approach.
- The different design concepts presented during public workshops in 2017 informed the priorities included in the RFQ.

**8. The RFQ states that the City wants to preserve the existing Milton Small building, but has assigned a relatively low point value to that preference—can you clarify?**

- While the policy priorities included in the RFQ are ranked in order of importance, there are no point values assigned to them. At this point in the process, respondents should assume that preservation of the existing building will continue to be one of the City's top five priorities for site redevelopment. The City recognizes that there are inherent trade-offs between its priorities, and will look to respondents in the RFP stage to propose feasible development programs that successfully balance these priorities.

**9. Is there a predisposition for a specific use in the retained building at 505 W. Chapel Hill Street?**

- No, there is no predisposition for a specific use for the current Milton Small structure.

**10. Will respondents be allowed inside the building before 11/9/2021?**

- Respondents will not be allowed in the building before RFQ responses are due on 11/9/2021. The City anticipates opening the building to pre-qualified firms for tours during the RFP stage.

**11. Are there unit mix/size requirements for the affordable housing component?**

- No, the City only stipulates that the development program must include 80 units of permanently affordable housing to residents living at 60% Area Media Income (AMI). There is no prescription in terms of unit mix or size requirements.

**12. How many firms will the City invite to Phase II?**

- There is no pre-determined number for how many firms the City will pre-qualify and invite to participate in the RFP phase.

**13. May a team submit as a Master Developer and also as a developer for a single use?**

- Yes. Respondents may choose to submit responses as both a Master Developer and for single use(s). Respondents should clearly identify within their response for which use(s) they are applying.

**14. Do you have a preference for (1) a Master Developer with comprehensive experience, executing across all asset classes, or (2) developers with singular asset experience working distinctly or (3) under the leadership of a Master Developer?**

- There is no preference between (1) a Master Developer with comprehensive experience executing across all asset classes and (3) developers with singular experience working under the leadership of a Master Developer. The City intends to designate a Master Developer to lead the project, so is not interested in scenario (2) - developers with singular asset experience working distinctly - as a solution during the RFP stage. Respondents may submit responses as a Master Developer and for single use(s). Respondents should clearly identify within their response for which use(s) they are applying.

**15. Is there a preference for lab space vs. general office space, as long as vitality is added to the neighborhood at the street level, and the criteria described in the RFQ are met?**

- No, the City has not articulated a preference between lab space, office space or any other type of use for the commercial component at this stage in the project. Either can be included as part of a mixed-use project that enhances the vibrancy of the site. The City is open to developers presenting feasible programs for the project's commercial component, which may include all office space, all lab space, a mix of the two uses, or some other combination of uses aligned with stated policy priorities. The City also expects the commercial development component to generate onsite employment and create ongoing tax revenue streams for the City.

**16. Is the affordable housing requirement intended to produce rental units, or could it include for sale units?**

- The City does not currently have a preference in terms of whether the 80 units of permanently affordable housing at 60% AMI are rental units or for sale units. During the RFP stage, respondents will be asked to submit a detailed development program that demonstrates an ability to meet these established parameters for onsite affordability.

**17. Is there asbestos in the building?**

- Respondents should review the Environmental Site Assessment Report, available on the project website, for details on site conditions.

**18. What's the status of the brownfields?**

- The City has already established the site's eligibility to enter into a Brownfields Agreement with the North Carolina Brownfields Program. The City is currently in the final stages of negotiation with the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality to finalize the terms of the Brownfields Agreement for the site.

**19. Is the building designated historic?**

- The building is not currently on the National Register of Historic Places. Should a developer be interested in pursuing historic tax credits, the City will support the nomination process through the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office to have the building listed on the National Register, which is a prerequisite for eligibility for historic tax credits.

## Pre-Submittal Meeting Attendees

<b>Meeting Attendee</b>	<b>Firm Name</b>
David Toney	Akridge
Peter Calkins	Ancora Partners, LLC
Ursula Powidzki	Ancora Partners, LLC
Nicole Morrill	Ancora Partners, LLC
Austin Hills	Austin Lawrence Partners
Drew Johnson	Austin Lawrence Partners
Omar Beasley	Cardinal Blue Consulting LLC
Dan Gualtieri	Crescent Communities
Yolanda Winstead	DHIC
Patrick Nerz	DHIC
Michael Rodgers	DHIC
Kayla Strampe	DHIC
Natalie Britt	DHIC
Anna Branly	Downtown Durham, Inc.
Sanjeev Patel	Duda Paine
Ben Perry	East West Partners
James Montague	F7 International
Mike Sabodish	Froehling & Robertson
Gregg Sandreuter	HM Partners, LLC
Micah Kordsmeier	Hoffman & Associates
Steve Brooks	IDP Properties
Marcus Acheson	Little Diversified
Philip Oliver	LS3P Associates
Marcia McNally	Marcia McNally
Kate Bowers	Moseley Architects
Stormie Forte	Obsidian Consulting Services/City of Raleigh City Council
Taylor Brown	Pennrose
Randy Clack	Pennrose
Amon Martin	Pennrose
David Green	Perkins & Will
Zena Howard	Perkins & Will
Renny Logan	Perkins & Will
Lindsey Holder	Portman Holdings, LLC
Reid Scott	Portman Holdings, LLC
Kyle Maxwell	Rise

Bradley Albury	Rise
Alex Cosio	Silverstein Properties
Jason Kaufman	Silverstein Properties
Madison Ross	Surface 678
Swati Khimesra	Surface 678
Trevor Stroebel	The John Buck Company
Woody Coley	Trammell Crow
Travis Melvin	Trammell Crow
Danny Tran	Weller Development Company
Daniel Coffman	Weller Development Company
Adam Genn	Weller Development Company
Jeffrey Baker	Weller Development Company
Christopher Fleming	WinnCompanies
Nyasha Mandima	WinnCompanies
Adam Tucker	Zimmer Developer Company
Landon Zimmer	Zimmer Developer Company