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ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS & PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS

Pre-Bid Meeting Materials

1. **Will you make the slide deck (outside of the recording) available following the meeting?**
   
   Yes. The slide deck presented in the pre-bid meeting was posted to plan.navyyard.org on Friday, January 15, 2021.

2. **Will you be providing a list of attendees and contact information for those on the call?**

   Yes. The list of registrants, including contact information, was posted to plan.navyyard.org on Friday, January 15, 2021.

General Page Limits and Formatting

3. **Will PIDC enforce or have preference for page size limits (A3, A4, etc.), font size limits, or other formatting requirements outside of the page number restriction?**

   Pages should be 8.5 x 11 (letter size). Portrait or landscape orientations, or a mix thereof through the document, are acceptable. There are no specific requirements regarding font type or size; however, proposals should be reasonably legible when printed or viewed at 100% on a standard computer screen.

4. **Do Images and Section Dividers go toward the page count?**

   Images placed in-line or otherwise on a page with substantive text count toward the page count; section dividers and title pages do not.

5. **Is there a maximum number of pages for the entire proposal, including the appendix?**

   There is no maximum number of pages for the entire document. Appendices will be reviewed, as time allows, for informational purposes.
## Statement of Qualifications

6. Please confirm what elements should be included in the Statement of Qualifications, which is limited in the RFP to five pages.

The Statement of Qualifications segment of the proposal (exclusive of associated appendix pages) has been expanded to a maximum of eight (8) pages. The following chart clarifies items that should be included in the eight-page Statement of Qualifications section, and indicates other items that can be included in associated appendix pages. The associated appendix should be no more than 20 pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Qualifications</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No more than 8 pages</td>
<td>No more than 20 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lead consultant's expertise, capacity, and experience, including up to five projects*</td>
<td>• Examples of up to, but no more than, five projects of similar scope and magnitude successfully completed by the subconsultant(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification of subconsultant(s), including explanation of proposed role(s) and identification of M/W/DSBEs</td>
<td>• Resumes or CVs for, and brief summaries of up to five projects of similar scope and magnitude successfully completed by individuals identified as key personnel from the lead consultant and subconsultant(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of subconsultant(s)' expertise, capacity, and experience</td>
<td>• In the case of any potential conflicts of interest, identification of specific steps the consultant or subconsultant(s) will take to ensure that no conflicts of interest arise during the term of the contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of how team (including subconsultant(s)) will be structured and managed, including:</td>
<td>• References (3-5 references) for the lead consultant and each subconsultant, including project names, consultant/subconsultant’s role, and contact information (both telephone and email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Identification of project manager and primary point of contact</td>
<td>As space allows and at the discretion of the Respondent, the items listed above may instead be included in the 8-page Statement of Qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Identification of key personnel from lead consultant and subconsultant(s), including detail of specific responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Indication of lead consultant’s acceptance of personnel retention requirements in Section VII(B) of the RFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disclosure of professional engagements, relationships, conflicts of interest, and/or potential conflicts of interest that may impact the consultant’s and/or subconsultant’s performance of the scope of services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As space allows, additional detail of example projects successfully completed by the lead consultant, beyond that provided in the 8-page Statement of Qualifications, can also be included in the appendix, for informational purposes.

Refer to Section VII(B) of the RFP for further description of the required elements referenced above.
7. Please confirm if subconsultants are also required to include examples of no more than five projects of similar scope and magnitude, or if the five project requirement applies only to the lead consultant.

Yes, proposals should include examples of up to five projects of similar scope and magnitude successfully completed by the subconsultant(s). As noted in the response to Question 6 above, subconsultant projects may be briefly described in the explanation of subconsultant’s expertise and experience in the 8-page Statement of Qualifications; detail of subconsultant example projects should be provided as an appendix.

8. If the lead consultant is a joint venture of two firms, how many projects to provide?

PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic welcome proposals from firms organized in a joint venture responding in a single lead consultant role. In this case, the lead consultant entity should provide five project examples, which may represent a mix of projects performed by the partner firms as separate entities. As noted in the response to Question 7 above, proposals should also provide example projects for subconsultant(s) (no more than five projects per subconsultant, provided at the team’s discretion and as space allows).

9. Regarding the request to provide up to five project examples for the consultant and each subconsultant; what information do you want to see here most, given the space constraint?

In order for PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic to assess technical experience and capacity of the proposing team, project examples should describe the scope and scale of the work, including a project timeline and the consultant’s or subconsultant’s role on the project. Examples may also indicate approaches taken to achieve diverse and inclusive participation (including certified M/W/DSBE) and inclusive outcomes. Respondents may use their discretion in including other information specific to the project examples, with the goal of being as responsive as possible to the work described in this RFP.

10. Are you looking for built projects, or can we provide examples that were successfully completed in terms of our contract with the client?

We acknowledge that projects considered similar to the scope of this work may not necessarily represent built projects. Examples that are successfully completed in terms of the contract with the client are welcomed.
**Explanation of Work**

11. **Does the five (5) page maximum refer to the entire Section VII(C), including 1. Workplan and Schedule, 2. Deliverables, and 3. Project Timeline & Capacity to Perform?**

Yes. In the substantive content provided in response to subsections 1, 2, and 3 of Section VII(C), the proposal should describe the consultant’s approach to the project and proposed method of completing all tasks associated with the Scope of Work (set forth in Section V of the RFP) in a high-quality, timely fashion. Proposals should specifically identify all deliverables that respondents will provide, as well as include a detailed timeline with key milestones and a project budget.

Further materials over five pages in response to the Explanation of Work may be included in an appendix, for informational purposes only.

**Economic Opportunity Plan and OEO**

12. **The RFP only provides the terms of the City of Philadelphia’s anti-discrimination policies and requirements in Attachment B. Please provide a copy of the “Solicitation For Participation and Commitment Form” described in Attachment B that is to be executed by the lead consultant.**

Please refer to the Antidiscrimination Policy Solicitation for Participation and Commitment Form provided as the final page of this Q+A document.

13. **There is mention of a Joint Venture Eligibility Information Form required if applicant has entered a Joint Venture partnership. The form is not found within the RFP and not obvious when on the OEO website. Can you provide the form or direct us to this document?**

This form would be provided directly by OEO if and when a legally signed formal joint venture agreement is made available to OEO.

14. **This section states a joint venture needs City’s review and approval. Does this process need to be complete before February 5, 2021, the submission deadline, or by the start of project?**

Given the process stated in the response above, the City’s approval of any formal joint venture arrangements is not required by the proposal submission deadline. If the selected master planning team represents a formal joint venture partnership, the City’s approval will be required prior to the start of the Master Plan Update.
Standard Terms and Conditions

15. Can you confirm Article IV, Section 4(1)(h) ("Commercial Activity License") does not apply to professional services?

No. The Philadelphia Department of Licenses & Inspections requires that “any person or legal entity that does business in Philadelphia needs this license." Please refer to this City of Philadelphia webpage for more information about the Commercial Activity License.

16. Can you confirm what is meant by “other states insurance including Pennsylvania” in Article IX, Section 9(1)(a)(3) ("Insurance")?

The lead consultant (“Provider”) shall procure, or cause to be procured, all insurance from reputable insurers admitted to do business on a direct basis in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

17. Do all subconsultants have to adhere to the Insurance Coverage Costs or can there be variances based on their involvement/ firm size/ fee?

The Standard Contract and Terms provided in Attachment A to the RFP will be signed between PIDC and the lead consultant (“Provider”) only. PIDC will look solely to the Provider for any claims, and the Provider will manage the risk of the subconsultants through their own contract(s) with the subconsultants.

PROJECT ROLES AND PROCEDURES

18. How will decisions be made between client group – public agencies and developers – during the planning process?

PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic have a strong existing working relationship thanks to many years of collaboration in development at the Navy Yard and throughout the city of Philadelphia. Each partner will be represented on the Steering Committee that will guide the master planning team in the development of the Master Plan Update, including decision-making throughout the planning process.

19. Will PIDC facilitate meetings with PAID?

PAID is a governmental authority; PIDC manages all activities and operations of PAID, pursuant to a formal written management agreement. PAID has no employees. Throughout the planning process, members of PIDC’s Navy Yard team will represent PAID’s interest.
20. Will there be collaboration with the current Ensemble/Mosaic design team, and if so, who are members of that team?

The Ensemble/Mosaic design team, including consultants for specific projects in the Initial Phase, is still being defined. Any collaboration as it pertains to the Ensemble/Mosaic conceptual design will be managed through the Ensemble/Mosaic leadership team. Once the design team is established for the Initial Phase, significant collaboration and coordination between that team and the master planning team is expected.

21. What will be PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic roles in organizing and running the stakeholder public meetings?

PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic will consult with the selected master planning team to identify appropriate stakeholder groups and agencies and facilitate organizing communication. The planning team is expected to manage and execute specific engagement activities which may include online surveys, virtual one-on-one or group interviews, focus groups, and/or other methods acceptable to PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic.

22. Can you tell us who will be on the selection committee for the project?

Proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by PIDC, Ensemble/Mosaic, and select advisors.

23. How will the plan be formally ratified?

PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic will be responsible for formally accepting the final Master Plan Update and associated deliverables.

24. Are consultants on the selected master planning team able to also contract and provide services for the developer team?

Yes. Consultants and subconsultants seeking to serve in both capacities during the Master Planning process must acknowledge that while working on the Master Plan Update, they commit to representing the joint interests of PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic. Consultants seeking to serve in both capacities should indicate in their workplan how, in the event of situations where the interests of PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic diverge, they will reach solutions that work for all parties.
TEAMING AND INCLUSION

25. Is there a requirement that these proposals be submitted with an Architecture firm as the lead (prime) agent?

No. PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic welcome proposals from experienced, diverse firms or teams of firms and do not require a specific type of firm in the lead consultant role.

26. Please clarify the need for a cost estimation consultant in this effort. If cost estimates are required can you specify the milestones by which cost should be measured?

As noted in the RFP, the Master Plan Update should include order of magnitude cost estimates for any recommended capital and operational improvements (Section V(C)(9) on page 24). As an example, teams should be prepared to provide order of magnitude cost estimates for recommended public infrastructure (e.g., Broad Street entrance updates). Other examples include, but are not limited to, public amenities (e.g., parks and waterfront activation) and expanded transit (e.g. driverless shuttles for internal Navy Yard circulation). Any and all solutions must meet an economic feasibility standard.

27. Will PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic help to broker partnerships with minority owned vendors?

As noted in the pre-bid meeting, PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic are committed to increasing opportunities for minority-owned vendors and happy to facilitate introductions as requested. Direct specific requests for introductions to NavyYardPlan@NavyYard.org. In your email, please identify the specific firms you seek introductions to.

28. Can you clarify the issue of exclusivity for MBE/DBE firms?

To maximize participation opportunities, teams cannot preclude MBE or WBE subconsultants from participating on other teams.

29. Is a Service Disabled Veteran Owned Business (SDVOSB) acceptable in fulfilling the 40% requirement? If so, does that specifically alter the percentage requirements?

Respondents must satisfy the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) minimum participation levels for MBE and WBE (17 to 21% MBE and 12 to 16% WBE). Once those levels of participation have been achieved, SDVOSB or other disabled-owned business enterprise (DSBE) certifications are acceptable to raise participation to the 40% requirement.
30. Could you clarify the minimum participation percentages for MBE and WBE firms? Both are shown as ranges (17-21% and 12-16% respectively). Is the minimum percentage at the top or bottom of those ranges?

Teams must satisfy the minimum MBE and WBE participation levels (i.e., 17% and 12% respectively), but should endeavor to meet or exceed the top of each range. Teams then have discretion to use MBE, WBE, or DSBE participation to fill the remaining gap to 40%. For example, the requirements may be satisfied by (1) a non-M/W/DSBE lead consultant with a 17% MBE sub + a 12% WBE sub + 11% DSBE sub, or (2) an MBE lead consultant with 40% of the contract and 60% performed by non-M/W/DSBE subconsultants.

31. Do firms/subconsultants need to be MBE/WBE certified in the city of Philadelphia to count towards the 40% requirement? If a firm/subconsultant is an MBE/WBE in another state, does it count toward the total percentage requirements? If not, is there a pathway to do so?

Firms should be certified by an OEO Recognized Certification Agency, which includes certifying agencies of other states. Refer to the full list of Recognized Certification Agencies available at this link. Once certified by an OEO Recognized Certification Agency, certified firms can then apply for registration in the City of Philadelphia OEO’s M/W/DSBE Registered Directory. There is no fee to apply to the OEO registry.

32. If we include M/WBE firms who have pending applications for the City’s OEO registry may they be counted toward PIDC’s goals?

Yes.

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

33. The RFP scope area is highlighted on Figure 4 of page 7 as being the Mustin Site and the Historic Core. This conflicts with the written description of other PAID site. Please clarify the scope of design, planning or guideline updates for the PAID sites outlined in Figure 5.

To clarify, the RFP referenced in the legend for Figure 4 is the 2019-2020 developer solicitation RFP. The sites highlighted in green on Figure 4 are referred to in the Master Plan Update RFP as the Ensemble/Mosaic Parcels, comprising 109 acres within the Historic Core and Mustin District. The scope of work for the PAID-retained development sites (Figure 5) and parcels to be transferred to PAID from the Navy (Figure 6, blue parcels) is described in Section V(C)(3) on page 20 of the RFP.
34. Have minimums or maximums development densities been established?

The Master Plan Update should incorporate approximately 2.5 million square feet of new life science/manufacturing/office space in the Mustin District, approximately 350,000 square feet of retail/makerspace in the Historic Core, and approximately 2,900 residential units (1,900 units in the Historic Core and 1,000 in the Mustin District). These figures should be considered minimum densities.

35. Can you clarify what you mean by Chapel Block development being concurrent with Master Plan? Is Chapel Block design already underway by another firm, or will the design fall under the Master Plan design team?

In response to robust commercial demand and to accelerate the first residential development at the Navy Yard, PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic have agreed to allow a limited set of projects to proceed on a parallel track with the Master Plan Update. These projects are referred to as the “Chapel Block” or “Initial Phase”, and are anticipated to contain approximately 600 residential units, a 75,000 square foot speculative life science building, a hotel, and parking to support these uses. Ensemble/Mosaic is currently building a team of professionals to design, permit, and construct these projects. The Steering Committee will facilitate coordination of efforts between this team and the master planning team. As noted in the RFP, the successful team will be expected to review Ensemble/Mosaic’s proposed design and development plan at the start of the Master Plan Update to ensure compatibility with existing Navy Yard uses, design standards, and efficient campus access and circulation.

36. What latitude will the selected master planning team have to re-envision the work already completed in the conceptual plan?

As noted in the RFP, the master planning team is expected to review, test, and refine Ensemble/Mosaic’s Conceptual Plan, and recommend adjustments, if needed, to ensure consistent development quality, cohesive placemaking, strategically located retail and amenities, activated ground-floor uses, efficient access/circulation, and other Master Plan Update objectives (Section V(C)(2) on page 18). The consultant should be prepared to review the Initial Phase components of Ensemble/Mosaic’s Conceptual Plan upon commencement of the Project. For all portions of the Conceptual Plan outside of the Initial Phase, PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic are excited to work with the planning team to develop a compelling and dynamic vision that is based on established development types, densities, and parking requirements.
37. What opportunity will the team have to revisit other existing plans?

The Master Plan Update will also build upon the development framework contemplated in the 2004 and 2013 master plans, updating with creative planning that knits the Navy Yard together as a dynamic, cohesive place. This update will incorporate areas of the Navy Yard, including the Broad Street entrance and League Island Boulevard West corridor, that have been minimally considered in previous plans. These critical nodes should be planned with the goal of maximizing economic development, investment, and job creation, while fostering the Navy Yard’s identity as a welcoming neighborhood for all employees, residents, and visitors.

38. Does the city have a comprehensive waterfront plan?

No.

DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE AND TIMELINES

39. Please clarify the factors driving the December 31, 2021 deliverable date.

In light of the existence of the 2004 Master Plan, the 2013 Master Plan Update, and the Ensemble/Mosaic Conceptual Plan, PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic believe that completion by December 31, 2021 is feasible. Once completed, the Master Plan Update will guide new development at the Navy Yard and facilitate completion of the next phase of the Navy Yard’s growth and expansion. To the extent that a team believes that additional time is required to complete the scope of work, please explain this in your proposal and note how much additional time your team would require.

40. What timeframe have you projected for the completion of the Historic Core and Mustin North?

The completion of these two districts will be largely driven by market demand, and is projected to occur between seven and twelve years from completion of the Master Plan Update.

41. Can you share the estimated timeline for the build-out of the Ensemble controlled sites in the Corporate Center/Central Green District?

Ensemble directly or indirectly controls three pad-ready sites in the Corporate Center. Two of these sites are subject to options with existing tenants. The third site is intended to be developed concurrently with the Initial Phase.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

42. Who will own and operate the residential facilities?
A single-purpose entity created by Ensemble/Mosaic will own and operate the residential product at the Navy Yard.

43. How are you addressing affordable housing in the plan?
15% of residential units constructed by Ensemble/Mosaic will be workforce housing.

44. Is residential envisioned to be all rental or mix of rental / condo?
All residential product at the Navy Yard will be rental.

RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

45. Would health care, including emergency medical clinics, be considered “retail” uses?
Yes. PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic will specify permissible retail uses with the selected master planning team.

ECONOMIC AND MARKET ANALYSIS

46. Real estate market analysis was not identified in the scope of work. Should respondents assume that our team is developing our own market analysis for the various sectors or is some or all of that being addressed by Ensemble / Mosaic? If so, which sectors (if any) should our team focus on?
Hospitality and residential market analyses are outside of the scope of this Master Plan Update. Details of the residential program, including the mix of unit types, pricing, and phasing, will be determined by the Ensemble/Mosaic development team and shared with the selected master planning team as available.

Commercial market analysis to build upon the growing cell and gene therapy market at the Navy Yard will be an element of Ensemble/Mosaic’s overall marketing plan for their holdings at Navy Yard, and outside the scope of this RFP. On the other hand, the master planning team should be prepared to provide commercial analysis and guidance relevant to the highest and best uses for the PAID-owned sites in the master planning area, as described in Section V(C)(3) of the RFP on page 20.

A formal retail market analysis is not intended for the scope of this RFP. However, the master planning team should be prepared to consider current and emerging trends as
they relate to the retail, placemaking, and inclusive development that are central goals of this Master Plan Update.

47. Will the Ensemble/Mosaic development team be providing market research to the team regarding anticipated development program GSF and phasing for specific land uses to support the master plan?

Yes. In addition to details regarding the total GSF and unit counts in the Ensemble/Mosaic Conceptual Plan (provided in the RFP on Page 12), Ensemble/Mosaic and PIDC will provide additional information regarding phasing and development timeline requirements. The Master Plan Update should address phasing based on the master plan, infrastructure, and integration into the larger campus.

INFRASTRUCTURE

48. Is the infrastructure at the Navy Yard private or public?

Roads built in the Mustin District will be owned by PAID, but built to City specifications with the goal that streets will, at some point, be transferred to the City. PAID operates the electric grid at the Navy Yard; electric infrastructure up to the demarcation point and the delivery point from PECO will remain under ownership of PAID electric utility. Other utilities (water systems, including sanitary and stormwater; and gas) will be controlled by the respective utility authorities (PWD and PGW, respectively) at or within the property, as designated by the applicable utility, and beyond that point, it will be owned by the developer.

49. What utility/infrastructure base mapping is available from PIDC for pre-2013 and post-2013, and will this be provided to the winning team in CAD or GIS format for use in the new Master Plan?

Electric systems mapping is available in CAD and will be provided to the selected master planning team. Certain water systems and stormwater mapping is available and will be provided to the selected master planning team as appropriate.

50. Do you anticipate that the consultant teams will be responsible for evaluating the seawall and would a hydrology study be required or provided?

The scope of this project does not specifically include any seawall analysis or hydrology analysis. However, planning for stormwater infrastructure may involve new proposed outfalls into the Delaware River, and the master planning team should be prepared to advise on any seawall analysis or hydrology studies that may be required in conjunction with outfalls. If respondents believe further work is necessary for the purpose of the Master
Plan Update, please specify scope and budget as a separate item, and include a rationale for this work.

51. **It was mentioned that the Navy Yard Gate be less of a physical gate and more of a representational gate. If this is the case, will there still be a need for security measures or at least some form of protection for the 109 acres of land?**

Yes, secure entrances and public spaces will still be required at the Navy Yard. The specific nature and detail of security requirements will be shared with the selected master planning team.

52. **Would the funding strategy we develop be limited to shared infrastructure and public space, or would it extend to the funding and financial performance of the development products shown in Ensemble/Mosaic’s conceptual plan?**

The funding strategy should be limited to shared infrastructure and public space.

**ENVIRONMENTAL, SUSTAINABILITY, AND RESILIENCY**

**Studies and background documents**

53. **Is there a completed governing environmental impact report (EIR), or will design lead to a new EIR process?**

PIDC has a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and other reports for the parcels to be transferred from the Navy (as noted in blue on Figure 6 on page 9 of the RFP), and has environmental baseline survey and decision documents for the remainder of the master planning area, which will be provided to the selected master planning team. All redevelopments will have to go through Pennsylvania’s Act 2 remediation program. Most areas are covered by an SIA agreement.

54. **Will existing conditions geotechnical and environmental information be provided to the selected consultant team?**

Yes - to the extent PIDC has these reports, they will be provided to the selected master planning team. If additional studies are completed during the master planning process, we will make them available to the planning team.
55. The site has a history of highly active heavy (military) industry. To what extent was the site analyzed for any toxicity or contamination from these industries. Is this something that should be considered part of the scope?

Prior to transferring the Navy Yard from the Navy to PIDC, the Navy conducted a variety of environmental investigation in order to provide PIDC with a deed covenant, required under Section 120(h) of the federal Superfund, warranting that “all remedial action necessary to protect human health and the environment with respect to any such [hazardous] substances remaining on the property has been taken” before the date of transfer. At the time of transfer, the Navy represented to PIDC that there were no unaddressed comments from EPA or the Pennsylvania DEP (PA DEP). Because of the Navy’s prior investigations, PA DEP currently has a set of environmental reports prepared by the Navy that describe the existing environmental conditions as would be set forth in a baseline environmental report, required pursuant to Section 305 (b) of Act 2 (which sets forth Pennsylvania’s land recycling program). No further environmental studies are included in the scope of this master planning RFP.

56. Has PIDC started the Act 2 remediation process?

No.

LEED-ND

57. Is the intent to benchmark against LEED-ND or pursue eventual certification?

The intent is to pursue eventual LEED-ND certification.

58. Is the intent to simply provide a LEED-ND checklist, or are you anticipating some analysis along with the checklist?

The intent is that the LEED-ND framework provide a guide to the Master Plan Update, and ultimately that the scope of work would include a preliminary checklist and summary analysis. The summary analysis would indicate the potential points available for the project and what level of certification the project could potentially achieve.

59. Knowing the details of LEED-ND, we likely will recommend going beyond the defined master plan boundaries in order to achieve a higher level of certification. For the LEED-ND boundary, may we expand the boundaries of the master plan if it’s of benefit to the project?

PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic control the areas explicitly noted in the RFP and proposals should focus on this area. If a team believes that expanded boundaries are necessary or beneficial, they should (1) include the areas within the Master Plan area in their base
proposal, and (2) articulate any additional areas, scope, and cost as an optional scope item. The suggestion will be considered by PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic in the evaluation of proposals.

60. From all of the other LEED projects we have consulted on at the Navy Yard, we have learned to register the project early to prevent rules changing with updates to LEED. Will early funds be allocated for us to register the LEED ND project shortly after a LEED consultant puts their work together?

If a team believes that early registration is important to the scope, they should include that in their proposal and budget, along with the team’s rationale for the early allocation of such funds.

61. Does the development team have any priorities related to air quality / human health as related being in the flight path of the airport?

Health concerns, including air quality and quality of life, are an element of the development team’s goal for a sustainable development. If a proposing master planning team brings specific ideas for how to address these goals as they relate to the flight path, they should be addressed in the proposal and workplan.

Resiliency

62. How much consideration is given to resiliency in the comprehensive plan?

The Navy Yard is in the floodplain, making resiliency an important element of any long-range planning. PIDC has worked closely with the Army Corps of Engineers, FEMA, and the City of Philadelphia’s Office of Transportation, Infrastructure, and Sustainability (oTIS) to ensure development is compliant with sea level rise (SLR) projections, and expects that future planning, including this Master Plan Update, will take floodplain and sea level rise considerations into account.

63. Have studies been done on sea level rise and, if not, will the selected master planning team be expected to undertake those studies?

Respondents are encouraged to consult FEMA floodplain studies (available online), which address anticipated sea level rise. To the extent a team believes that additional analysis is required to complete the Master Plan Update, it should be included in the proposal and budget.
64. Have you been in contact with the Army Corps about wetland replacement requirements?

Preliminary wetland delineations were completed in 2005 and 2008. As part of that process the Army Corps was contacted and performed a preliminary walk of those specific areas. To date no discussions on wetland replacement have occurred, however, Ensemble/Mosaic will be performing a formal wetland delineation survey and go through the wetland relocation process concurrent with the Master Plan Update. This scope should not be included in proposals for the Master Plan Update.

65. Are the wetland and sea level rise concerns being issued as a separate RFP?

No. Ensemble/Mosaic will be performing a separate wetland delineation and mitigation scope of work concurrent with the Master Plan. This scope of work should not be part of the proposals in response to this master planning RFP.

66. During the pre-bid meeting, it was mentioned that there is a concurrent wetlands study being undertaken at the Navy Yard. What is the timeframe for completion of this study and what material, if any, will be shared with the consultant team?

The timeframe for completion of the wetlands study will extend beyond the timeframe for the Master Plan Update. Materials will be shared with the selected master planning team on an as available and as needed basis during the master planning process.

67. Will PIDC be providing the floodplain constraints as described on V.C.3.b.?

The floodplain constraints described in this section refer to the League Island Boulevard West corridor’s location in a FEMA Mapped Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) AE Zone. Projects in the SFHA have special requirements. This designation impacts construction and development (including building design and uses). Refer to the code bulletin for development in special flood hazard areas (PDF).

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

68. Is the entire site subject to historic preservation guidelines and review?

As noted in the RFP, the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard Historic District encompasses most of the present-day Navy Yard (Section IV(B)(1) on page 13). The Shipyard Historic District is further demised into Zone 1 parcels, in which SHPO must approve any construction or material rehabilitation, and Zone 2 parcels, in which SHPO must be notified and consulted of any such work. Refer to Document B1. Historic Districts and Covenants included in the RFP download zip file for a map indicating Zone 1 and Zone 2 boundaries.
69. Will historic preservation evaluations be required for existing properties in the masterplan?

No specific historic preservation evaluation is required; however, the master planning team should be prepared to identify what elements, if any, of the Master Plan Update require reporting, review, or approval by historic preservation authorities. Teams should be able to describe any such requirements (e.g., specific forms or processes), but performance of these requirements is not within the scope of the Master Plan Update.

70. Please share more about the Chapel at the heart of the Chapel Block.

The Chapel is a historic, iconic part of the Navy Yard and its history. The Chapel is currently used by the Four Chaplains Memorial Foundation for weekly weekend services and special events. The Chapel will be incorporated into Ensemble/Mosaic’s plan for the Initial Phase. In conjunction with the hotels at the Navy Yard, the Chapel offers unique opportunities for event space and other creative uses that honor its history.

EQUITABLE AND INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT

71. Does the client have an equitable development definition and/or have any pre-established equitable development goals, targets or metrics? Affordable housing; commercial, community and business development, purchasing and procurement, equity ownership, blue/green infrastructure, programming, cultural identity, other?

PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic have agreed to select equitable development objectives, as part of their development agreement. These objectives center on ownership of new development, participation in construction and operations, retail opportunities for local, M/WBE firms, and workforce housing. Specific goals will be shared with the selected master planning team. Teams may include additional equitable development considerations in their proposal scope and budget; these will be considered by PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic in the evaluation of proposals.

72. How will design schemes be tested against the economics of the project and equitable development goals that have cost implications?

As noted in the RFP, the Master Plan Update will include order of magnitude cost estimates for any recommended capital and operational improvements (Section V(C)(9) on page 24). Through the master planning process, these cost estimates will be considered alongside project economics and specific equitable development goals to be shared with the selected master planning team.
73. How will equitable development requirements be ratified?

The selected master planning team will incorporate equitable development objectives, as directed by PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic. Monitoring and achievement of those goals will be accomplished through the development agreement, rather than the master planning process.

74. How will public agencies and developers be held accountable to equitable development requirements, targets and metrics?

Monitoring and achievement will be accomplished through the development agreement, rather than the master planning process.

75. How has the city allocated incentives and resources to help support execution of equitable development goals?

This is outside the scope of the Master Plan Update.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

76. It sounds like the existing team is handling community engagement work, but you’re also asking for an engagement expert on the master planning team. Do you still have a need for additional engagement?

Yes. PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic will collaborate with the selected master planning team to develop and execute community engagement during the master planning process, but the planning team is expected to interact with and coordinate with key stakeholders to get feedback that drives an achievable plan. PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic have identified three key stakeholder groups: Navy Yard stakeholders (major companies and employees), adjacent communities, and city and state partners as appropriate. These groups are defined in more detail in the RFP (Section V(B)(1) on page 16). That being said, feedback on stakeholder identification and the management of stakeholder outreach is expected from the master planning team. PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic welcome proposals that respond to this need, either from the lead consultant or a subconsultant.

77. Have any community/stakeholder advisory committees been established outside of the client group and developers?

No.
78. Which / how many “immediately adjacent community groups” are to be engaged? Will they be engaged as a whole or individually?

Specific community groups will be identified in consultation with PIDC and Ensemble/Mosaic in the early stages of the master planning process. Proposals are welcome to consider various approaches to engagement of community groups and other stakeholders, with the goal of successfully generating feedback to inform an achievable plan. Proposals should indicate the number of stakeholder engagements contemplated in the project plan and associated budget for this plan activity.

TRANSPORTATION, PARKING, AND WAYFINDING

79. Will the traffic modeling completed under the previous (2004/2013) Master Plans, or other studies or analysis of vehicular and pedestrian movements throughout the Navy Yard, be provided to the selected respondent? Can we assume that transportation modeling efforts would not start from scratch?

The selected master planning team will be provided with traffic studies that pertain to certain limited areas in the master planning area. The Master Plan Update should include an updated transportation plan based on current and projected vehicular traffic volumes that reflect ongoing development and a post-COVID environment.

80. Mustin North campus indicates isolated above grade structured parking, and Mustin South is integrated into buildings. Is this a pro forma driven decision, a wetlands restriction, or are there other factors that were considered?

This decision was mostly driven by function and should be reviewed/tested by the selected master planning team. The original thinking is that the functional requirements of life science GMP facilities are not conducive to integrating parking within the structures; however, in a more dense, pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use environment such as the Mustin South district, more flexibility exists to have integrated solutions. Any and all solutions must meet an economic feasibility standard.

81. Please expand on the transportation plan and envisioned outcomes of this scope item.

The transportation plan should address access to the Navy Yard and circulation within the Navy Yard, to effectively and efficiently support all existing and future uses. The plan should develop realistic strategies to manage all types of transportation, transit, and alternative modes, including but not limited to single-occupant vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles, bike share, park-and-ride, and emerging technologies such as driverless shuttles. The Master Plan Update should also explore connections between the Navy Yard and other
key destinations in the City, including University City. Planning should address the advent of residential users and specifically address shared and efficient parking solutions to support all existing and planned uses.

**82. How will local site transportation circulation be coordinated with the City’s mobility plan?**

The transportation plan should be consistent with initiatives of the Philadelphia Streets Department and Philadelphia’s Office of Transportation, Infrastructure, and Sustainability (oTIS), including pilot projects for innovative transportation solutions.

**83. Could you address the wayfinding strategy portion of the scope? Are you looking for a new full branding and wayfinding package for the whole campus or to leverage and expand your existing wayfinding system across the district?**

The Master Plan Update should provide a high-level survey and critique of existing wayfinding and signage systems, leading to high-level recommendations and precedent approaches for consideration at the Navy Yard. A full wayfinding plan, or branding exercise, is not included in the scope of this RFP.

**84. Is your intention that we develop an updated design (requiring design development, construction documents, etc.) to respond to the more complex campus? Alternatively, we could stay at a master plan level and show general concepts for design updates with information on costs and phasing. Please advise which is desired.**

Work at a master plan level is sufficient and appropriate for the scope of this master planning RFP. Detailed design documents are outside the scope of this RFP.

**85. Is it your intention in that scope to redesign the Navy Yard brand or district identity or limit our scope to signage and wayfinding only?**

Branding is outside the scope of this RFP.
SMART CITIES

86. Can you provide more information on what is required of the Master Plan Update on the "smart city" energy plan underway now by AECOM? Should teams develop and build on top of this or is the PIDC/Mosaic/Ensemble team looking for fresh and new ideas to propose?

The selected master planning team is expected to integrate planning and recommendations from AECOM’s Smart Cities plan into the Master Plan Update.

87. Could you supply any information with regards to connectivity (including plans to build out a 5G network at the site), public wi-fi, or digital divide needs?

These elements are being considered as part of the Smart Cities plan underway by AECOM. That plan is slated for completion in 2Q 2021 and recommendations or strategies will be provided to the master planning team for integration into the Master Plan Update.

88. Is it possible to reach out to AECOM for potential teaming opportunities?

Yes.

BUILDING AND SYSTEM DESIGN

89. Will this phase of the project include low voltage wiring needs? Will the engineer chosen be responsible for developing along with GC the low voltage wiring needs?

No. This RFP is for planning services only. Electrical systems for new development will be addressed outside of this RFP by Ensemble/Mosaic.

90. Will the owner be included in end user access control and surveillance selection / input given the cloud-based nature / technology specs for these services that will be ongoing monthly subscriptions?

This RFP is for planning services only.

91. Is it best for a low voltage design company to partner with the engineer team chosen before or post bid? Or before or post firm selection?

Electrical systems for new development will be addressed outside of this RFP.

92. Will the job require Union electricians for high voltage electricity services?

This RFP is for planning services only.
### ANTIDISCRIMINATION POLICY SOLICITATION FOR PARTICIPATION AND COMMITMENT FORM

Minority (MBE), Woman (WBE), Disabled (DSBE) and Disadvantaged (DBE) Business Enterprises

<table>
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<tr>
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<th>Date Solicited</th>
<th>Commitment Made</th>
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<td>By Phone</td>
<td>By Mail</td>
<td>Yes (If Yes, give date)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSBE</td>
<td>M-DBE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</table>

List below ALL MBE/WBE/DBE/DSBEs that were solicited regardless of whether a commitment resulted therefrom. - Photocopy this form as necessary.

---

1. If Bidder/Proposer makes solicitation(s) and commitment(s) with a DBE, Bidder/Proposer shall indicate which class type, M-DBE or W-DBE, is submitted for credit.

2. Attach all quotations to this form.
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