

**Questions and Answers
Navy Yard Parking Study
11/30/22**

1. What is the expectation relative to schedule? Are there any milestones or project drivers that need to be accounted for?

Although we could be somewhat flexible with dates, our goal is to have a draft no later than April 15, 2023 and a final deliverable by May 15, 2023.

2. Do assumptions used to establish use, size, and occupant load of Building 76, 75, 752, 79, and 611 need to be reviewed and confirmed?

No.

3. Who are the stakeholder groups, and what is the frequency of meetings/presentations required?

PIDC is the primary stakeholder. There will be a kick-off meeting and selected consultant should present the draft and final deliverables. We also anticipate one informational session with our development partner, Ensemble/Mosaic, so the successful team can understand their perspective on development of the 624 East parcel; PIDC should also be present for this session. Additional meeting frequency should be determined by the consultant and described in the proposal.

4. Identifying an appropriate line will require sufficient study of HC-03 (Ensemble/Mosaic), HC-PG-01 (PAID), and the buffer between the two structures. What level of involvement will Ensemble/Mosaic have?

We anticipate one informational session with our development partner, Ensemble/Mosaic, so the successful team can understand their perspective on development of the 624 East parcel; PIDC should also be present for this session. Any information needs should be requested through PIDC. The only information available at this time is conceptual and can be found in the 2022 Plan Update. The buffer should adhere to Philadelphia Building Code.

5. What is the expectation relative to final deliverable(s) for Task 1?

Deliverables necessary to meet the objective of the project should be determined by the consultant and presented in the proposal.

6. Should stormwater management strategies be explored and incorporated for each proposed development site for Task 1?

Stormwater management should be explored only to the degree of considering the approximate size and location as part of the study.

7. What level of interior planning/test-fitting is expected to determine size and configuration for Buildings HC611A and HC611B?

Minimal. 611 should be split based on the continuation of the road and density will be based on assumed creative office uses.

8. What level of structure/facility assessment, if any, is expected to determine feasibility of Building 752, 79, and 611?

We do not anticipate any work beyond reviewing any available data would be required, however firms may provide an optional additional scope and pricing if they so choose. The main concern for these buildings is to evaluate density based on commercial or creative office uses.

9. What is the expectation relative to final deliverable(s) for Task 2?

Deliverables necessary to meet the objective of the project should be determined by the consultant and presented in the proposal.

10. Should stormwater management strategies be explored and incorporated for each proposed development site for Task 2?

Stormwater management should be explored only to the degree of considering the approximate size and location as part of the study

11. RFP indicates that PIDC seeks an experienced team to develop parking plan and does not indicate specifically that it seeks a team for full parking structure design. Is PIDC looking for proposal only for providing parking structure concepts at this point?

Yes.

If yes, what is the level of detail that should be included in the concept phase plans?

The level of detail necessary to meet the objective of the project should be determined by the consultant and presented in the proposal. At a minimum, the deliverables should contain sufficient analysis, site layout, and justification to support recommendations from the planning team regarding the size of the parking structure on the 624 West lot, as well as the size and configuration of surface parking on the remaining lots, as needed to support the increased density assigned to the subject properties.

12. What type of credit or weightage a team is going to get for a team which exceeds the percentage requirement of MBE/WBE/DSBE? Is there a specific weightage for credit, 25% vs. 50% vs. 75% vs. 100%?

Proposals will be evaluated based on several factors, including meeting/exceeding these goals. PIDC is committed to maximizing opportunities for M/WBE businesses and strongly encourages proposers to include meaningful M/WBE participation in their proposals.

13. Is PIDC envisioning to have concept foundation plan in the concept phase?

No.

14. Is there a survey available or required for developing concepts and new design?

Any available survey information will be provided to the selected consultant and we do not anticipate a full survey being required at this time.

15. Site is surrounded by streets on 3 sides, Is there a need of including any logistical plan to keep the traffic circulation running in the concept phase?

All parking recommendations, including ingress/egress, should be compatible with efficient flow of Navy Yard traffic.

16. Please confirm that PIDC is not envisioning any below grade parking level in parking structure and all 5 levels are to be above grade.

That is correct.

17. Please confirm parking structure can be a precast parking structure with double tees.

We will rely on the selected consultant to propose what type of structure would be most appropriate.

18. What is the anticipated timeframe for this work for concepts/schematic design, preliminary and final design, construction including precast erection?

Concepts/schematic design are the only phases included in this RFP.

19. How was parking garage demand (550 spaces) determined? Was there a parking study performed or it is required? If yes, is it possible to get a copy of it?

The demand was determined as part of the 2022 Plan Update, which can be found here: www.navyyard.org/plan. The selected consultant will be expected to take a fresh look at this sizing recommendation, based on the target redevelopment objectives of PIDC for the specified parcels.

20. What parking garage amenities are envisioned (e.g. green roof, solar roof, parking guidance systems, etc.)?

We will rely on the selected consultant to propose what type of structure would be most appropriate. The parking garage should be conceptual in nature with the main focus being capacity, however recommendations regarding sustainability and resiliency elements that can be incorporated into design/construction should also be included

21. What user groups are anticipated for the garage?

Please refer to the 2022 Plan Update (www.navyyard.org/plan).

22. Will concept plans include façade concepts? Should team anticipate façade concept design or will master plan architect dictate façade design?

We do not anticipate that being included in this study.

23. How many concepts (for garage design and façade) should our team anticipate?

We will rely on the selected consultant to propose how many concepts should be included and this should be presented in the proposal. The proposals should be focused on the size of the garage rather than the design at this time.

24. Will concept team be awarded parking garage design?

The parking garage design consultant is not being selected at this time. The study will be used by PIDC to set the subdivision line on the B624 West parcel and inform redevelopment plans for the remaining parcels.

25. Other than review of parking demand ratios and potential operational methods of reducing parking demand by the various land uses, are any other parking planning responsibilities to be addressed by our team?

No.

26. How many meetings should be anticipated by our team?

There will be a kick-off meeting, an informational session with Ensemble/Mosaic, and the selected consultant should present the draft and final deliverables. Additional meeting frequency should be determined by the consultant and described in the proposal.

27. In addition to the questions above and in case we missed any major detail, is it possible to know questions and responses from other teams?

Q&A will be posted to our website.

28. In the proposal outline section 1.f – a fee proposal is requested and itemized by task. Where can we find the list of clearly defined tasks required for this effort?

The consultant should determine which defined tasks are necessary and present that information in the proposal.

29. Are you requiring key personnel resumes of particular SMEs like architects, engineers, designers, planners – and do those individuals need to be certified in PA?

The consultant should determine which disciplines are required to meet the objectives of the project and present that information in the proposal. Since signed/sealed documents are not required, certification in PA is not required.

30. In the General Provisions Article III section of the RFP (PDF Page 42) design submissions are required in a specific format and also by licensed engineers and architect. Is this study requiring that level of design submissions be included in the proposal or is this not relevant at this time?

That is not relevant at this time.

31. Can you please provide a list of the firms/people who participated in the pre-proposal meeting on November 15th, if you have it available?

We do not have that available. Since the meeting was not mandatory, there was no sign-in sheet.

32. Is the intent that this project will monetize parking in the future?

That is not relevant at this time, but we should assume that the garage will be free, similar to other garages and lots at the Navy Yard

33. Are the site plans requested in the RFP intended to be sealed engineering type land development drawings or concept style general parking allocation plans?

Concept style general parking allocation plans.

34. What are the primary goals and objectives of the parking study, and what is the expected level of work product?

Please refer to the RFP.

35. Is this study intended to determine the total number of parking spaces needed to support only the PIDC owned parcels or is the intent to provide parking that can serve the general area as a whole?

PIDC owned parcels.

36. Are all of the parcels and land uses listed in Exhibit C considered PIDC owned parcels?

No, the PIDC owned parcels in question are noted in the RFP.

37. Is the intent of the 940-space HC-PG-01 parking garage to fully support the parking needs of those parcels?

The parking garage and surface parking lots should support Buildings 76, 79, 611A, and 611B. The 2022 Plan Update both and this should be evaluated by the project team.

38. Does the PIDC intend to use the existing on-street parking supply to support the parking needs for their parcels?

The study should identify the parking required for the specified buildings and set forth solutions for accommodating those needs through a combination of structured and surface parking. Street parking is at a premium at the Navy Yard and should not be utilized as part of the solution.

39. From a transit perspective and opportunity, is there any ridership information available on the utilization of the existing transit service that would be beneficial for this study?

Currently, <10% of Navy Yard employees utilize transit.

40. The site plan portion of this RFP, is the PIDC looking for a civil engineering site plan (survey, grading plan, utilities, etc) or just a layout which takes into account developable land?

A layout which takes into account developable land