

# ADDENDUM NO. 1

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS — GENERAL CONTRACTOR SERVICES

TRANSBAY BLOCK 4 WEST | SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Issued by: Mercy Housing California & Young Community Developers

Addendum Date: May 1, 2026

Original RFP Date: April 10, 2026 | Proposal Due Date: May 21, 2026 | 2:00 PM

## PURPOSE

This Addendum No. 1 is issued in response to questions received from prospective General Contractor respondents following the issuance of the Transbay Block 4 West GC RFP on April 10, 2026, and the Pre-Submission Meeting held on April 23, 2026. Questions were received through April 24, 2026 per the deadline stated in the RFP.

This Addendum is incorporated into and made part of the RFP. In the event of any conflict between this Addendum and the original RFP, the terms of this Addendum shall control. All other terms, conditions, and requirements of the RFP remain unchanged.

**Respondents are advised to review all questions and answers below, as certain clarifications may affect the scope of the cost estimate or the substance of the proposal narrative.**

## DOCUMENT KEY

DOCUMENT KEY	
<b>Q#</b>	Question number — referenced throughout this addendum. All questions are incorporated by reference into the RFP.
<b>Q&amp;A Addendum No. 1</b>	This document constitutes Addendum No. 1 to the TB4W GC RFP dated April 10, 2026.
<b>Effective Date</b>	May 1, 2026. Answers posted per the RFP selection timeline.
<b>Priority</b>	In the event of conflict between this Addendum and the original RFP, this Addendum controls.
<b>Attachment References</b>	References to Attachments A–L refer to attachments issued with the original RFP dated April 10, 2026.
<b>TBD / To Be Confirmed</b>	Items noted as TBD will be addressed during the preconstruction phase with the selected General Contractor.

## QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Questions are grouped by topic for ease of reference. Respondents should ensure their proposal addresses any scope or scope-interpretation changes clarified herein.

### EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS

Q #	QUESTION	ANSWER
Q1	The RFP states that the minimum qualification threshold requires projects completed within the last five (5) years. May respondents include projects from the last ten (10) years in their Experience Profiles?	Respondents may include projects from the last ten (10) years of experience. As described in the RFP please submit examples at least two projects of similar type and scope, including at least one Type I high-rise of 15+ stories or 150+ feet with 175+ units. If you do not have two projects in the last ten (10) years, we will accept your submission, but you will lose points. For the Contractor's Qualifications Statement (AIA A305, Section 3.5 – Projects Completed), respondents may reference projects completed within the last ten (10) years, consistent with the instruction in Section IV, Item 3 of the RFP.
Q2	For Joint Ventures, does the limit of six (6) project profiles apply per firm, or to the JV as a whole?	For Joint Ventures, each member firm may submit up to six (6) project profiles independently. The collective experience of the JV will be evaluated and scored together, as stated in Section IV, Item 2 of the RFP.
Q3	As a private company, we consider our financial statements to be highly confidential and proprietary. Is it acceptable to substitute a letter from our Chief Financial Officer confirming financial capability and bonding capacity in lieu of full financial statements?	Financial statements are a required element of the Contractor's Qualifications Statement (AIA A305) per Section IV, Item 3 of the RFP, and a CFO letter alone is not an acceptable substitute. However, the development team acknowledges the sensitivity of this information. Respondents may submit financial statements under strictly separate, confidential cover clearly marked 'CONFIDENTIAL - FINANCIAL STATEMENTS,' addressed directly to the RFP contacts. Financial statements will be reviewed only by the evaluation panel and will not be shared beyond that group. Respondents who have documented concerns about confidentiality are encouraged to contact the development team prior to the proposal deadline to discuss acceptable formats.
Q4	Section IV, Item 2 (Experience Profiles) states that a minimum of two projects must have been completed within the last five (5) years. Section IV, Item 3 (Contractor's Qualifications Statement) references projects completed in the past ten (10) years. Please clarify which timeframe governs.	Both timeframes are correct and apply to different submission elements. The five-year lookback requests respondents to demonstrate at least two completed projects of similar construction type and scope (including at least one Type I high-rise of 15+ stories or 150+ feet with 175+ units) within the last five years. The ten (10) year lookback applies to Section 3.5 of the AIA A305 Contractor's Qualifications Statement, where respondents may reference a broader project history. Respondents should clearly identify within their Experience Profiles which two projects satisfy the five-year threshold.

### COST ESTIMATE & FEES

Q #	QUESTION	ANSWER
Q5	Given that the RFP is actively exploring full design-build delivery, should respondents base their proposed fee, general conditions, and cost estimate on a traditional GMP/cost-plus structure or a design-build structure?	Respondents should base their primary proposal, including the Conceptual Cost Estimate (Attachment K), proposed fee, and general conditions, on a traditional negotiated GMP (cost-plus) delivery structure. The Design-Build Narrative (Section III and Submission Item 7) is a separate evaluation element. Respondents who wish to provide supplemental pricing under a full design-build scenario may do so as an optional attachment, clearly labeled as such, but it is not required. But in the design-build narrative portion of the response,

		respondents should describe how design-build would bring cost savings and cost certainty.
<b>Q6</b>	Should the cost estimate include underground utilities as part of the Tehama Street Improvements scope (Part 2 of the cost estimate)?	Yes. Respondents should include underground dry utility coordination and wet utility connections as a line item in Part 2 – Tehama Street Improvements. Final utility relocation and coordination scope will be confirmed during preconstruction in coordination with SFPUC, PG&E, and other applicable utility agencies.
<b>Q7</b>	Should the Community + Multipurpose room be priced as a cold-dark shell or as a full interior buildout?	The Community and Multipurpose rooms are residential amenity spaces serving building residents and should be estimated as a full interior buildout. The ground-floor commercial/retail space (the approximately 4,200 SF grocery-anchored space) should be estimated as a warm shell condition per MOHCD commercial underwriting guidelines.
<b>Q8</b>	Should the open space parcel and/or the mid-block mews be included in the cost estimate? If so, in which part?	The Block 4W development program does not include a mid-block mews as part of its scope. For site work estimating purposes, assume a fence along the eastern property line with a pedestrian door that allows visual access to the open space parcel from both Howard and Tehama Streets. Respondents should state these clearly in their cost estimate submissions.
<b>Q9</b>	Where should respondents assume the emergency generator will be located—at the podium level or at grade?	Generator location has not been determined at this stage of design. PG&E has been pushing back against sub-surface transformers in San Francisco. For estimating purposes, respondents should assume either a podium-level or at-grade location and should clearly state their assumption. Generator sizing and placement will be refined during schematic design in coordination with the MEP design-build subcontractor.

**SITE & GEOTECHNICAL**

Q #	QUESTION	ANSWER
<b>Q10</b>	Is any geotechnical or soils information available for Block 4, Block 2, or adjacent parcels? Is a preliminary geotechnical report available?	No geotechnical report is available at this time. Respondents must use the assumptions stated in Section IV, Item 5 of the RFP: (1) foundation soil will be improved; (2) soil below the groundwater level will not be susceptible to liquefaction (Site Class D applies for the improved condition); (3) a deep foundation system will be used; and (4) where liquefiable soil remains below the basement/ground slab, Site Class F and site-specific response spectra apply. Respondents are encouraged to reference comparable nearby projects (e.g., 160 Folsom Street) as a basis for estimating. A full geotechnical investigation will be completed during the preconstruction phase.
<b>Q11</b>	Section IV, Item 5 states to 'assume foundation soil will be improved.' What type of soil improvement should we assume—over-excavation with engineered fill, or a ground improvement system?	No specific soil improvement method is prescribed at this time. Respondents should propose the approach they believe is most cost-effective based on their experience with similar high-rise projects in the Transbay District and Yerba Buena soil conditions, and should clearly note their assumed improvement method and depth in the cost estimate. This will be one of the items refined with the selected GC during preconstruction. For example, at Transbay Block 2, the site soil was improved through Deep Soil Mixing.
<b>Q12</b>	For the deep foundation assumption, is there a preferred foundation type (e.g., driven piles, drilled piers, auger-cast piles)? Are there assumed quantities or depths?	No specific deep foundation type, quantity, or depth is prescribed. Respondents should assume the deep foundation system they consider most appropriate based on their experience with comparable high-rise projects in similar soil conditions and should state these assumptions clearly. As a reference point, Transbay Block 2 improved soil through deep soil mixing, then built a mat foundation. Note that in prior

Transbay high-rise projects, an exercise was conducted to verify that tower foundation piles reached bedrock; respondents should anticipate a similar verification requirement and price accordingly. Foundation design will be confirmed during preconstruction.

<b>Q13</b>	Are there any as-builts available for the site?	No as-builts are available. Block 4W is currently an undeveloped parcel. Respondents should refer to Attachment J (Preliminary Conceptual Design) and make reasonable assumptions about existing site conditions for estimating purposes.
<b>Q14</b>	During the pre-submission meeting on April 23, 2026, a geotechnical report for the project was mentioned. Can the development team please share that report?	An old geotechnical report was completed for the previously conceived Transbay Block 4 West site. However, it was completed by the previous developer for the site and has not yet been shared with Mercy/YCD. When the report is available, it can be shared with potential respondents. Any reference to geotechnical work at the pre-submission meeting was in the context of the foundation and soils assumptions established for estimating purposes, which are set out in Section IV, Item 5 of the RFP. A full geotechnical investigation for Block 4W will be conducted during the preconstruction phase with the selected General Contractor. For proposal purposes, respondents must rely on the RFP assumptions.

**TEHAMA STREET IMPROVEMENTS**

Q #	QUESTION	ANSWER
<b>Q15</b>	Are there any conceptual plans or separate narratives available for the Tehama Street extension beyond what is shown in the building drawings?	No separate Tehama Street improvement drawings have been issued at this time. Respondents should use the information in Attachment J (Preliminary Conceptual Design) and the project narrative in Section II of the RFP to inform their estimate. The Tehama Street extension runs from Beale Street on the west to Main Street on the east, along the south side of the site.]
<b>Q16</b>	What street cross-section should be assumed for the Tehama Street extension? The concept plans show a 12-foot-wide sidewalk—is this accurate for both the north and south sides of the extension?	Respondents should assume a standard two-lane urban street section consistent with San Francisco DPW standards for a new local street. A 12-foot sidewalk width on both the north and south sides of the extension is a reasonable assumption based on the floor plan depictions. Exact right-of-way dimensions and cross-section will be confirmed during preconstruction coordination with SFMTA and DPW. Respondents should note their assumed cross-section clearly.]
<b>Q17</b>	Should we assume full reconstruction of existing sidewalks along the Howard Street and Beale Street project frontages?	Yes. The TB4W project team is responsible for all streetscape improvements on the sidewalk fronting the property from the building face to the curb on Howard Street, Beale Street, and Tehama Street, excluding any cycle-tracks. The City of San Francisco has separate active projects — the Howard Street Improvement Project and the Active Beale Project — that cover improvements outward from the cycle-track; those are not part of the Block 4W scope. Detailed sidewalk plans for coordination will be made available to the selected General Contractor during preconstruction.
<b>Q18</b>	Does the existing bus stop island on Beale Street remain as-is, or should we assume relocation?	Bus stop relocation on Beale Street is TBD, pending coordination with SFMTA and DPW, and will be addressed during preconstruction. Respondents should note that there is a dedicated bicycle track fronting the sidewalks on both Beale Street and Howard Street. Any staging or logistics plan must account for the bike tracks and must not assume it is available for construction use without prior SFMTA approval.

**DESIGN & ARCHITECTURE**

Q #	QUESTION	ANSWER
Q19	How is design responsibility divided between Kennerly Architecture & Planning (KAP) and Solomon Cordwell Buenz (SCB)? Which firm leads which aspects of the design?	KAP and SCB are both serving as Project Architects and will both remain as Architects of Record under any delivery method selected. The specific scope delineation between KAP and SCB will be discussed further with shortlisted firms at the interview stage. Both firms are engaged and collaborating on the design; the GC should expect to coordinate with both architectural teams throughout preconstruction.
Q20	What is the baseline assumption for the exterior building envelope/façade system?	No single façade system has been prescribed at this stage, but one exterior skin system will wrap the entirety of the façade. Note that the façade system selection will be dependent upon the variety of exterior textures and finishes required by the design, and must accommodate a minimum 6-inch window recess. The RFP intentionally solicits GC input on the most cost-effective and constructible envelope approach consistent with these design requirements. Respondents should articulate their recommended envelope system and their experience with it as part of the Cost Savings Narrative (Section IV, Item 6). Please refer to Attachment L (Design Standards) and Attachment J (Preliminary Conceptual Design) for design context and performance parameters.
Q21	Is the tower setback at Level 9 along Tehama Street a code requirement or a planning/easement condition?	The Level 9 setback along Tehama is driven by the Transbay Redevelopment Plan's Design Controls and Design Guidelines (DCDG) requirements administered by OCII. Respondents should treat this as a fixed design constraint and price accordingly.

**STAGING & LOGISTICS**

Q #	QUESTION	ANSWER
Q22	Can respondents assume full and exclusive use of Tehama Street for construction staging throughout the full vertical construction duration?	Yes. As stated in Section II of the RFP, Tehama Street may be used for staging during construction. The Tehama Street extension is to be completed and opened simultaneously with the residential building, so respondents should plan to restore and complete Tehama Street to City standards as part of the project closeout sequence. Respondents should describe their proposed sequencing of Tehama Street staging versus final completion in their Staging/Logistics Plan (Section IV, Item 8).
Q23	What is the status of Transbay Block 4 East (Block 4E), and can the GC assume use of Block 4E for staging and laydown during Block 4W construction?	Block 4E is planned for future development as an approximately 450-foot market-rate residential tower in the Transbay Redevelopment Plan. Block 4E construction will occur after Block 4W. Respondents may assume that Block 4E will be available for construction staging and laydown during the Block 4W construction period. Respondents should describe their proposed use of Block 4E for staging in their Staging/Logistics Plan (Section IV, Item 8).
Q24	Will the 25-foot mid-block mews be available for use during construction? Can we assume the open space parcel is available for laydown and staging?	There is no mid-block mews in the 4W development program. The open space parcel should be assumed as available for laydown and staging.
Q25	Can respondents solicit input from trade partners and subcontractors in preparing the Conceptual Cost Estimate?	Yes. Use of subcontractor and trade partner input is encouraged and is specifically referenced in the RFP. Section IV, Item 6 (Cost Savings Narrative) asks respondents to describe their 'proposed use of subcontractor input for cost estimates.' Respondents should describe which trades they engaged and how that input informed their estimate.

**PROJECT TEAM & PROCESS**

Q #	QUESTION	ANSWER
Q26	Who makes up the Selection Panel that will evaluate proposals?	As stated in Section V of the RFP, the Selection Committee is composed of representatives from Mercy Housing California, Young Community Developers (YCD), an Owner's Representative, and a representative from OCII (Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure).
Q27	Is the development team planning to engage a Construction Manager or Owner's Representative for the project?	Yes. The development team anticipates engaging an Owner's Representative who will be involved throughout preconstruction and construction. The Owner's Representative has a seat on the RFP evaluation panel. Respondents should expect to coordinate closely with the Owner's Representative as part of the project team.
Q28	Has a condominium subdivision map been filed, or does the development team intend to file one for the project?	No condominium subdivision map has been filed, and none is anticipated. Transbay Block 4 West is planned as a single-phase affordable rental housing development. This does not affect the General Contractor's scope of work or any element of the proposal submission.

## CONTACT

Questions regarding this Addendum should be directed to:

**Sean Wils, Mercy Housing California | [sean.wils@mercyhousing.org](mailto:sean.wils@mercyhousing.org)**

**Robert Abbott, Young Community Developers | [rabbott@ycdjobs.org](mailto:rabbott@ycdjobs.org)**

---

*Proposals remain due on Thursday, May 21, 2026 at 2:00 PM. No extension to the proposal deadline is granted by this Addendum.*