BUILDING MASSING

Q: Can we propose a purchase price based on a project that is different (taller and/or larger) than that outlined in the RFP? OCII will not consider any proposals that include a purchase price, or design, that reflects anything other than the specific parameters included in the RFP, including the proposed Plan Amendment. Proposal may not include any assumptions that would increase the height of the building, increase the bulk of the building at any height (beyond the proposed Plan Amendment), require any land assemblage either with the 201 Mission Driveway Parcel or the open space parcel on the corner of Howard and Beale, or any exceptions to the open space or parking requirements in the RFP, or any other variations or amendments beyond what is included in the RFP.

Q: Does the design for this proposal need to be based on 700,000gsf, and not on the 848,000gsf that are considered in the final EIR. The 700,000 is an estimate only based on the height and bulk controls outlined in the RFP. Your proposed project should be designed to maximize the square footage and thus the purchase price, while staying within the height and bulk controls in the redevelopment plan as proposed to be amended in the RFP. The 848,000 is the maximum allowable square footage cleared in the EIR, so your project should not be more than 848,000 square feet, but you are not likely to get up to that number because of the fixed height and bulk controls.

Q: If selected and if a deal is made with 201 Mission, what might be the character of that building. We assumed that the 550 height would stay the same, but would it be possible to achieve a larger floor plate on the upper floors than 12,000 sf, if we started with the N1 site and added the 7645 sf of the driveway? The maximum average floor plate for the upper tower portion of a 550’ tall tower in a C-3-O (SD) is 12,000 square feet, per Chart B in Planning Code Section 270 (below). If the entire block is assembled, the building envelop above the 100’ base building wouldn’t change from that assumed in the RFP since the maximum floor plate above 100’ is 25,000 square feet. The additional square footage could be added to the base building.
Q: For the upper portion of the tower I am confused by the “average floor size = 12,000 sf” and “maximum floor size 17,000 sf.” Does that mean that for every 17ksf floor in the upper tower you need to have a 7ksf floor (17+7 = 24/2 = 12) to maintain an average of 12ksf? I suspect most will want to maximize the floor plate, so if you went with all 17ksf floors on the upper tower then the average is 17ksf. In this case, what does the 12ksf average relate to? The maximum is 17,000, so you are correct in your initial statement, in order to maintain the 12,000 sf average, for every 17,000 sf floor plate you must have a 7,000 floor plate.

Q: Using very basic math assuming 14’ slab to slab heights, I get the following density:
Base – 10 floors x 25ksf = 250ksf
Lower – 15 floors x 20ksf = 300ksf
Upper – 15 floors x 17ksf = 250 ksf
Total = 40 floors = 800ksf which is about 100ksf more than the approximation in the RFP; is my rounding too gross or am I missing something? The above average floorplate sizes are wrong. You should refer to Figure 4 on page 3.6 of the RFP for the correct maximum average floor sizes.

Q: The square footage mentioned in Figure 4 (average floor size of 12,000sf in upper tower, average floor size of 17,000sf in lower tower) are gross sf or rentable sf? Please let me know. We cannot fit 700,000 gsf on this site and am wondering if we are missing something. The average floor plate sizes in section 270 of the Planning Code refer to gross square feet.

Q: When you estimated the 700,000 gsf – did you assume residential floor-to-floor heights? How many stories did you assume the tower will have? The 700,000 gsf is a rough estimate based on a floor to floor height of 13.5 feet and the parameters set out in Sections 270 and 272 of the planning code, but you should maximize the square footage and purchase price based on your design assumptions and Sections 270 and 272.

Q: For Block 5, maximum height is 550’ to top of last occupied floor. Any parapet/crown height is in addition to that correct? Correct. See page 18 of the Development Controls for further information.

Q: Regarding the 700,000 square foot building that is referenced in the RFP, can you please confirm whether that is net rentable area or gross buildable area? The 700,000 is an estimate only of the gross square feet based on the height and bulk controls outlined in the RFP. Your proposed project should be designed to maximize the square footage and thus the purchase price, while staying within the height and bulk controls in the redevelopment plan as proposed to be amended in the RFP. The maximum allowable square footage cleared in the EIR is 848,000 square feet, so your project should not be more than 848,000 square feet, but you are not likely to get up to that number because of the fixed height and bulk controls.

Q: Can an elevated deck with low rise podium floors span over the 201 Mission driveway (although it is not acquired by the OCII) as well as over Natoma Street and the open space on M1 and lot 12 while maintaining the public open space? The proposal should only include development on the approx. 26,300 square foot N1 parcel. After a developer is selected there may be a short window of opportunity to discuss additional development alternatives.
DESIGN REVIEW AND APPROVALS

Q: Is the project subject to design review by the Planning Commission? The Prop M allocation has to go to the Planning Commission, so they will have the opportunity to comment on the Project, however the design approvals are done by the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure.

Q: Is Block 5 subject to Proposition M? If so will the Block 5 development be given any priority over other proposed developments? Will OCII assist in getting Block 5 a priority? Yes, Block 5 is subject to a Prop M allocation. There is the expectation that there will be sufficient Prop M allocation for Block 5, assuming a March 2015 DDA execution. No, Block 5 does not get a Prop M priority.

SPECIAL DISTRICTS

Q: As it relates to the Community Benefit District (Commercial Space within 500 feet of the TTC). What is the correct building square footage to use for the required $0.18 per building square foot per year? Rentable, Gross Entitled? Building square footage is defined as gross building square footage as determined by the outside measurements of a building.

Q: What is the correct lot square footage to use for the required $0.18 per lot square foot per year? The size of the finished lot will be used. Lot square footage is defined as the total amount of area within the borders of the parcel. The borders of a parcel are defined on the County Assessor parcel maps. For the purposes of the proposal assume 26,336 for the lot size of Parcel N1, and the open space calculation to determine the lot size for the open space.

Q: Regarding the open space are we required to pay $0.18 psf on that lot square footage as well? Or just on the 26,336 sf that the office tower will be developed upon? You will be required to pay the CBD payment on the open space based on the lot square footage of the open space.

Q: As it relates to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District. What is the correct office square footage to use for the required “per office square foot” calculation? Rentable, Gross Entitled? What is the correct retail square footage to use for the required “per retail square foot” calculation? Rentable, Gross Entitled? For purposes of this calculation use gross square feet for both retail and office as defined in section 102.9 of the Planning Code.

ADJACENT USES

Q: Regarding the 201 Mission driveway parcel and the TJPA’s need to acquire it for the train box is it feasible for the selected developer to acquire that parcel post award and construct improvements on that site? I ask this in the context of inquiring if the TJPA needs the 201 site for excavation purposes, access or otherwise which would prevent the selected developer from building on the 201 site prior to the train box and above ground improvements being completed. We fully understand our proposal cannot include the assumption of obtaining the 201 site but trying to do a little more discovery on how the adjacent development plans fit together. The 201 Mission driveway is not needed for construction of the trainbox, however it is the only vehicular access point for the 201 Mission Building, so if acquired, alternate access arrangements must be made which will require a separate agreement between TJPA and the owner of 201 Mission Street.

Q: What is the proposed timing for approval of Phase 2 of the TTC project extending the Train Box to Main Street? Phase 2 of the TTC project is expected to be complete in 2023
Q: Will the proposed train box development require the TJPA to acquire the 201 Mission driveway parcel? Yes

Q: Can you please confirm the height of Transbay Block 4? Is it 450’ as shown in the attached development plan area? Yes, the maximum height for the tower on Block 4 is 450-feet.

Q: Are there any conceptual plans of the below and above ground improvements for the site where the train box will be located? There are not any conceptual plans for the trainbox or intercity bus facility that are currently publicly available.

STRUCTURAL

Q: The Structural Study assumed a 3 level parking garage that was 28 feet deep, this would presumably provide more than the allowed parking (3.5% of GFA). What other below grade uses will be allowed (ie office above the 700,000 cap)? Is it correct that there will need to be 3 subgrade levels? Also, from structural study garage extends midway into Natoma Street. Is this correct? OCII has not contemplated any below grade uses. There does not need to be 3 subgrade levels. And yes, the garage can extend into Natoma Street.

Q: CIDH piles on 17’ X 20’ grid over the 26,300 SF tower footprint would yield at least 65 instead of the 36 indicated in structural narrative. Is this correct? We selected large diameter CIDH piles on a wider spaced grid than 17’ x 20’. Clearly a number of permutations of pile diameter and spacing are possible.

Q: What is the depth of the excavation bottom of the TTC Basement? The base of the excavation is generally at -41ft NAVD88.

Q: Regarding the Structure-Soil-Structure Interaction (SSSI) analysis model, as required per Attachment 3, will the existing LS-DYNA analysis model of the trainbox as depicted in Figure 3 be provided to the successful Block 5 development team consultant for reference, or will an independent model need to be created from the ground up? The analysis model will not be provided.

Q: Does the temporary shoring need to be designed for any seismic loading? This is primarily a matter for San Francisco building department, however good practice would normally require it.

Q: Piles/Piers associated with the permanent foundation are not allowed within 37 feet of the TTC property line, but piles/piers associated the temporary shoring are allowed to within 5 feet of the TTC property line, correct? Yes.

Q: Are pile/pier foundations for a proposed heavy concrete tower required to be embedded into bedrock (roughly 180 feet below the ground surface) and for a proposed lighter steel framed tower to a depth of roughly 156 feet per the ARUP report in Attachment 3 of the RFP? The piles must be of sufficient length to control settlement and have an appropriate factor of safety on capacity. The assumptions used by Arup for the weight of the tower, pile diameters, etc. dictate the requirements for pile lengths specified in the report.

Q: Is a SSSI analysis of the proposed structure on the TTC required for submission and review by TJPA even if the project design complies with the requirements listed at the top of Page 4.5 of the RFP? Yes.

Q: Is a SSSI model required for the temporary shoring design for the static design and seismic design (if required)? See item 4; it is likely that the complexity of seismic loading will be such that closed-form solutions and racking analyses will be inappropriate and that SSSI will be required.
ENVIRONMENTAL AND GEOTECHNICAL

Q: Has there been any environmental investigation completed to date? Has there been any geotechnical investigation done to date? There are numerous and voluminous documents on the environmental and geotechnical conditions on and around the Transbay Transit Center. They are too large to transmit electronically, but the list of documents is below. If you would like the documents, a CD with everything can be ordered and picked up from OCII.

Environmental

Site Investigation Report West Approach Project, Transbay Terminal Loop - 16 volumes
Soil Contamination Investigations requested by State along alignment of the Transbay Terminal Bus Ramps and West Approach to the Bay Bridge.

- SIR Vol 1 (Text, Tables, & Figures) June 1999.pdf
  Boring locations done on Block 5 (Borings DTB53-1 to DTB57-1) are shown on pages 48 and 49.
  Borings DTB53-1 to DTB57-1 test results can be found on pages 91, 93-96

  Drill Logs on pgs 305-317

  Lab Results pg 235-237, 249-250

  pg 281, 282, 366

Transbay Transit Center Program Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
Group 7 Block 3718, Lots 25 and 27 Report compiles data from previous reports, historical archives and regulatory databases of known contamination sources in vicinity of Block 5

Tar-Flat --19th Century Solutions 20th Century Hazards
Detailed records research of historical uses for blocks in Transbay Area. Block 5 is covered on pg 9-38

Existing Structures

- 1934 Maps - SF Topography.pdf
  Survey done by state showing existing structures in 1934. Provides clues to foundations and basement structures that are likely to be encountered.

- 2008 Demolition Dwgs Transbay Terminal and Ramps.pdf
  Shows how much of the old Transbay Terminal Bus Ramps were demolished and what was left in place.

Railway facilities SanFrancisco viaduct.pdf
Shows footings and piles of the old Bus Ramps

Terminal separation Bridge removal.pdf
Shows how much of the footing and Piles from the old Embarcadero that were demolished and what was left in place.

Geotechnical

- URS Geotech Report
  URS did a number of geotechnical borings for the Transit Center site, a few close to Block 5

- 1936 FoundationDataSFTerminal.pdf
Geotechnical Borings 406-408 done in the streets adjacent to Block 5 in preparation for construction of the Terminal Loop in 1936

Final Geotechnical Report Transbay Transit Center URP unsecured.pdf
Boring B-6 done in Beale adjacent Block 5

Foundation Investigation_HLA_6-29-1978.pdf
Geotechnical boring data collected for the construction of 201 Mission to the North of Block 5

Temporary Terminal Final Geotechnical_Engineering_Report.pdf
Geotechnical boring data collected for the Temporary Terminal to the south of Block 5

Q: The Transbay EIR considered a 550-foot tower on Block 5, but it was assumed to the east of the current location. Also, a 300-foot building was assumed on the current site. Now, have you had a shadow analysis done for a 550-foot tower at the current location? Refer to Section 5.1.3.4 on page 5-21 of the EIR for information on the shadows for a taller tower on Block 5: “Because the Design for Development Vision would have fewer towers and because those towers would be taller and more slender than those of the Full Build Alternative, shadowing effects would be generally less than those of the Full Build Alternative and more similar to those of the Reduced Scope Alternative. No adverse effects to sites under the control for the Recreation and Parks Department were found. Therefore, these shading effects would not be adverse.”

CONTRACT COMPLIANCE

Q: The RFP (8.58 / Attachment 10) states that SBE limits for professional services are $2,000,000. In reviewing SF City and County Chapter 14B requirements, as well as the SF County Transportation Authority’s requirements for small local businesses, that threshold is currently $2,500,000 average annual gross receipts. Furthermore, the current thresholds for LBE Certification with the City and County of SF have designations for “Micro”, “Small” and “SBA” designations, with varying Economic Thresholds, none of which are $2,000,000? The Project is administered by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII). The former Redevelopment Agency’s Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Program is applicable to the Project and there is a 50% SBE participation goal for Professional Services contracts. First consideration will be given in awarding contracts to San Francisco-based SBEs and non San Francisco-based SBEs should be used to satisfy participation goals only if San Francisco-based SBEs are not available, qualified, or if their bids or fees are significantly higher than those of non San Francisco-based SBEs.

As of March 2012, OCII no longer certifies SBEs. However, firms previously certified as a minority-owned business enterprise (MBE), women-owned business enterprise (WBE), or SBE with the Former Agency will continue to be valid through the expiration date on the certificate. The directory of firms is found here: http://www.iucp.com/Default.aspx?agency=SFRA.

OCII will also honor firms certified with the City and County of San Francisco as a Local Business Enterprise (LBE) as follows: (1) LBEs designated as “Micro” are automatically accepted by OCII; and (2) LBEs designated as “Small” may be accepted if the firms’ three-year average annual gross receipts do not exceed $2 million. Please note LBEs are certified for specific types of work and may be certified “Micro” for certain types of work and “Small” for others. Proposers should carefully review an LBE’s certification. Proposers considering a Small-LBE for professional services should confirm with the firm whether the firm meets the $2 million threshold “however the current development team should not include any design consultants or subconsultants except those specifically requested to be included.”
Finally, OCII accepts SBE, MBE and WBE certifications from the following jurisdictions as long as the firm meets the $2 million threshold: State of California—Small Business Enterprises (SBE), Federal, and other local jurisdictions. Staff will make the final determination on the consistency of the certification standards and acceptance or denial of certifications listed above.

OTHER

Q: Are there any existing tax bills for any of the parcels in the Block 5 offering? No

Q: We assume we do not have to acquire any TDRs for Block 5 as the site is located in a zoning district that does not require TDRs for office projects. Also, the RFP does not contemplate a TDR requirement. Can you confirm that? There is no mention of TDRs in the Redevelopment Plan or Development Controls.

Q: Are the number of garage floors and floor to floor heights the maximum allowed? Can additional floors be added? There are no controls on the number of floors or floor heights. The only parking controls are referenced in the RFP and have to do with maximum square footage allocated to parking.

Q: Do the following fees: Transit Center Open Space Fee (Planning Code Section 424.6); Transit Delay Mitigation Fee (Planning Code Section 424.7); and, Transit Center Transportation and Street Improvement Fee (Planning Code Section 424.7), apply to Block 5? None of the fees mentioned above apply to Block 5.