



City of Raleigh

Request for Proposals #: 274-PLANDEV-2025-MS

Title: Market and Design Study Analysis for Redevelopment Sites:
Former DMV and Moore Square East

Proposal Due Date and Time: July 18, 2025 at 5:00PM EST

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Issue Date: July 11, 2025

Issuing Department: Planning and Development
Direct all inquiries concerning this RFP to:

Jake Levitas

Planning Supervisor

Email: jake.levitas@raleighnc.gov

City of Raleigh
Addendum 2 to RFP 274-PLANDEV-2025-MS

Issue Date:

To: All Proposers

This Addendum, containing the following additions, clarifications, and/or changes, is issued prior to receipt of proposal packages and does hereby become part of the original RFP documents and supersedes the original RFP documents in case of conflict.

Receipt of this addendum must be acknowledged by signing in the area indicated below. Please make the follow additions, clarifications, and/or changes to the RFP as listed below and **sign and return this addendum page with your proposal package.**

Jake Levitas
Planning Supervisor

Sign below and return this addendum with your proposal.



Proposer Name & Company: _____ **Date:** _____

Signature: _____ **Title:** _____

Questions Received and Staff Responses

Q&A via Email

Pre-submittal Conference	
Any chance there are meeting minutes from Friday? We are definitely interested but was unable to attend due to a previously scheduled meeting. [Received 6/30 from Josh Decker]	<i>The slides and attendees from the presentation were posted as an addendum to the RFP on the State's eVP website.</i>
Is there a recording available of the pre-bid meeting? [Received 7/3 from Anu Samarajiva]	<i>The meeting was not recorded, but the slides and attendees are available at the link above.</i>

Proposal Requirements	
Should each team member complete the reference form and include it in the proposal submission, or should references themselves complete and submit the forms directly to the City? [Received 7/3 from Cassandra Pierre-Louis]	<i>Reference forms must be completed by the references themselves and submitted directly to the City by the reference.</i>
Are references required only for the prime/lead firm, or for all consultants involved? [Received 7/3 from Cassandra Pierre-Louis]	<i>References are only required for the prime/lead firm.</i>
Are the Reference Questionnaires required from the prime consultant (or Proposer) only or should they include any from subconsultants? [Received 7/3 from Grace Kim]	<i>See above.</i>
If a responding team includes multiple firms, are the subconsultants required to submit references? If so, is it 3 references and accompanying forms across the entire team or 3 references and accompanying forms per team? [Received 7/3 from Austin Amandolia]	<i>See above.</i>
Our firm has recently submitted business references on past City of Raleigh proposals. Would the City allow firms to reuse reference questionnaire forms that are on file from the recently submitted business references? [Received 7/3 from Austin Amandolia]	<i>No, reference forms previously submitted on behalf of applying firms cannot be reused. New reference forms must be submitted to the City for this RFP by the references themselves.</i>
Are subconsultants required to complete all of the forms included in the RFP? If not, which	<i>Forms are only required for the prime/lead firm.</i>

specific forms are they expected to submit? [Received 7/3 from Cassandra Pierre-Louis]	
If a responding team includes multiple firms, how should we approach the project-specific firm chart? Should this cover the relationship between the two firms or should each firm submit their own internal project specific charts? [Received 7/3 from Austin Amandolia]	<i>A single chart should be included that displays the relationships between all firms and staff members proposed to be involved in the project.</i>
Are subconsultants required to submit financial statements? [Received 7/3 from Austin Amandolia]	<i>Financial statements are only required for the prime/lead firm.</i>
Are you able to clarify if the two following questions on the Proposer Questionnaire are applicable to an economic development consulting firm licensed in Illinois? [Received 7/3 from Grace Kim] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are you registered with the North Carolina Secretary of State to conduct business (if required)? - Are you properly licensed/certified by the Federal and/or State of North Carolina to perform the specified work? 	<i>Being registered in a firm's home state is acceptable to submit a proposal.</i>
Regarding Section 3: Financial Information and Stability, if we select option 3 and submit a certified, signed statement from a licensed CPA, could you please confirm that accompanying financial information is not required at the time of the proposal submission? [Received 7/3 from Grace Kim]	<i>Yes, Option 3 meets the requirements of this section of the proposal.</i>

Selection Process	
MBE/DBE Weighting RFP // § 7.0 Scoring – Please confirm the point allocation (prime vs. sub) for certified MBE/DBE firms and whether additional weighting is applied when the prime consultant itself holds active N.C. HUB certification. [Received 7/3 from Caelyn Steele]	<i>There are no MWBE goals or weighted scoring for MBE/DBE firms for this RFP.</i>
Equity-Impact Analytics Scope // § 3.1 Market Analysis – Will experience in quantifying the socioeconomic impacts and integrating equity-based fiscal metrics be explicitly scored, and if so, what is the relative weight within the evaluation rubric? [Received 7/3 from Caelyn Steele]	<i>These elements are not explicitly part of the scope and will not be explicitly scored. At most, they could potentially contribute in a supporting role to a team's score for project approach and team experience if the team demonstrates an ability to incorporate them</i>

	<i>without adding significantly to the project budget or timeline.</i>
Will there be an opportunity for the chosen firm to negotiate changes in the contract with the City or is it expected for the chosen firm to accept the terms and conditions provided in the RFP? [Received 7/3 from Austin Amandolia]	<i>We expect to negotiate with the chosen firm on scope and budget based on the firm's proposal and approach to the project. The other terms and conditions provided are standard contractual terms for working with the City. While minor changes to these may be accommodated, they should not be expected.</i>

Scope and Timeline	
The RFP refers to the market study being completed in the fall. Is there a more specific target timeline or completion date? [Received 7/3 from Annie Fulton]	<i>The City aims to complete the study and present the findings to City Council by the end of November 2025.</i>
Digital Dashboard Deliverables // Deliverables § 4.0 – Are interactive dashboards (e.g., ArcGIS Online, Power BI) acceptable in lieu of static appendices, and does the City have a preferred open-data format for future public release? [Received 7/3 from Caelyn Steele]	<i>Any dashboards would likely need to be in addition to a static final report/presentation for City Council and public consumption, rather than in lieu of. It may be difficult to accommodate both within the project budget, but we are open to creative ideas for conveying the information if the consultant team thinks it can be delivered efficiently in another format. Defining the final form and scope of deliverables, including data, will be part of negotiations with the selected team. At this time we do not have a specific preference for an open data format.</i>
Engagement Expectations // Project Approach – Please confirm that public engagement beyond City staff/Council briefings is outside the base scope and will not influence scoring; if future engagement becomes necessary, will it be procured under a separate contract? [Received 7/3 from Caelyn Steele]	<i>Public engagement is not a part of this scope and will not influence scoring. The consultant may be asked to present at a meeting of the DMV Project Working Group (anticipated to take place in October 2025), and at the presentation of findings to City Council upon completion of the study (anticipated to take place in November 2025).</i>
Pro-Forma Detail Level // Financial Analysis § 3.3 – Should proposers budget for a full 15-year cash-flow model with residual land valuation, or will static pro formas and fiscal-impact tables satisfy City requirements? [Received 7/3 from Caelyn Steele]	<i>We are open to either option. While a 15-year DCF spreadsheet is more accurate in theory, a static pro-forma may be a better fit given likelihood that key numbers will shift between delivery of the study findings and when a project would be in pre-development. Feel free to recommend an approach in your proposal. A fiscal impact analysis is not necessary.</i>

<p>Renderings vs. Massing Models Final Presentation – Are photo-realistic renderings or animated fly-throughs required for Council review, or will annotated SketchUp/Revit massing stills meet expectations? [Received 7/3 from Caelyn Steele]</p>	<p><i>Simple massing stills are sufficient. The goal is to understand yields, not to fully design a project.</i></p>
<p>Is the expectation that the consultant team will need to produce two distinct deliverables on each site for each task? For example, would we need to produce a slide presentation and memo for both Moore Square East and the DMV sites separately? [Received 7/3 from Alex Shaia]</p>	<p><i>It is not necessary to produce two deliverables, but it may be desirable for clarity.</i></p>

Data Access and Due Diligence	
<p>Data Provision & Reimbursement // General Conditions – Will the City provide parcel-level GIS, utility as-builts, traffic counts, and Phase I environmental reports for both sites, or reimburse the consultant for acquiring such datasets? [Received 7/3 from Caelyn Steele]</p>	<p><i>We will provide our GIS layers which include utility as-builts. AADT traffic counts are available from the NCDOT website. NCDOT routinely counts New Bern Ave and Tarboro Rd in front of the DMV site. The Moore Square site does not have direct frontage counts but there are nearby counts. No independent counts are scoped for this project. The City has obtained reasonably detailed environmental reports for both properties that will be provided.</i></p>
<p>Affordable-Housing Financing Inputs // DMV Site Requirements – Is the City willing to share current bond-cap availability, LIHTC scoring priorities, or other subsidy parameters to inform the affordable-unit sensitivity analysis? [Received 7/3 from Caelyn Steele]</p>	<p><i>Yes, this information will be shared.</i></p>
<p>Parking & Mobility Data // Design Analysis § 3.2 – Will updated BRT alignment files and parking-utilization studies be provided to ensure test-fits align with forthcoming mobility investments? [Received 7/3 from Caelyn Steele]</p>	<p><i>Current BRT design documents will be provided. No parking analysis has been conducted. The City will work with consultants on parking assumptions. There are no parking requirements for either site, so the parking strategy will be market-based and (in the case of the affordable project) driven by requirements imposed by the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency.</i></p>
<p>Has the City conducted any preliminary assessments on either site related to infrastructure capacity, environmental constraints (such as wetlands or floodplains),</p>	<p><i>We will provide environmental layers and other information about site conditions. An in-house utility sufficiency analysis is underway for the DMV site. We do not anticipate</i></p>

or other due diligence items typically addressed in a civil engineering review? If so, would those materials be available for review? [Received 7/3 from Alex Shaia]	<i>infrastructure sufficiency to be a binding constraint on the development yield of either site.</i>
--	---

Redevelopment Solicitation Process (RFQ/RFP)	
Will respondents to this RFP, or their selected teams, be precluded from submitting responses to any future RFQ/RFP related to the Moore Square East and West sites? [Received 6/30 from Jingjing Liu]	<i>Respondents to this RFP will not be precluded and can participate fully in responses to future solicitation processes (RFQ/RFP/etc) for either the Moore Square or DMV redevelopment sites. This study will be completed prior to the issuance of future solicitations for development partners.</i>
Please confirm that the selected consultant(s) for the market study are not precluded from participating in future RFPs related to these sites. [Received 7/3 from Annie Fulton]	<i>See above.</i>
What is the anticipated procurement process for selecting a development partner for the Moore Square East site once this market study is complete? Will it be an RFP or an RFQ? [Received 6/30 from Jingjing Liu]	<i>The City hopes that the market study will help identify the optimal solicitation and/or disposition process for the Moore Square East site that will result in the best outcomes for the City (including maximizing sale proceeds, minimizing time to closing, and supporting the surrounding area). Options being considered include an RFQ and/or RFP process, negotiated offer and upset bid, private sale via the City's charter authority, or a combination of the above processes.</i>
What role, if any, is the previously selected developer for the Moore Square East site anticipated to play in this process? [Received 7/3 from Anu Samarajiva]	<i>The previously selected developer (LODEN) will have no direct role in the market study. The City expects to coordinate with LODEN moving forward on the Hadley property. They could also be one of several developers interviewed by the consultant team to gauge the market for the Moore Square East property.</i>

Q&A from Pre-Proposal Conference on June 27, 2025

<p>Will this presentation be made available? Also, may we have the list of participants?</p>	<p><i>The slides and attendees from the presentation were posted as an addendum to the RFP on the State's eVP website.</i></p>
<p>May offerors propose adjustments to scope to get closer to \$100K budget? i.e. modifying/removing items we recommend are less critical for study goals</p>	<p><i>Staff will negotiate with teams to get to a final budget and scope, so yes there can be adjustments to scope. Staff will talk through the tasks with the chosen team to get to a middle ground on budget and scope that works for both sides. The \$100,000 budget estimated in the RFP should be considered as a starting point for discussion.</i></p> <p><i>However, teams should note that the budget proposed to complete the full scope as outlined in the RFP is part of the scoring criteria. Therefore, proposed adjustments to scope and budget should be framed as an addendum for staff to consider. In other words, <u>teams' primary budget figures should reflect the full scope in the RFP and not assume any proposed adjustments will be accepted.</u> If a reduced scope and budget is included in the proposal, it should be included <u>in addition to</u> rather than instead of that proposed for the full scope, and should be clearly labeled as such.</i></p>
<p>Do you expect to issue a solicitation for a consultant to support the RFQ/RFP process for one or both sites? Content development, evaluation support, and/or negotiation support (i.e. owners rep)</p>	<p><i>That has not been a consideration. The City's assumption is that we will leverage our own internal resources to manage the process. But we may consider it.</i></p>
<p>Would the winning team be unable to pursue the future RFPs for development of these sites?</p>	<p><i>We expect to close out this contract before the development RFP goes out, so there will not be conflict between the two. We also anticipate including most or all of the market and design study deliverables as part of the RFQ and RFP so it will be made available to all of the applicants. So yes, the winning team will be able to pursue the future development RFP as well.</i></p>
<p>How important is the public participation part of the project?</p>	<p><i>Public participation is critical in that the feasibility assessments as part of this study will evaluate the community priorities identified. However, direct public participation or engagement is being managed separately by the City and is not included in the scope of work required by the consultant team for this RFP.</i></p>