



Newberg Workforce Housing RFP – Q&A#1  
03.14.23

**Q: Is there a hierarchy of preference for the type of housing units created? (e.g. 1-bed, families)**

A: We are agnostic to the type of housing to be developed, assuming you are within zoning guidelines. However, the employers in the Consortium have shared in the past that there is a shortage of “starter” residences, like studios and 1-bedroom units. Some of the Consortium members have expressed a specific interest in these studio and 1-bedroom units, while other members are open to the size of the units. As a respondent, please simply make your case for the types of units you are proposing.

**Q: Is there a preference for units that are ADA compliant?**

A: It is important that some portion of the units are accessible.

**Q: You mentioned there is a survey that was done with employers regarding their housing needs – is that available?**

A: SEDCOR does not have the results compiled across all employers and will look into compiling them for distribution. Watch this space for updates.

**Q: What was the sample size of the survey and did employees or leadership at these Consortium companies participate? Is it possible for RFP respondents to conduct their own surveys with the Consortium and/or their employees for this project?**

A: The survey was conducted across a range of employees of different sizes. For example, A-dec surveyed everyone and they have 1600 employees. The partners will consider using part of the April 5<sup>th</sup> event to generate a consistent, single set of questions to be fielded in a brief survey to employers.

**Q: Are you looking to prioritize development proposals that include government subsidies?**

A: We already have a government subsidy of \$3M in state funding. We have no preference for other subsidies coming to the table or not. We are trying to be open to the creativity of the proposal respondents.

**Q: Is there one single definition of the % of AMI targets defined by this RFP?**

A: According to HUD, middle-income households are those who have income of 80% to 120% of Yamhill County’s MFI for a household of four or income between \$77,500 to \$116,300. These households can afford monthly housing costs of \$1,940 to \$2,900.



**Q: How is the Consortium thinking of supply chain diversity, aka the diversity of the proposal team? Will that be a factor in the evaluation process?**

A: The review team appreciates diversity and would like to have a better understanding if/how it is reflected in your approach. Although it will be a factor in our evaluation process, it will not ultimately be tied to project scores.

**Q: The RFP mentioned sustainability as being important, however this can often be a tradeoff with cost. How should we balance this tradeoff, specifically with the RFP scoring considering costs but not sustainability?**

A: Our goal is to demonstrate best practices that build housing for less total cost and time, and that are scalable. That is our highest priority. We are also open to hearing about how sustainability can help contribute to smart usage of the up to \$3M in available funding. Make your case as to why sustainability is important for your proposal, and we will evaluate it with that lens. Additionally, proposals that are explicitly NOT environmentally responsible in order to save costs are unlikely to be looked upon favorably.

**Q: It appears that there are two conflicting priorities in the RFP: maximizing bang for the buck and piloting scalable solutions. How is the Consortium thinking about weighing those two things together for a successful outcome?**

A: There is no easy answer to this question, and it will depend in part on what proposals are submitted. While we don't always agree that new technologies are more expensive, we acknowledge that certain innovations cost more up front to test and learn from. We welcome that and suggest that proposals clearly delineate what portions of the up to \$3M in funding will support innovation at higher price points, versus return-generating investments.

**Q: Is funding going to trigger prevailing wage rates or BOLI?**

A: We will answer this after checking again with the State. Watch this space for final guidance.

**Q: The RFP scoring seems to be in a bit of conflict as we are being challenged to think out of the box yet find some of the economies of scale that are typically found in larger scale projects. Will you be able to look at solutions with a different lens (i.e. put the scoring aside) if we pull on some of those larger-scale efficiencies?**

A: We won't know until we see it – but make your case. We are open to many things. As a group, we are trying to challenge the housing ecosystem to deliver workforce priced units by doing [XYZ]. If the way to get there is to produce a lot of affordable or market-rate units to subsidize workforce units, we would need to see the business case and consider it.

**Q: Is the City of Newberg able to assist/share what land might be available for development?**

A: Yes, Doug Rux from the City of Newberg [Doug.Rux@newbergoregon.gov](mailto:Doug.Rux@newbergoregon.gov) can field those questions.



**Q: Can you talk about sites and what the Consortium members are thinking? Do you want proposers to originate sites?**

A: A little bit of both. Some likely proposal respondents already control land in Newberg. Those who do not, we encourage to begin by speaking with Doug Rux at the City of Newberg. Some Consortium members are landowners and are open to discussions about their land. Also, we encourage Newberg landowners to partner with respondents.

**Q: Can you speak about the Consortium's thoughts on the up to \$3M budget spend and the end deliverable. Does there need to be a scalable plan or quantity of units, or can it be a prototype of 1?**

A: Housing must be produced, although we don't have a target number we are looking for. Our values include:

- Enabling the Consortium to utilize some portion of the \$3M multiple times, and/or create a meaningful number of units to impact Newberg's workforce housing shortage.
- Demonstrate best practices and/or innovations that are scalable in Newberg and beyond that reduce the cost and time to deliver new housing.

The Consortium will consider support for prototypes that have the potential to scale in the future.

**Q: Is there a rough timeline or range for implementation?**

A: There is no specific timeline for implementation. We do have funding that needs to be expended sooner rather than later, and the partners prefer to make an impact on available workforce housing sooner rather than later. The Consortium is open to considering many timelines as long as the proposed project meets the other project goals.

**Q: Can you provide a list of the people and organizations interested in this RFP process to see where we might explore possible collaborations?**

A: We are already connecting multiple entities considering a proposal. We will reach out to interested parties to confirm their openness to sharing contact information. Stay tuned.

**Q: What is the target household size?**

A: There is no target household size. Each respondent should make the case for their proposed household size.

**Q: Does the page limit exclude Table of Contents?**

A: Yes.

**Q: What are comparable, current costs in the Upper Willamette Valley market? How are they calculated?**

A: We expect respondents to share how their proposal saves time and/or cost on a per unit and/or square foot basis. This can be in comparison to previous projects completed and/or comparable projects completed in the Willamette Valley and/or Portland Metro. Each proposal



will serve as a data point, along with the comparables included by each proposal, to build a “big picture” for the NWHC.

**Q: What are the comparable, current Upper Willamette Valley development timelines?**

A: Same answer as above, with regard to time.

**Q: From p.4, NWHC Guiding Principles. Clarify what is intended by “use no more than 30% of the target markets’ income” to arrive at proposed rents or sales prices.**

A: No more than 30% of a resident’s income should be spent on living in the proposed housing. The target market is 80%-120% of AMI. Based on whether your project is ownership or rent, you can arrive at the allowable monthly rent and/or mortgage payments.

**Q: Please provide more detail regarding the April 5 NWHC In-person all day workshop, team building and Q&A session #3: agenda, key topics to be discussed and anticipated activities.**

A: The April 5<sup>th</sup> workshop is an opportunity for proposal respondents and other like-minded doers to collaborate with a network of those who are interested in helping the City of Newberg to address their workforce housing needs. The all-day event will take place at a Friendsview facility (Friendsview is a Consortium member), and will be a mix of learning more about the Newberg opportunity from MMHF, SEDCOR and the NWHC members, workshoping together a plan to address some of the key challenges around workforce housing, and an afternoon Q&A session. Lunch will be provided. More details will be forthcoming shortly.

**Q: Water and Sewer utilities are high in Newberg. Will the City of Newberg provide reduced water and sewer charges to make projects financially feasible?**

A: Nothing is guaranteed. We encourage you to think outside of the box. It is helpful for us to understand obstacles to building workforce housing and we hope to capture those at the April 5<sup>th</sup> event and through submitted proposals.

**Q: Similarly, with the City of Newberg waive or reduce permit and/or system development charges to help achieve the 25% overall development reduction goal?**

A: See above

**Q: If a large-scale project (200+ units) with at least 50% of the housing proposed making 80%-120% of AMI, will the City of Newberg provide a full property tax exemption for at least 10 years?**

A: See above

**Q: Will the City provide expedited permit review for the project?**

A: See above



**Q: If the project is large scale, 200+ units and with at least 20% of the housing at 80%-120% would it be considered and not negatively scored?**

A: We encourage this creativity, and also encourage the applicant to both:

- Reach out to the MMHF for a “pre-submission” conference, and
- Make the case in the application how this helps achieve the NWHC and SEDCOR’s goals