

Responses to Questions from Potential RFI Respondents

Published – March 20, 2026

The following responses address questions received from participants during and shortly after the RFI information session held on March 10, 2026, as part of the Greater Boston Regional Offsite Construction Strategy Request for Information (RFI) process. These questions highlight key areas where respondents sought additional clarity to inform their submissions. Potential respondents can reach out to MAPC with additional questions by emailing the project team at HUD-GBROCS@mapc.org

1. What format should responses take (bullets vs. narrative)?

Respondents may submit information in either bullet or narrative format. We encourage clarity and specificity over format. Where possible, please:

- Provide concise, structured responses (bullets are welcome)
- Include examples, case studies, or data points to support your responses
- Clearly indicate where information is conceptual vs. based on experience

2. Are you only looking for a manufacturing facility, or other types of facilities as well?

The primary focus of this effort is to understand pathways to support offsite housing production capacity in the Greater Boston region. At the time of the grant application submission in 2023, there were no significant offsite manufacturing facilities located within the region. Since then, the landscape has evolved, with emerging facilities of varying scales now operating or under development in and around Greater Boston. In response to this shift, our approach has broadened to take a more ecosystem-oriented perspective.

Through this RFI and subsequent research, we are exploring:

- Future facility attraction or support: A future solicitation may consider opportunities to attract new facilities and/or support the expansion of existing ones, depending on what is most viable and impactful.
- A broader definition of “facility”: We are not limiting our thinking to a single large manufacturing plant. We are interested in a range of facility types that contribute to a functioning ecosystem, including:
 - Manufacturing facilities (large-scale or micro-facilities)
 - Assembly, staging, or logistics hubs
 - Workforce training and education facilities
 - Innovation, prototyping, or testing spaces

The goal is to better understand how different types of facilities, working together, can support a scalable, sustainable offsite construction ecosystem in the region.

3. If a respondent is a facility located outside Massachusetts, what incentives or reasons are there to participate in this effort?

We welcome participation from respondents located both within and outside Massachusetts. Input from out-of-state manufacturers and operators is valuable to help us understand broader industry practices, constraints, and opportunities.

This RFI is part of a research and strategy development phase, and participation offers an opportunity to:

- Inform future market opportunities in Greater Boston: Responses will help shape a future solicitation that may include opportunities for manufacturers to enter or expand into the regional market.
- Influence program and incentive design: Insights from respondents will directly inform how public-sector partners structure potential incentives, partnerships, and procurement approaches.
- Engage early in a developing regional ecosystem: This effort is aimed at building a coordinated pipeline and enabling environment for offsite construction. Input will directly support the work of project working groups, including research on regulatory conditions, permitting processes, workforce development, and facility siting considerations. For example, feedback can help identify opportunities to improve the regulatory environment to better support offsite construction.

While specific incentives will be defined through a future solicitation process, this RFI is an opportunity to help define what those incentives and partnerships should look like.

4. Why focus on “missing middle” housing scale? Define missing middle.

For the purposes of this project, “missing middle” housing refers to small to mid-scale or infill housing typologies that are compatible with existing neighborhoods in the region, including accessory dwelling units (ADUs), duplexes, triplexes, triple-deckers, townhomes, and small multifamily buildings up to development of 20 units.

The focus on these housing types reflect three critical considerations:

- **Regional fit and feasibility:** These typologies align closely with existing neighborhood patterns across Greater Boston denoting gentle density. Our assumption is that this scale also lends well to scalability through offsite methods. Given the regional nature of the initiative, our intention is to demonstrate robust demand for this scale of housing and the potential to aggregate it regionally across our municipal, state and regional partners through various methods including

considering public land disposition, adoption standardized RFP models that are performance based, identifying [Community Preservation Act \(CPA\)](#) funds etc.

- **Affordability and production goals:** While many 100% affordable [Low-Income Housing Tax Credit \(LIHTC\)](#) rental developments are typically larger (e.g., 30+ unit multifamily buildings) and may fall outside this definition, affordability remains central to missing middle housing in several ways:
 - These housing types are often more affordable by design, due to smaller unit sizes and lower construction complexity.
 - Inclusionary zoning policies in some municipalities can apply to these developments, creating income-restricted units.
 - They are well suited for affordable homeownership opportunities, including first-time buyers.
 - Community Development Corporations (CDCs) and Housing Authorities often deliver smaller-scale, income-restricted rental projects within this typology.
 - More broadly, increasing overall housing production at this scale contributes to alleviating regional housing supply constraints.
- **Complementary to existing construction systems:** This work is intended to complement, not replace, traditional construction and trades. Missing middle housing typologies are often not typically delivered through large-scale, union-bid construction processes, and therefore represent an opportunity to expand overall housing production while continuing to support existing labor systems.

5. How are you thinking about demand aggregation or development pipeline?

Our research has identified lack of demand aggregation as a key barrier to advancing offsite construction in the region. A key focus of this work is therefore to demonstrate and help identify demand at a regional scale in partnership with our working groups and advisory committee. We are exploring multiple approaches to address this, including:

Municipal coordination (via Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) and partnerships):

Identifying potential pipelines of projects or sites across participating communities.

Exploring opportunities to leverage publicly owned land and local funding sources. We are also conducting research to demonstrate demand for missing middle typologies, into a more visible and predictable set of opportunities to signal potential demand and reduce uncertainty, rather than guarantee specific project delivery. Examples of potential actions or recommendations that may emerge at both the partner and system level include:

- Bundling public sites to explore economies of scale.
- Allocating local funding (e.g., CPA) to support projects.

- Developing model procurement approaches that support offsite construction that can be adopted at the municipal or regional scales.
- Streamlining local permitting and approvals, including opportunities for pre-approval or standardization. This may include pre-approving modular designs for ADUs and other typologies.
- Identifying state-level regulatory considerations, including building code alignment, inspection protocols, and coordination across agencies.
- Exploring transportation and logistics constraints, such as oversized load regulations, routing, and site access considerations for module delivery.
- Standardizing review and inspection processes where possible to reduce friction.
- Exploring financial mechanisms to reduce market risk with state partners, such as backstop guarantees or pooled or shared-risk funding structures and tools that help de-risk early projects and enable broader market adoption.

6. Is the funding secure?

Yes. The funding has been obligated by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and we have an executed contract in place. Grant work has been progressing per our action plan and we expect to continue all approved work in alignment with the contract obligations.