

RFQ Q&A Lakewood Complex Project		
	Question	Response
1	Will the State P3 Unit spearhead rezoning with the City of Lakewood or will the developer be expected to run this process?	The P3 Unit is actively collaborating with the City of Lakewood as it revises its zoning code. The planning staff has determined that the existing zoning designation of Mixed-Use-Employment for the Lakewood parcel is no longer appropriate and should be removed from the code. Currently, the P3 Unit is working with the city to rezone the Lakewood Complex to Mixed-General-Urban in the new zoning framework. If this rezoning has not been finalized by the time a developer is selected, the State and the developer will partner to ensure its completion.
2	Are there Floor Area Limits (FAR)?	<p>There are no specific FAR requirements established by the State for the RFQ. Offerors should use the anticipated Mixed-Use - General - Urban (M-G-U) zoning for the Site when developing their proposals including density requirements anticipated under this code. For details on M-G-U density and form requirements, see: Lakewood MGU Zone District Summary See also Section 3.4 Current Zoning/Planning Guidelines and Potential to Change Zoning for more information on the status of rezoning efforts.</p> <p>There are several RFQ evaluation factors that may relate to proposed program density, as outlined in Section 6.2 Evaluation Criteria. These factors include site utilization ("how the SOQ maximizes the utility, density, and affordability of the Project"), affordable set-asides ("the creativity and determination to include affordable housing"), financial offer ("reasonableness of proposed ground lease structure and overall financial return to the Department"), and compatibility ("creative site planning and compatibility with surrounding communities").</p>
3	Are there incentives for delivering affordable housing?	Offerors are expected to utilize all readily available sources of financing to preserve residual land value for the State and subsequent ground rent. Potential sources of public funding for affordable housing must be confirmed by offerors and may include Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), Colorado Affordable Housing Tax Credits (AHTC), Affordable Housing Program (AHP), Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME), Housing Development Grant Funds (HDG), Housing Development Loan Fund (HDLF), Colorado Housing Investment Fund (CHIF), and Proposition 123.
4	Regarding Flex - Parking: Please provide the exact number or parking spots included, comprising the 30%.	<p>The flex parcel currently includes 148 surface parking spaces. Approximately 70% of the surface lot (~103 spaces) will need to be potentially available for 1881 Pierce Building parking. The exact agreement on usage of these 148 surface parking spaces will be negotiated during the PDA and Development Agreement phase. The remaining 30% of surface lot (~45 spaces) will be available for use by the selected offeror under a long-term easement and management agreement, or similar structure. However, note that the available parking space count is approximate and would need to account for future extension of an access route that connects Reed Street and Pierce Street and forms the northern boundary of future Parcel 1.</p> <p>Alternative arrangements for use of the Flex Parcel, including temporary or semi-permanent uses or structured parking may be considered, but Offerors must demonstrate in their request that adequate parking will be preserved to ensure viable future use. In addition, the State cannot guarantee availability of the remaining 70% of the flex parcel beyond the construction period, during which time it is expected to be available for construction staging and parking.</p>

5	Will the developer be fully responsible for maintaining the flex parcel or will that be shared with the State?	Yes, the developer responsible for the maintenance and operation of the flex parcel if it is utilized by project occupants as part of the development. However, the State is willing to consider specific contingencies in the Development Agreement. Should the building at 1881 Pierce be repurposed in a way that necessitates additional parking usage, the State would be open to sharing some of the maintenance costs for the flex parcel.
6	Is Parcel 3 part of the development?	Yes, parcel 3 is part of the development.
7	Is Parcel 3 required to be open space or is that up for negotiation?	Parcel 3 is not mandated to be designated as open space. As long as the project ensures access to the loading dock for the State, developers are free to submit proposals that they believe will be most effective.
8	Is the access drive to the loading dock required to remain or can it be reconfigured?	The State is open to reconfiguring the access drive, provided that access to the loading dock remains uninterrupted during the process.
9	Can the access drive to the loading dock be shared access?	Yes, the access drive to the loading dock can be shared access.
10	Do we have potential capacity information from Xcel energy yet?	The team has reached out to Xcel for additional capacity information and is waiting on a response.
11	Is the art along the art walk owned by the State, City, or the artists?	The properties on Parcels 1 and 2 underlying the art walk are owned by the State. Currently there are not art components along the art walk on the State's property except for the graphics painted on the sidewalk.
12	Are the underground tanks for the old backup generator on the developable area, or is that going to be maintained by the State?	The three 20,000-gallon tanks that were abandoned in place are located in the parking lot north of the building and not included in the RFQ parcel space. The former 8,000-gallon concrete tank vault is located between the northeast corner of the Flex parcel and the west side of the building.
13	Have letters been received from the State regarding decommissioning of the former tanks?	The state sent an NFA letter for the removal of the 8,000-gallon tank. No closure letter was issued for the three 20,000-gallon tanks abandoned in-place. No releases were recorded and the tanks are not in the RFQ site area.
14	Is there any limitation on including market rate units?	While there is no specific limit on the inclusion of market-rate units, an excessive percentage of such units will not be a viable option for the State in this project.
15	Is the DPA looking for a specific type of architectural design?	No
16	Is the rezoning process open to the public process?	Please see answer 1
17	What is the timeline for DMV moving out and History of CO moving in?	The timeline for DMV moving out of 1881 Pierce is set for the third quarter of 2025 and a potential move in date for History Colorado is the Summer of 2026.
18	Will the prior site plan developed be provided?	Since the AECOM concept site plan was created, there have been significant changes to zoning and parcel sizes. As a result, the State has opted not to release the site plan to avoid any confusion among developers regarding our density goals.
19	Is this process exempt from State procurement?	Yes
20	When will the ALTA survey be ready?	The ALTA Survey is underway and a date will be provided soon.
21	Can a CAD file of the survey be provided?	Yes, preliminary draft CAD files of the topography and approximate boundary locations will be provided the week of March 31st in the Data Room.
22	Will the Public Private Partnership office consider an offer for a portion of the total land available, to accommodate a smaller project?	No, proposals should aim to address the entirety of the RFQ. However, developers are encouraged to collaborate with one another if they believe that partnership will be the most effective approach for this project. Additionally, the P3 Unit plans to bring 7 to 12 different types of parcels across the State of Colorado to market through a similar procurement process over the next five years. If this particular project isn't a good fit for a developer and they are unable to establish a suitable partnership, we encourage them to continue following our Office's initiatives.

23	Is it anticipated that the ground lease will ultimately be subordinate to the 1st lien mortgage?	There is no existing first lien mortgage on the fee ownership of the Site. The ground lease (and subsequent leasehold mortgage, if required by lenders) will not be subordinate to any mortgage.
24	Is it anticipated that lease payment will be subject to available cash flow, or will those be hard payments?	To be negotiated with the selected developer.
25	Minimum of 80 affordable units, is there a maximum number of units Contemplated?	Currently, there is no maximum limit on the number of units. If developers plan to include market-rate units, they should be aware that the P3 Unit will assess proposals based on the proportion of market-rate units in relation to affordable and attainable units included in the overall concept. Offerors should refer to the requirements of the anticipated Mixed-Use - General - Urban (M-G-U) zoning for the Site when developing their proposals.
26	Is there a minimum or maximum amount of attainable housing (80% - 120% AMI) units required?	There is no minimum or maximum requirement for the number of attainable housing units for the concept to be considered. However, the inclusion of attainable housing units may be used as a criterion for evaluation during the procurement process.
27	How much state funding would be available for pre-development costs?	Given that the P3 Unit has already invested a substantial amount in the project, it does not anticipate committing significant additional funds for further pre-development costs but is open to sharing some expenses. Currently, the P3 Unit envisions this contribution to be in the range of a few hundred thousand dollars, with the exact amount subject to negotiation during the pre-development agreement phase.
28	Any target tenant preferences? IE large families, seniors, etc?	No
29	Any hard or absolute timing deadlines we need to be aware of?	Aside from the target date for breaking ground in the first half of 2027, there are no firm deadlines. The specific target dates will be negotiated and established in the Pre-development and Development Agreements, depending on how the projects are financed to achieve that goal.
30	Question from the Site Walk - Are there Severed Mineral Rights on any of the parcels? What information can be shared with respondents?	In Process of Confirming
31	Question from the Site Walk - Can the State provide a utility bill for existing parcels that includes water, sewer, power, stormwater, etc?	Provided in the Data Room.
32	Section 2.1 - Minimize State Investment - What state funds are available for this RFQ? Do those funds come with specific AMI targets?	The term "State investment," as used in this context, specifically refers to the investments made by the P3 Unit. The P3 Unit acknowledges that the developer is likely to pursue additional funding opportunities from various State programs, including grants, housing funding initiatives, or tax credits. However, these alternative funding sources are not classified as "State investment" for the purposes of this discussion. It is important to note that any other funding sources the developer seeks to utilize must align with the specific terms and conditions associated with each source.
33	Section 3.2 - Site Description - Would you please provide more clarity on terms of the shared parking in 30% of the flex space? What quantity of parking stalls are intended to be reserved for the existing DMV building vs. quantity for new development? Will all parking be unassigned for use by anyone?	See question 4
34	Section 3.2 - Parcel 2 - Site Description - Would the state consider removing portions of the parcels from the RFQ, if suggested? As the area where the city has a right of first refusal may be better served as a continuation of the park.	See question 22

35	Section 3.4 - Potential to Change Zoning - Will the local zoning and development standard be applied to this project? Will the City of Lakewood be the permitting authority?	Yes, projects developed on State land for public use are subject to local zoning and development standards. The City of Lakewood will be the permitting authority.
36	Please confirm/clarify if any or all of the following are to be included in the 30 page count limit described in Section 4.4.1 of the SOQ	
	1. Administrative Documents:	
	1.1 Cover Sheet & Signature Page -	Excluded
	1.3 Organizational Chart -	Included
	1.4 Additional Attachments -	Excluded
	1.5 W-9 -	Excluded
	2. Offeror Team Experience and Capability:	
	2.3 Statement of Financial Condition -	Excluded
	8.7 Non-Collusion Certification -	Excluded
	8.8 Conflicts of Interest Disclosure -	Excluded
	8.9 Debarment and Suspension Disclosure -	Excluded
	8.11 Contract Disclosure (w/additional attachment) if applicable -	Excluded
	4. Preliminary Financial Feasibility -	
	4.1.1 Assumptions -	Included
	4.1.2 Sources and Uses -	Included
	4.1.3 Cashflow Projections -	Included
	4.1.4 Summary Metrics -	Included
	4.1.5 Proposed Ground Lease Structure -	Included
	4.1.6 Refinancing, Disposition, and Return Metrics -	Included
	5. PDA Heads of Terms Markup -	Excluded
37	The RFQ references a minimum 80 units of affordable housing. So long as the 80 units are met - can the balance or the site be programmed for market rate and/or attainable housing?	If developers intend to incorporate market-rate units into their proposals, they should be mindful that the P3 Unit will evaluate submissions based on a variety of factors including number of affordable units provided, level or mix of affordability, and an overall program that maximizes the utility and density of the site.
38	Does the state prioritize maximizing the number of affordable/attainable housing units or value for the land?	The P3 Unit will assess these proposals based on the overall balance of the project, focusing on several key areas, including affordability, land value, and project feasibility, among other factors.

39	For any State investment - should responders assume that investment could come in the form of predevelopment financing? Development financing (at construction start)? Or other programmatic support (eg tax abatements)	Offerors should not assume any state financing from the P3 Unit as part of their project beyond a portion of pre-development costs. Specific policy support may be suggested in the proposal for further negotiation during the pre-development period, but will be subject to its own specific terms and conditions.
40	How must the Lakewood Art Walk that presently runs through Parcels 1 and 2 be incorporated into prospective development plans	Prospective development partners should recognize and preserve the concept of the Lakewood Art Walk. While innovative ideas to enhance the art walk are encouraged, they are not required at this time.
41	The RFQ References a prior planning study by AECOM but it does not show up in the due diligence folder. Can you provide an update as to when this will be available?	See 18