ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS

October 28, 2026

RE: River North RFQ – Question Responses

EXISTING DUE DILIGENCE

1. The RFQ indicates environmental assessments are underway for Parcels 1 and 2 and identifies infrastructure constraints. Can the City provide an inventory of completed, commissioned, and planned due-diligence materials, including environmental assessments, surveys, geotechnical investigations, utility mapping, drainage/floodplain studies, title/easement documentation, and historic-resource assessments? Which materials will be available to the selected partner, and which investigations must be included in the 12-month services scope? Also, who did this work?

The City has the following materials: building plans, Decommissioning plans, Site Surveys and boundary information, environmental assessments, utility maps and capacity information. The actual documents will be made available to the selected partner upon execution of a Professional Services Agreement (PSA). The City will work with the selected partner to identify any outstanding due-diligence materials and determine which additional investigations are necessary to support the project. The scope and timing of these investigations will be coordinated with the selected partner, including consideration of the 12-month services period. If additional time is required to complete necessary due diligence, extensions to the PSA may be considered.

ANTICIPATED BUDGET

2. Has the City established an anticipated budget, funding allocation, or not-to-exceed amount for the 12-month Phase I Professional Services Agreement? If so, what range, and does it include third-party investigations, market studies, engagement, and other consultant expenses? If no budget exists, how will the City negotiate and approve the professional-services fee after selection?

The City of Grand Rapids has developed preliminary budget expectations for the 12-month Phase I Professional Services Agreement and is actively aligning anticipated project costs with available and potential funding sources. The overall budget and funding allocation are being refined to ensure alignment with the project's objectives, scope of services, and anticipated deliverables. The budget is expected to account for professional services, including third-party investigations, market studies, stakeholder engagement, and other consultant-related expenses, with the final allocation and contract terms established prior to execution of the Professional Services Agreement.

EXISTING ASSESSMENT FUNDING

3. Does the City anticipate using Brownfield Redevelopment Authority, EGLE, or other resources for additional eligible investigations, and should those be excluded from the professional services budget?

The City is open to utilizing a variety of funding sources, including the Brownfield Redevelopment Authority, EGLE, and other available resources, to help offset eligible investigation costs. However, no funding sources have been firmly committed to these activities at this time. To ensure consistency across proposals, all anticipated costs for eligible investigations should be included in the professional-services budget.

PARCEL 3 SCOPE

4. The RFQ describes three parcels, but Appendix E calls for a final master site plan encompassing at least Parcels 1 and 2. What analysis and deliverables are required for Parcel 3?

The master site plan shall include Parcels 1 and 2. Whether it extends to Parcel 3 depends on the Partner's recommendation for the Development Center. If the Partner recommends relocating the Development Center or redeveloping any portion of Parcel 3, the master site plan shall include Parcel 3 at the same level of detail as Parcels 1 and 2. If the selected Partner recommends retaining the Development Center at 1120 Monroe Ave NW with only limited site changes, Parcel 3 may be addressed through a response that addresses parking, circulation, access, and stormwater consideration particular to that parcel rather than a full master site plan.

DEVELOPMENT CENTER ALTERNATIVES

5. Which requirements for the consolidated Development Center, including size, parking, location, and uninterrupted services, are fixed versus open to alternatives?

The size, parking, and location parameters for the consolidated Development Center described in the RFQ are recommendations, not fixed requirements. The City recognizes that meeting all of them may not be feasible, and is open to a range of scenarios, including rehabilitation of the existing Development Center at 1120 Monroe, new space within a redevelopment of Parcel 3, relocation to a new or existing structure separate from Parcel 3, or a hybrid approach. Development Center services, however, must continue without interruption through any transition, and consolidation of city services should be prioritized. Respondents are not expected to select a scenario in their submittals to the RFQ. Ultimately, a recommended approach for the Development Center is a deliverable of the master site plan. The City's Facility Master Plan (2025) outlines the primary and secondary recommendations for a consolidated facility alongside other City needs.

STORM DRAINS AND EASEMENTS

6. What is the status of the City/Kent County Drain Commissioner work to locate major drains, determine setbacks, address surcharge and capacity, and establish easements? When will findings be available?

Due diligence work by the Kent County Drain Commissioner is in its early stages. At this time, no firm date will be given as to when these findings will become available.

FEE SUBMISSION

7.Is a fee proposal, rate schedule, or cost assumption expected at the qualifications stage, or will compensation be negotiated after selection?

See Answer to Question 2.

RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL

8. What are the anticipated duration and material terms of the selected partner's right of first refusal, and how will it interact with the subsequent disposition RFP?

The specific terms of the selected partner's right of first refusal, including its duration and other material conditions, will be negotiated as part of the Purchase and Sale Agreement (PSA). The property's disposition will be guided by the City's disposition policy, which allows for multiple methods of disposition, not limited to a Request for Proposals (RFP) process. As the planning process progresses, the City will determine the most appropriate disposition method for the property.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLATFORM

9. Which City-designated participation platform will be used, and what licenses, support, and existing data will the City provide?

The selected Partner should use Engage GR, the City's PublicInput platform. The City will provide access to Engage GR, so the Partner will not need a separate platform license. Before engagement activities begin, the City plans to hold an onboarding call with the selected partner's team to make sure they are comfortable using the platform to build and manage the project's page.

The City will also provide in-kind support for venues. Meeting space may be available at nearby City facilities, such as the conference and community rooms at the Development Center (1120 Monroe Avenue NW). In addition, the Communications Department can help design promotional and engagement materials and provide marketing and technical support to help reduce outreach costs. The selected Partner will be responsible for providing interpretation services, translated materials, and ensuring that engagement events are accessible and family friendly. While childcare services are not required, the partner should ensure that effective spaces and activities exist for children of attendees.

See also the responses to Questions 1 and 35 for existing data provided by the City and adopted community engagement standards.

SITE VISIT RSVP

10. The RFQ says Friday, October 15, but October 15, 2026 is Thursday. Please confirm the deadline for the October 20 site visit.

The deadline to the site visit was Friday, October 16th.

CURRENT ZONING, OVERLAYS, AND HEIGHT VERIFICATION

11. Please provide the adopted Map A exhibit for Ordinance 2025-06 and a current parcel-level zoning/overlay extract for the area bounded by Coldbrook, Leonard, Plainfield, and the Grand River. For each parcel, identify the base district, applicable overlays, any controlling prior approvals, base height, and maximum height under available bonuses. Please specifically reconcile those records with the RFQ's five-to-seven-story statement for 1101, 1165, and 1120 Monroe.

All three City-owned parcels are zoned TN-TCC (Traditional Neighborhood-Transitional City Center). Parcels 1 (1101 Monroe Ave NW) and 2 (1165 Monroe Ave NW) are also within the Grand River Overlay District (OD-GR). No planned unit developments, special land uses, conditional rezonings, or variances currently control development on any of the three parcels.

Parcels 1 and 2: Minimum height is 3 stories, and maximum height is 5 stories, but development may reach up to 7 stories by qualifying for the height bonuses in Table 5.8.03.F. These parcels are subject, however, to the step-back requirements of Table 5.8.03.E. Where a property directly abuts the Grand River, buildings shall be sited to encourage pedestrian activity on both the street side and the river side. For Parcel 3: Minimum height is 2 stories and maximum height is 5 stories per Table 5.6.08.A. OD-GR height bonuses do not apply to Parcel 3.

The Grand River Overlay Map B2 can be reviewed online as part of the City's Zoning Maps.

12. With the ongoing ZoneGR process and the site's future land use designations, what building height limits does the City anticipate for the River North parcels under the proposed zoning? Please distinguish by-right heights from any additional height available through bonuses, special approvals, or other mechanisms, and identify any applicable riverfront restrictions.

All three parcels are designated 'Downtown' on the Community Master Plan's Future Character and Land Use Map. The Downtown designation promotes a dense development pattern focused on close proximity to services, a diversity of uses, and dynamic building styles. Its preferred building form is predominantly mid- or high-rise, with commercial, institutional, multi-family, or mixed uses.

Proposed height standards are not yet available. The City expects to release a public review draft of the Zone GR code and zoning map in early-2027. That draft will be the first point at

which proposed heights for the successor to the TN-TCC zone can be reviewed. The Zone GR Directions Report sets the general direction for the update but does not establish height limits. Its recommendations include regulating height through building types; relying more on by-right approvals and fewer discretionary actions; and creating a Large-Site Development process for parcels with greater acreage.

As stated on page 31 of the Zone GR Directions Report, the City anticipates retaining riverfront standards equivalent to the Grand River Overlay District (OD-GR), either as an overlay or as standards applicable to river frontage. The Directions Report also recommends riverfront facade standards, public access along and through sites to the river, and preservation of river views, with reference to the River for All plan. Parcels 1 and 2 are currently within OD-GR, while Parcel 3 is not.

DEVELOPABLE AREA AT 1101 MONROE

13. The utility maps appear to show major storm drains crossing 1101 Monroe, with some infrastructure labeled "unknown," potentially limiting the developable area. Can the City confirm the location of these utilities and the resulting buildable area after required easements and setbacks? How does the City anticipate addressing these constraints, including potential relocation or other infrastructure improvements, and who would be responsible for the associated costs? Should respondents assume the utilities will remain in place when preparing development concepts? Please confirm that the City will consider responses that propose Business Terms (Section 7.f., page 16) where the team or the members of the team receive an option or comparable right to acquire of develop identified parcels?

The City has approximate information regarding the location of existing utilities and the resulting buildable area after required easements and setbacks. Further site investigation and due diligence, as outlined in this RFQ, will be necessary to better define these constraints. Once additional information is available, the City will evaluate potential options for addressing any necessary infrastructure improvements, including associated costs and responsibilities.

The City encourages respondents to think creatively and develop concepts that are not limited by existing utilities or current site constraints. Development concepts should balance visionary thinking with the financial realities of implementation.

Regarding business terms that include an option or comparable right to acquire or develop identified parcels, please refer to the response to Question 8 for information regarding the right of first refusal and property disposition.

14. Regarding the submission of recent audited financial statements or letters from financial institution (Section F. on page 16) and proof of insurance (Section H on page 16), if a proposal includes multiple firms as a development team, are these requirements from only the lead entity, or from all of the firms on the team?

Documents from the Lead entity will be sufficient.

15. The large county drain commissioner storm sewers shown on the utility diagram were also mentioned in the RFQ in Appendix D. However, the sanitary that runs under the existing Coldbrook building is shown on the utility diagram but not mentioned in Appendix D. (This could be a 60" brick sanitary sewer from 1890 and may have a lift station to get sewer contents over Coldbrook creek drain west of the existing building between the building and river.) Are these sanitary items still in service or have they been abandoned in place? If active, would easements also be expected for these items?

Sanitary assets are still in place on this property and, yes, they would need easements.

RESPONDENT ELIGIBILITY AND RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL

16. May a team led by a planning, engineering, and environmental consulting firm, without a developer or equity partner, respond as the Partner? If so, will that team be evaluated on equal footing under Evaluation Criterion 5 (Financial Capacity, Local Presence, and Business Terms) and Development Objective 5 (Economic Viability), or does the City expect development and acquisition capacity to be demonstrated within the team?

A team can be led by a planning, engineering, and environmental consulting firm. The team will be evaluated using the same metrics as every other respondent.

17. Must a respondent express an intent or interest to acquire or develop any parcel to be considered qualified? May a respondent decline or waive the right of first refusal described in Section 1 and serve solely under the fee-based Professional Services Agreement, and would that choice affect scoring?

See Answers to Question 8 & 16.

18. If a Partner team includes, or later identifies, a development entity, may the right of first refusal be designated or assigned to that entity? Separately, how does the City intend to manage the potential conflict of a Partner preparing the disposition strategy and pricing guidance while also holding a right of first refusal on the same parcels?

See Answer to Question 8 for whether the right of first refusal can be designated to a partner development entity.

The City reserves all rights with respect to the ultimate disposition of the parcels. The Partner's guidance will serve as a recommendation to the City Commission but the City is under no obligation to convey property at any particular price and will consider overall public benefit, not simply purchase price, in evaluating any conveyance.

19. For respondents not proposing future acquisition, will a letter from a financial institution satisfy the Financial Capacity requirement in Section 7.F in lieu of audited financial statements?

Section 7.F states that audited financial statements OR letters from financial institutions are required. Either will be sufficient to satisfy this requirement.

FEE, BUDGET, AND FUNDING

20. Section 7.F references Proposed Business Terms, and Section 10 references cost and fee proposals. Should respondents submit a fee proposal, rate schedule, or fee methodology with the RFQ, or will compensation be negotiated with the selected Partner? Has the City established a budget and funding source for the twelve-month PSA?

See Answer to Question 2.

21. Will third-party investigation costs (Phase II ESA, geotechnical borings, survey, title, and utility locating) be included in the Partner's fee, carried as reimbursable allowances, or contracted directly by the City?

Third-party investigation costs are expected to be carried as reimbursable allowances and accounted for in the overall project budget. This expectation is based on the anticipated deliverable of a comprehensive site due diligence report that incorporates Phase I/II environmental findings, a geotechnical summary, an infrastructure assessment, and a title review. The specific scope and associated costs of these investigations will be defined during contract negotiations and incorporated into the final Professional Services Agreement.

22. Does the City anticipate using federal or state funds (for example, EPA Brownfield, HUD, or EGLE programs) for the PSA, site investigations, or future redevelopment, such that federal procurement, NEPA, Section 106, or prevailing wage requirements would apply?

See Answer to Question 3.

TEAMING

23. May a firm serve as a subconsultant on more than one respondent team? Please confirm how the Non-Collusion certification in Section 10 applies to subconsultants.

Subconsultants will not be permitted to serve on more than one responding team for this RFQ.

24. Will members of the selected Partner team be eligible to provide services to developers responding to, or selected through, the subsequent disposition RFP under City Commission Policy 900-63?

Members of the selected Partner team will be eligible to provide services for developers responding to the disposition RFP. As stated on page 4 of the RFQ, "selection as Partner does not preclude participation in parcel ownership or development.

25. Is there a numeric participation goal for Micro Local, Minority, or Women Business Enterprises? Which certifications will the City recognize, and is Grand Rapids/West Michigan presence credited for subconsultants as well as the lead entity?

There are no specific numeric participation goals for Micro Local, Minority, or Women Business Enterprises (M/W/DBE) in the respondents' initial proposal. Respondents should demonstrate a genuine effort to assemble a diverse project team that includes M/W/DBE firms. However, inclusion is a priority for the City of Grand Rapids for development projects, especially when seeking City incentives. When developing a project that may use public incentives, please refer to the City of Grand Rapids Inclusion plan. Additionally, the City of Grand Rapids will recognize certifications issued by credible certifying organizations. Local presence will be primarily taken from the Lead entity.

SCOPE AND SITE INFORMATION

26. Appendix E, Section 5 calls for a master site plan covering all properties within the RFQ boundary, while Section 6 references at least Parcels 1 and 2. Please confirm whether Parcel 3 (1120 Monroe Ave NW) is fully within the master site plan scope, and whether adjacent City-owned properties (Coldbrook Annex, Monroe Fire Station, and the Leonard Fire Station site) should be considered.

See Answer to Question 4.

27. Who is preparing the Phase I Baseline Environmental Assessment and Hazardous Materials Assessment now underway for Parcels 1 and 2, when will they be complete, and will they be shared before the submission deadline? Is that firm eligible to respond? Is an updated assessment of Parcel 3, last assessed in March 2010, expected within the PSA?

See Answer to Question 1.

28. May respondents execute a non-disclosure agreement now to obtain the as-builts, decommissioning plans, surveys, environmental reports, and utility capacity information listed under Available Documentation before the submission deadline?

See Answer to Question 1.

29. For the Kent County Drain Commissioner storm sewers on Parcels 1 and 3, what level of analysis is expected for the Coldbrook Creek drain capacity strategy: a planning-level strategy, hydraulic and hydrologic modeling, or design of a relocation? Will existing models, inspection records, and as-builts be provided, and does the City expect minimum setbacks to be established before the PSA begins?

See Answer to Question 6.

30. Please describe the flood protection system adjacent to Parcels 1 and 2, including whether it is a FEMA-accredited levee or floodwall, any applicable encroachment or setback limits.

The flood protection system adjacent to Parcels 1 and 2 consists of a retaining wall in combination with an earthen berm. Any proposed modifications to the flood protection berm must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

Applicable setback requirements are governed by Section 5.8.03.D of the Grand River Overlay District (OD-GR), which supersedes the base zoning district setback requirements on the riparian side of the property. The required setback is 30% of the lot depth, subject to a minimum of 30 feet and a maximum of 50 feet, measured from the applicable Grand River riverwalk, floodwall, shoreline, or dock line. The Planning Commission may authorize a reduction in the required setback through the Optional Plan Review process.

Any proposed work within or adjacent to the flood protection system should be reviewed for compliance with applicable City requirements and any additional floodplain or encroachment restrictions.

31. Has the 1911 pump station on Parcel 1 been locally designated, listed in, or determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places? Is a historic structure report or facade condition assessment expected within the scope, and should respondents evaluate historic tax credit eligibility?

The 1911 pump station has not been locally designated, listed in the National Register of Historic Places, or determined eligible for listing. Respondents should evaluate the structure's eligibility for historic tax credits, as well as the condition of the facade for continued use.

As stated in the RFQ, Parcel 1 may be considered part of a historic resource and should be preserved to the extent feasible. The selected Partner will work with the City to identify the most

appropriate tools and methods for preserving the exterior facade of the main building along Monroe Ave NW.

32. For the Development Center, has the 45,000 GSF program and parking requirement been validated through the Facilities Master Plan, or is the Partner expected to validate it? Are specific alternative City-owned or leased sites to be evaluated, what level of design and cost estimating is expected, and how does the City anticipate funding a new or expanded Development Center?

The 45,000 GSF program and associated parking requirements originate from the City's 2025 Facility Master Plan. Respondents are not expected to validate these figures as part of their RFQ submittals. The selected Partner, however, may refine them through the master site planning process. The Facility Master Plan identifies a general location for a consolidated Development Center, which is intended to maximize walkability. The Facility Master Plan notes that the City could work with Kent County to explore possible use of County-owned space at 300 Monroe Ave NW, but it does not identify any specific City-owned or leased sites for consideration. The City has not identified a funding source for a new or expanded Development Center. Respondents are invited to describe potential funding and financing approaches as part of their submittals.

33. Will the Fire Department occupy Parcel 1 throughout the PSA term, and what access constraints should respondents assume for intrusive investigations in occupied buildings?

No, the Grand Rapids Fire Department (GRFD) is expected to fully transition to its new $46 million Training Center at 850 Pannell Street NW by Spring 2027.

34. The RFQ notes that the Parks and Recreation Strategic Master Plan update changes the expectation for Parcel 1 and that GR Forward is under revision. What are the revised expectations for Parcel 1, and what is the anticipated adoption timing for both plans? Is the Partner expected to prepare and support adoption of any zoning text or overlay amendments, or only recommend them?

The 2022 Parks and Recreation Strategic Master Plan and the 2015 GR Forward plan are both under revision, but neither update is expected to include site-specific expectations or objectives for Parcel 1. Adoption of the updated Parks and Recreation Strategic Master Plan is anticipated in Spring 2027. An adoption timeline for the successor plan to GR Forward has not yet been determined. The 2022 Parks and Recreation Strategic Master Plan identifies several expansive objectives for Parcel 1 (the Coldbrook site), including redevelopment into a community and recreation hub with a new indoor facility, public outdoor event space, and direct water access for nearby neighborhoods. GR Forward sets out different goals for the site, including creating habitat that expands opportunities for stormwater management and improved river access. Some of these GR Forward objectives were previously realized with the construction of new riverfront access trails and landings in 2016. Regardless, both plan updates are expected to continue prioritizing the Grand River. The Grand River Greenway Vision and Framework for

Action (2025) identifies Parcel 1 as an opportunity primed for "transformation into an active destination," but does not prescribe a specific development path. The Partner is not expected to prepare zoning text or overlay amendments. However, the Partner should be ready to recommend an appropriate successor zoning district for the site under Zone GR as needed to realize effective development outcomes.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

35. Section 6 sets a Threshold of Engagement at the inform level. Is inform the minimum, and what level of the City's Community Engagement Framework does the City expect for this project? Which public participation platform should be used, and will the City provide platform licensing, venues, interpretation, and childcare support, or should those costs be carried by the Partner? Does the City expect community-based organization partners to be compensated?

Inform is the minimum threshold for engagement, but the City expects this project to reach the Involve level at key milestones. Under the City of Grand Rapids Community Engagement Framework, Inform is an educational effort that shares information with the public, while Involve gathers public input that shapes decisions. Although there is no adjacent residential development, the disposition of public property calls for robust engagement. The Inform component should educate residents and stakeholders about the site's fixed constraints, including drainage and stormwater easements, flood protection, the historic façade, and the master planning effort. Beyond that, the Partner should identify meaningful opportunities to involve the public at key milestones, such as initial design and the programming of public amenities. As proposed, community input influences decisions on public amenities, design, and process, though it does not decide the project as a whole.

Where a community-based organization performs engagement work on the Partner's behalf, such as hosting, translation, or event moderation, the City encourages fair compensation for that work.

See the response to Questions 9 for requirements related to platform licensing, venues, interpretation services, and childcare support.

SUBMISSION AND CONTRACT

36. What time on November 16, 2026 are submissions due, and must both the electronic and hard copies be received by that time? Is there a file size limit for the emailed PDF?

All application material must be submit and received by the City of Grand Rapids Economic Development Department by November 16, 2026 at 12:00 pm ET. The City does not specify an explicit file size limit for emailed PDFs. However, applicants should consider the sending and receiving limits imposed by their email providers to ensure successful delivery before the deadline.

37. May resumes, project sheets, and the organizational chart be included as appendices outside the section page limits? Are 11x17 pages permitted for visual materials?

Resumes, project sheets, and organizational charts will count toward the page limits for their respective sections and may not be included as appendices outside those limits. Respondents may include Letters of Support, additional project examples beyond the required five, supporting market or financial analysis, and additional visual materials as supplementary materials, provided they are clearly labeled as such. Additionally, 11" × 17" pages are permitted for visual materials.

38. The RFQ references Appendix A (Conflict of Interest Disclosure) and Appendix B (Site Maps and Documentation), which do not appear to be included in the RFQ as posted, and refers to utilities information in Appendix E rather than Appendix D. Can you post the missing appendices and confirm the references. Please also confirm whether a signed RFQ form is required, as referenced in Section 10.

Appendix A and Appendix B have been posted with the RFQ on the City of Grand Rapids Economic Development Department webpage. Please refer to the following link to access the materials: https://www.grandrapidsmi.gov/departments/economic-development/

Appendix D is the correct reference for the Utilities Information section.

There is no separate RFQ form that is required. The only document that must be signed from the City is a Conflict of Interest Disclosure form.

39. Will the City consider modifications to the indemnification provisions in Section 10, including limiting the duty to defend for professional liability claims to the extent caused by the Partner's negligence, consistent with insurable coverage? What performance bonds, if any, are anticipated for the PSA?

The City of Grand Rapids is open to modifications to the indemnification provisions in Section 10 if appropriate. Performance and Payment bonds are both typically required of the prime contractor on capital construction projects. The City does not require performance bonds of consultants, subcontractors, or suppliers, however there are other liability requirements and guarantees that apply to those parties for capital projects, depending on the project and assumed risk. Exact liability requirements and guarantees will be discussed when the professional services agreement is negotiated.

40. As the October 16 RSVP date has passed, may additional respondents attend the October 20 site visit, in person or virtually? Will the attendee list and any site visit materials be posted with the Q&A?

Respondents wishing to attend the October 20 site visit were required to RSVP by October 16. No attendee list will be shared. No additional materials were provided at the site visit beyond those already available on the City of Grand Rapids website with the RFQ packet.