



Purchasing Division

## **ADDENDUM NO. 3**

**DATE:** February 14, 2025  
**FROM:** City of Grand Junction Purchasing Division  
**TO:** All Offerors  
**RE:** Development of the Salt Flats (21.78 acres located at 450 28 Road Grand Junction, Colorado)  
LOI-5577-25-KN

Offerors responding to the above referenced solicitation are hereby instructed that the requirements have been clarified, modified, superseded and supplemented as to this date as hereinafter described.

Please make note of the following clarifications:

- Q:** I noticed in the RFP you are looking for potential LIHTC developments. I'm curious if you have multiple LIHTC developers proposing for projects on the salt flats property. How are you going to prioritize which LIHTC communities get to go in for tax credits? (Question from Pre-Proposal Meeting)

**A:** The City is looking to have you propose what that looks like on your time table. There could always be adjustments available in the future. The City does have some time limits to the site in general, based on our chap agreement. It could be that we have three projects proposed, but some of them are all synchronized in a way that they wouldn't compete with each other. Until we see what we get back in this process, we really won't know how to answer that.
- Q:** The city's RFP is inclusive of the housing authorities portion. Can you just give a little bit of guidance around that? Also is the housing authorities portion, part of the 324 units. How do those pieces kind of play together? (Question from Pre-Proposal Meeting)

**A:** The housing authority's parcel is approximately three to four acres. It's not beneficially surveyed and scoped out yet, but we estimate about three to four acres of the total 21.78 parcel available. The site will have a total of 324 housing units, regardless of how developers divide the portions. The project manager will track unit types, affordability categories (70%), and square footage, especially for mixed-use developments. Traffic requirements and total site usage will also be monitored. The housing authority's units contribute to the total, which includes both rental and homeownership. The remaining 30% of units can be mixed-use or fall into attainable housing categories.
- Q:** Can I ask one follow up question you talked about the detention? Is that site wide detention? Should we be planning for detention in our response? (Question from Pre-Proposal Meeting)

**A:** The detention pond in the southwest corner has limited additional capacity. Projects are expected to manage their own detention on-site. However, for larger developments, a regional approach may be considered to accommodate additional site needs. For example, only part of a project's acreage may require on-site detention.

4. **Q:** Is it conceivable that a single design gets developed at the same time for the entire site, including the housing authority site, as one comprehensive village or neighborhood plan? (Question from Pre-Proposal Meeting)
- A:** A phased master plan for the site is possible, but previous discussions revealed differing visions for its development. If a developer is interested in the entire site (excluding the housing authority's portion) and proposes a phased approach, it would be reviewed against the evaluation criteria.
5. **Q:** From your illustrative it looks like the greater density of development is on the housing authority site. So what is, what is the remainder on the rest of the site, or the 324, units? (Question from Pre-Proposal Meeting)
- A:** The illustrative density shown was only for grant purposes and does not represent the actual plan. The final density is still undecided, especially for the Housing Authority's portion, though a multi-family unit of four to five stories is likely. While the goal is to meet the 324-unit target, there is openness to higher density, potentially up to 550 units. The focus is on a mix of housing types to meet community needs, rather than strictly following the illustrative plan.
6. **Q:** So 324, is the minimum, and it could be whatever the market can support, correct? (Question from Pre-Proposal Meeting)
- A:** Correct.
7. **Q:** Will if a developer wanted to just answer an LOI for the housing authority, are we also required to submit a loi to the city? (Question from Pre-Proposal Meeting)
- A:** Yes.
8. **Q:** For the for sale properties, do you still consider 120 AMI or all the units you would prefer be below 120 AMI? (Question from Pre-Proposal Meeting)
- A:** Seventy percent of the site's units must be at or below 100% AMI. Proposition 123 allows for AMIs up to 120%, but it's uncertain if those guidelines will be adopted. Requests for higher AMIs will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Thirty percent of the units can exceed affordability guidelines. CHAFA's stance on counting units under Prop 123 is still unclear, but the current requirement for homeownership units is 100% AMI.
9. **Q:** Can you share the soils/Geotech report for Salt Flats from the CHFA Land Banking grant application?
- A:** The Geotech reports are included in the LOI under 4.2.3.5.
10. **Q:** If a developer wishes to participate in the forthcoming RFP from the Grand Junction Housing Authority, do they also need to submit an LOI to the City for LOI-5577-25-KN - Development of the Salt Flats?
- A:** Yes, this is recommended.
11. **Q:** Is the City expecting to see illustrative plans by an architect for the LOI submission or is a narrative sufficient?
- A:** Narrative is sufficient; however, more developed visuals are always helpful for understanding the project.

12. **Q:** If we are interested in the development opportunity on the GJHA portion of the Salt Flats property, would you like us to also respond to the general City RFP as well?

**A:** Yes, this is recommended.

13. **Q:** Do you know if the City of Grand Junction currently has any private activity bond (PAB) capacity available for the development of affordable housing (paired with 4% LIHTC)?

**A:** The City of Grand Junctions Private Activity Bond allocation and process can be found on the City's [website \(link\)](#).

14. **Q:** Can you please confirm if the Affordable Housing Incentive Program would waive 100% of fees for projects that are income averaged at 60% AMI? In various jurisdictions, we've seen a need to serve 70% and 80% AMI units, which is why we are interested in an average income project.

**A:** The current policy does not talk to income averaging, but does not require all units to be affordable to still receive all/a portion of the fee waivers. The incentive program is also contingent upon the annual budget process. If the proposed project includes fee waivers for all units, please note this in response.

15. **Q:** Does the 324 units requirement include the housing authority's planned development?

**A:** Yes. It is currently unknown what number of units GJHA will provide. The site, in totality (including GJHA), has to provide a *minimum* of 324 units.

16. **Q:** Are there sub-bullets missing under D.1: Development Strategy and Implementation Plan?

**A:** No, it is not missing sub-bullets. Section 5.D.1. shall read as follows:  
"Describe the proposed strategy and/or plan for achieving the objectives of this LOI."

17. **Q:** If parcels are divided between different developers and the housing authority, how will the city ensure that the sum of all units meets Prop 123's requirements of 70% affordable? Can one parcel propose more than 30% if the total is less than or equal to 30%?

**A:** Each proposal should provide an estimate of the units it seeks to provide and the expected affordability (AMI) of the units. This will be added together and considered in the evaluation of the LOIs to ensure that both a mix of unit types and affordability will meet the CHFA minimum requirements.

18. **Q:** Is the city looking to sell off parcels? Will they be donating the land to the accepted developers? Possibly a land lease?

**A:** The land can be sold or leased. It should be noted which of these (or both) are expected from a developer. If land donation is expected or if the proposer anticipates negotiating acquisition for a price, this should also be included in the response.

19. **Q:** Also can you please provide me with the geotechnical engineer's soils report on the site so we can think about that when considering "affordability"?

**A:** The Geotech report is included in the LOI under 4.2.3.5.

20. Below is the recording of the Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting on 2/7/2025.

[Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting - Development of the Salt Flats SOQ-5577-25-KN \(2/7/2025\)](#)

21. For a summary and full transcript of the Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting on 2/7/202, use the following link. [https://otter.ai/u/WYsSNexmi1dHC9WeOF5odcyh79g?utm\\_source=va\\_chat\\_link\\_1](https://otter.ai/u/WYsSNexmi1dHC9WeOF5odcyh79g?utm_source=va_chat_link_1)

**No further questions will be accepted. Inquiry deadline has pasted.**

The original solicitation for the project noted above is amended as noted.

All other conditions of subject remain the same.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "K Nelson". The letter "K" is large and stylized, with a long vertical stroke. The word "Nelson" is written in a cursive, flowing script.

Kassy Nelson, Buyer  
City of Grand Junction, Colorado