



REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF INTEREST AND QUALIFICATIONS

("RFQ") #5058ME

REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANT

(Cleveland State University Campus)

ADDENDUM #1, Questions and Answers

RFQ Issued Date: November 21, 2025

Questions due by: December 12, 2025 by 2:00pm EST via email with the RFI #5058ME in the subject line

Response Due Date /Time: January 16, 2026 by 2:00pm EST via email with the RFI #5058ME in the subject line

Contact:

Michael Eames

Purchasing Manager

bids@csuohio.edu

Responses must be received by the due date/time specified above.

Please refer to the attached sheets for Instructions & Information. Submissions are to be submitted in accordance with the enclosed Request for Statement of Interest and Qualifications Instructions and Specifications.

ADDENDUM #1, Questions and Answers

(“RFQ”) #5058ME, Real Estate Development Consultants

1. Is CSU looking for a deliverable that includes elements of a physical campus master plan to accompany the development strategy? Or is CSU expecting more of a report or white paper format for its deliverable?
 - a. CSU would like a development strategy that ensures CSU’s entire campus is fully optimized and that all real estate assets and improvements support the university's strategic goals, such as Cleveland State United (<https://www.csuohio.edu/uspc>).
2. Considering CSU’s desired output, to what extent is CSU expecting “professional design” services for this project versus strategic recommendations and analysis around real estate strategies?
 - a. We are focused on strategic recommendations and analysis.
3. Can CSU provide more detail about its expectations for the “Development Concept” and “Project Phasing and Budgets” requested under Submission Requirements? What level of detail is expected at this very early proposal stages?
 - a. CSU would like to understand approach, best practices and the firm’s ability to deliver on these things.
4. Many of the items listed under “Selection Criteria” are not included in the Submission Requirements, including a fee proposal. Can CSU confirm that it is expecting a proposal for a fixed firm fee that will be evaluated against the value presented in the Selection Criteria?
 - a. Please see the score criteria form.
5. If possible, please share the RFQ # for submission reference.
 - a. Please see RFQ for number.
6. The RFQ indicates that CSU is seeking a qualified and experienced real estate development consultant, but also refers to respondents as “developers.” The submission requirements also include a Development Concept as well as development budgets, which might typically be provided by a developer. Are you seeking to partner with a developer at this stage?

- a. Throughout the RFQ, “developer” is used in conjunction with “development consultant,” “consultant” and/or “project team.”
7. If possible, please provide a description of your ideal partner for this assignment? Are you seeking a developer? A real estate advisory firm? Are Architectural and Engineering services required for the real estate advisory team?
 - a. See RFQ: throughout the RFQ, “developer” is used in conjunction with “development consultant,” “consultant” and/or “project team.”
8. Do you intend to run a competitive process to secure a developer partner in the future? Or are you envisioning partnering with a developer you select via this RFQ to deliver the project?
 - a. We will consider all options in this process.
9. Are we correct to assume that firms that are selected for this project would remain eligible to either a) represent CSU in a future market engagement solicitation, or b) act as the developer to achieve your stated vision?
 - a. Correct
10. What information regarding CSU's current assets can be available prior to the submission, to support the requested Development Concept and budgets deliverables?
 - a. See list provided on page 13 of RFQ.
11. Please list the types of anticipated additional professional services, such as Architect and Engineer, Sustainability Consultant, etc.
 - a. We may take on additional services in the future, but they are not an expectation of this proposal. Respondent may identify those additional professional services it may offer.
12. Please describe the anticipated duration of the consultant contract, including estimate of regular meeting attendance throughout and critical milestones during the tenure.
 - a. TBD.
13. Please confirm EDGE participation requirement - 10% of gross fee?
 - a. Please see RFQ.
14. Can you provide more details on the specific goals and objectives of the real estate development plan for Cleveland State University (CSU)?
 - a. Please see RFQ.

15. Are there any particular areas or facilities on the CSU campus that are prioritized for development or redevelopment?
- a. “All campus real estate and buildings shall be included in this assessment, including academic space, parking facilities, athletic facilities, and administrative offices.”
16. Can you please describe the level of completeness targeted for the Development Concept per the Submission Requirements? The submission requirements include references to Project Phasing and Budgets. How detailed should budgets and development concepts be at this stage?
- a. We need to be able to understand Respondent’s ability along with its thoughtful approach to development.
17. Has the university completed any budgeting efforts or advanced any design work of projects included in the Master Plan?
- a. Please see RFQ.
18. What is the expected timeline for the evaluation of responses and the selection of the real estate development consultant?
- a. See RFQ.
19. Are there any anticipated dates for proposer presentations or interviews?
- a. We will notify those shortlisted of these dates.
20. Has CSU created a timeline for the execution of the Master Plan elements?
- a. No
21. Can you provide more details on the financial strategies and funding sources that CSU is considering for this project? Including timelines for funding.
- a. CSU is open to and willing to consider any and all options for financing and funding to include but not limited to state funding, federal funding, grants, Public Private partnerships and any other ideas the Respondent shares.
22. Are there any specific legal or regulatory requirements that respondents should be aware of?
- a. As a public university, CSU is subject to the laws of the State of Ohio.

23. Can you provide access to the existing analysis and background information mentioned in the RFQ, such as the Gordian Presentation of Findings and the Brailsford & Dunlavey Athletic Facilities Needs Assessment?
- a. Please see page 13 of the RFQ.
24. Is the Gordian Presentation of Findings (Phase 1) dated February 2025 specific inly to Facility Conditions Assessments of the 17 oldest buildings? Are there FCAs for the remaining buildings to be included in this assessment?
- a. Current findings are the 17 oldest buildings.
25. Does the CSU Space Utilization Plan dated November 2025 include all buildings and space types requested to be assessed under this RFQ for real estate assessment?
- a. TBD
26. Does the university have a reportable space inventory and/or management as an available resource?
- a. See CSU Space Utilization plan
27. Does the university have an adopted space classification system that delineates by space type/use?
- a. Yes
28. Are there any additional reports or documents that would be helpful for respondents to review?
- a. Please see page 13 of the RFQ.
29. Please elaborate on CSU's expectation relative to the assessment of campus infrastructure and utilities.
- a. CSU wants a development partner that will help with the process to plan for the future use of buildings and its utilities.
30. Are there any specific additional professional services that CSU anticipates needing for this project, such as architectural or engineering services?
- a. We may need additional services in the future.
31. How should respondents address the need for these additional services in their submissions?
- a. Respondents should share how they may use these services and how the outcomes that the services provide could help CSU in its planning.

32. Can CSU confirm whether the “existing analyses” listed (Gordian Phase 1, B&D Athletics, Performance Audit, Space Utilization Plan, etc.) represent all studies to be provided, or should the consultant anticipate conducting additional primary assessments?
- a. Please see page 13 of the RFQ.
33. Will CSU provide editable versions of the by-building expenses spreadsheet, utility reports, and lease agreements? If so, in what format (Excel, PDF, GIS layers)?
- a. No
34. Is there an up-to-date GIS or CAD-based inventory of campus parcels, utilities, easements, and right-of-way constraints?
- a. Not of all properties and locations.
35. Gordian covers only the 17 oldest buildings – should the consultant assume a full FCA for remaining buildings is required, or will CSU provide additional assessments?
- a. The rest won’t be complete prior to the completion of this RFQ.
36. Does the Space Utilization Plan include room-level utilization data by time of day and term, or is further quantification required?
- a. This will be work completed once CSU has identified a development consultant.
37. Can CSU clarify required components (e.g., land-use scenarios, development pipeline, proformas, phasing plan, feasibility studies, site planning, market analysis)?
- a. All of the above are great components to include, but the bidder isn’t limited to these components.
38. Should the consultant prepare detailed financial modeling for every proposed development concept, or only for shortlisted priority projects?
- a. The consultant should focus on the shortlisted priorities, but if they see opportunities in any area they should develop modelling and share.
39. What level of depth is expected for monetization strategies (e.g., high-level concepts, full life-cycle cost/benefit analysis, cash-flow projections)?
- a. Whatever the consultant feels is sufficient to cover how they will positively impact the outcomes at CSU.
40. Regarding chiller plant(s) and utilities, what level of engineering analysis is expected—conceptual-only or full technical evaluation?

- a. Conceptual for the bid process and then full evaluation will be decided once a development consultant is identified.
- 41. Should the consultant prepare both redevelopment alternatives AND disposition alternatives for every asset, or only those identified by CSU as candidates?
 - a. Please use criteria from RFQ document.
- 42. How does CSU define “sustainable financial objectives” and are there targeted revenue or cost-reduction thresholds associated with this project?

There are no targeted revenue or cost-reduction thresholds associated with this project.
- 43. Will CSU provide forecasts or scenarios for academic realignment (new programs, program reductions) that may influence space planning?
 - a. No
- 44. Should the consultant explore new student housing, public/private housing, or mixed-use concepts?
 - a. Yes
- 45. Does CSU expect a full transportation/parking demand study or only evaluations of select assets?
 - a. Evaluation of selected assets.
- 46. Who will be the day-to-day project manager for CSU during this engagement?
 - a. TBD
- 47. What stakeholders are required (e.g., faculty senate, athletics, finance, city partners, local developers, student groups)? Should interviews, workshops, or public meetings be included?
 - a. Those are all potential stakeholders and should be considered.
- 48. At what stages will the Board require presentations, approvals, or check-ins?
 - a. TBD
- 49. Should the consultant plan for coordination with the City of Cleveland, Greater Cleveland Partnership, NOACA, or neighboring property owners?
 - a. Possibly, depending on the Respondents’ proposals.
- 50. What constitutes a complete “phased development roadmap”? Should it include budgets, sequencing, funding structures, partnerships, or market absorption timelines?

- a. For Respondent to determine: Yes
51. Does CSU anticipate the selected consultant will also support RFP developer solicitation, negotiations, and deal structuring in later phases?
- a. TBD.
52. Should the consultant provide recommended procurement and delivery models (P3, Design-Build, concessions, ground leases, etc.)?
- a. Yes, if applicable
53. Should financial projections include net present value (NPV), IRR, debt-service coverage (DSCR), scenario planning, or sensitivity analysis?
- a. Yes, if applicable
54. Does CSU want the consultant to identify funding mechanisms (e.g., NMTC, HTC, TIF, BEDI, State capital bill) or prepare pre-applications?
- a. Yes, if applicable
55. Will CSU provide details on existing bonds, covenants, and restrictions that may affect monetization or redevelopment?
- a. Once the development consultant is identified.
56. The RFQ asks the consultant to define additional professional services needed. Does CSU expect firm commitments or only conceptual identification?
- a. Please show you have the ability and experience partnering with additional professional services.
57. What are the EDGE participation goals and reporting expectations for this contract?
- a. See RFQ.
58. Should conceptual site plans and massing studies be included, or only narrative-level planning?
- a. This should be determined by the Respondent.
59. Can CSU provide more detail on the scoring categories, especially how “completed responses to RFQ” (20 points) will be evaluated? (See Attachment E.)
- a. No
60. Does CSU expect local firms as teaming partners or is proximity scored but not required? (See firm location scoring in Attachment E.)
- a. All locations will be considered.

61. Are deliverables expected in PDF only, or also in editable formats (Word, Excel, GIS layers, CAD, PowerPoint)?
- a. See RFQ.
62. What is the anticipated timeline from award through deliverable completion?
- a. TBD
63. Will CSU provide access to buildings for walkthroughs and assessments, and are there any areas with limited access?
- a. We will be setting a date for walkthroughs for all shortlisted bidders.
64. Does CSU have expectations for steering committee meetings (weekly, biweekly, monthly)?
- a. There will be committee meetings with frequency TBD.
65. The RFQ is typically defined as a “statement of interest and qualifications,”. The submission requirements also appear to include a development concept and project phasing, and budgets. Can you clarify the purpose of the RFQ vs. the scope of the actual project?
- a. See RFQ.
66. Does CSU plan to issue an RFP to a select group of respondents to the RFQ with specific details with regard to timeline, deliverables, etc.? It would be helpful to understand a final scope of the project prior to finalizing the project team.
- a. Respondent is responsible for providing details about its timeline and deliverables.
67. Can you clarify whether CSU is seeking a consultant to conduct an analysis and develop an implementation plan or a developer to propose a concept, pricing and phasing based on the master plan? If the latter, does CSU plan to contribute any financial consideration to proposed redevelopment?
- a. The selected development consultant will assess CSU’s current campus, making use of existing analysis where available, including land use, facility utilization, and building conditions to provide a long-term development plan aligned with CSU’s academic and strategic goals.
68. How does the requested deliverable to align with the 2022 CSU Master Plan? Should responses assume continuity with that plan, or is CSU seeking a new vision that may replace or significantly modify it?
- a. Assume continuity with the plan.

69. The Selection Rating Form seems to include the evaluation of a formal fee proposal. Will CSU require cost proposals as part of this RFQ response?
- a. See requirements in RFQ.
70. The Selection Rating Form also evaluates “Criteria for Prioritizing Development and Phasing” as well as “Campus development budget and financial projections”. Can you clarify what you are looking for in these categories and how CSU would evaluate these items at this stage?
- a. This should be determined by the bidder.
71. What is the RFQ# that should be included on responses?
- a. See RFQ for RFQ #.
72. Will the consultant be expected to engage with external stakeholders as part of the process?
- a. Once a development consultant is identified, yes.
73. Who will be the primary point of contact for the consultant once selected?
- a. TBD
74. Which CSU departments or roles (e.g., Facilities, Finance, Academic Affairs) will participate in decision-making and coordination during the planning process?
- a. TBD
75. For facility condition and utilization metrics, will CSU rely solely on the existing analyses provided (Gordian Phase 1 findings, space utilization reports, utility reports), or should the consultant anticipate conducting any supplemental FCA investigation, especially outside of the oldest 17 buildings?
- a. TBD
76. Should the consultant validate or update any of the existing reports (Gordian findings, B&D athletic assessment, Space Utilization Plan), or will these be treated as baseline conditions for planning purposes?
- a. No need to update.
77. Is space programming or space-needs forecasting included in this engagement, or will CSU provide current academic and administrative forecasts for incorporation into the plan?
- a. See documents provided.

78. Should the consultant's strategic recommendations address the entire campus real estate portfolio, or will CSU identify priority buildings or parcels for focused evaluation?
- a. Please refer to RFQ criteria.
79. Can CSU clarify exactly what is meant by "Creating Development Roadmaps"? Are you looking for a vendor to work with CSU to create strategies for developing new facilities per the 2022 Master Plan? Would this include athletic facilities, parking garages, academic facilities, etc.?
- a. This is open to interpretation of the bidder.
80. The RFQ states the vendor should have "Experience in developing plans with public higher education institutions is desirable, which may include but not be limited to land sale(s), property leasing, repurposing facilities, space planning and/or public-private partnerships (P3s)." Is CSU looking to potentially monetize underutilized assets to help fund new development projects, optimize its portfolio, or both?
- a. We are open to all considerations.
81. Has CSU successfully completed any P3 projects for housing or other facility types?
- a. Yes
82. Has CSU conducted any space utilization and/or classroom utilization studies?
- a. Yes
83. Does CSU anticipate the selected consultant performing any new space utilization analyses, or should the consultant rely primarily on the existing CSU Space Utilization Plan (November 2025) and other available datasets when developing recommendations?
- a. This will be identified once a development partner is selected.
84. Beyond reviewing the Gordian Phase 1 findings and other existing materials, does CSU expect the consultant to conduct additional facility condition assessments? If so, what level of depth would be required?
- a. TBD
85. Could CSU clarify the expected level of detail for the Development Concept section of the submittal? Specifically, should this focus on overarching strategic direction, or does CSU expect initial redevelopment ideas, land-use scenarios, or potential financial pathways?

- a. Please review RFQ and present your best abilities to meet the requirements set forth in the document.
- 86. For the Project Phasing and Budgets section, should proposers include preliminary, order-of-magnitude cost ranges and high-level phasing logic, or does CSU expect a more detailed sequencing framework with estimated timelines, priority tiers, and potential financing structures?
 - a. This is up to the bidder.
- 87. Does CSU request a fee proposal as part of the RFQ response, or will fees be negotiated with shortlisted teams at a later stage? If a fee proposal is desired now, should it encompass both the consultant's planning scope and any anticipated solicitation or coordination with development partners?
 - a. This is outlined in the RFQ.