

Question #	Section Reference	Question / Comment	Response
1		Please provide a list of attendees (including entities represented), including any sign-in sheet, at the Blueprint Schools Phase II Industry Day event on October 21.	Provided as part of Addendum 1.
2		Please provide a list of presenters (including entities represented) at the Blueprint Schools Phase II Industry Day event on October 21	Speakers during Industry Day were: Mr. Jason Washington, PGCPS Dr. Monica Goldson, PGCPS The Honorable Calvin S. Hawkins, Prince George's County Council Ms. De'Nerika Johnson, PGCPS Mr. Bob Hunt, JLL Mr. Michael Hoffstrom, JLL Ms. Shesi Xi, SXM Strategies Ms. Kathy Dixon, K. Dixon Architecture Mr. Bob Jones, Arcadis
3		Please provide any materials shared or presented at the Blueprint Schools Phase II Industry Day event on October 21.	Provided as part of Addendum 1.
4		Please provide a list of consultants and advisors to PGCPS on the procurement and the project in order to facilitate compliance with teaming, conflict of interest and rules of conduct requirements.	Firms involved in the solicitation that are prohibited from participating on a project team responding to this solicitation include: Jones Lang Lasalle Americas, Inc. (JLL); Kutak Rock LLP; SXM Strategies, LLC; K Dixon Architecture PLLC; Arcadis U.S. Inc.; Lempugh Inc.(LMD); The Elocen Group; Symmetra Design; Convergent Technologies; Clark Azar & Associates; Cagley and Associates, Inc.; Bradley Site Design, Inc.; Geotechnical Engineers, Inc.; Henry Adams Consulting Engineers' Laisar Management Group, LLC; and any other Person that, to the best of Proposer's knowledge and belief, is engaged by PGCPS, the County, or any of the above listed entities, in connection with the Project or the solicitation.
5		During the Industry Day held on October 21, 2022 at 1PM, It was stated that subcontractors are not required to be exclusive to any particular team. On a similar but slightly different scenario, can you advise if it is acceptable for a third tier subcontractor who is part of the current PGCPS contract (i.e. Technical Advisory Services), to join a team, as a subcontractor, for DCP001-23 -PGCPS Blueprint Schools Phase II?	Firms involved in the solicitation that are prohibited from participating on a project team responding to this solicitation include: Jones Lang Lasalle Americas, Inc. (JLL); Kutak Rock LLP; SXM Strategies, LLC; K Dixon Architecture PLLC; Arcadis U.S. Inc.; Lempugh Inc.(LMD); The Elocen Group; Symmetra Design; Convergent Technologies; Clark Azar & Associates; Cagley and Associates, Inc.; Bradley Site Design, Inc.; Geotechnical Engineers, Inc.; Henry Adams Consulting Engineers' Laisar Management Group, LLC; and any other Person that, to the best of Proposer's knowledge and belief, is engaged by PGCPS, the County, or any of the above listed entities, in connection with the Project or the solicitation.
6	Form G.1	The form's footnotes include references to "Financing Member", which does not appear to be a defined term in the RFQ. Can PGCPS provide a definition for Financing Member?	"Financing Member" was included in error; all references to "Financing Member" should instead state "Equity Member". PGCPS issued new forms as part of Addendum 1.
7	Form G.1	Are there any restrictions regarding the inclusion of projects comprised of private financing and construction contractual structures that are similar to that of P3 DBF or DBFOM? While the form's footnotes explicitly reference the requirement to include P3 projects, Sub-section 5.3 (Attachment to Form G1) of Section 5.5 (Financial Capabilities and Experience) appears to allow for the inclusion of non-P3 projects that are relevant and comparable to this Project.	The Respondent can provide P3 project examples where the Equity Member was responsible for arranging and raising equity and/or debt. Projects where there was no financing component should not be included.

8	Form G.1	May the equity member include DBMO and DBFMO K-12 school projects where it held the prime DBMO or DBFMO contract but where there was no equity requirement?	The Respondent can provide P3 project examples where the Equity Member was responsible for arranging and raising equity and/or debt. Projects where there was no financing component should not be included.
9		In order to comply with the RFQ MBE and CBB requirements, are there specific state or county certifications required for the firms intended to satisfy the requirement?	MBE and CBB requirements will be further detailed in the RFP.
10	4.3.4.2. Page Limits	The RFQ indicates the following: "PGCPS may, in its discretion, reject pages that exceed the page limits or that fail to follow the content or format instructions outlined in this RFQ." To ensure fairness between Respondents, will PGCPS please confirm that pages that exceed the limits indicated in the RFQ will not be reviewed or evaluated for all Respondents' submissions.	PGCPS does not intend to change this section of the RFQ.
11	5.6 Financial Information	Where a Respondent is providing a Guarantor, please confirm that the Respondent should include a Financial Officer Certificate from the Guarantor only and not from the entity that it is guaranteeing.	The Respondent should provide a completed Form GG2 (Financial Information - Financial Officer Certificate) for each Guarantor and the entity the Guarantor is guaranteeing.
12	5.4 Technical Experience and Project Understanding	We are unclear on intent of the page counts specified in the RFQ relating to Form F1 and the Technical Narrative Attachment for Form F1. Form F1 is to have no more than 12 pages; however, each Major Participant must submit a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 6 projects and each Form F1 must not exceed 2 pages, which indicates that each Major Participant's Form F1 section may total up to 12 pages. Will PGCPS please confirm that the 12-page limit indicated for section 4.1 and the 6-page limit indicated for section 4.2 apply to each Major Participant in a Respondent's team rather than applying to a Respondent's Form F1 and Form F1 Technical Narrative Attachment sections in total.	The pages limits relating to Form F-1 apply to each Major Participant
13	2.2.9 Local Contracting and the Use of MBE and CBB Firms	The RFQ indicates that no less than 30% of the Project should be awarded to MBEs, and no less than 20% should be awarded to CBBs. Please confirm that these two percentages are not additive (i.e. that the total target is not 50%) and that each may contribute to the other.	The 30% and 20% percentages referenced in Section 2.2.9 of the RFQ are not intended to be additive. Rather, PGCPS plans to require the Developer to ensure no less than thirty percent (30%) of the Project in each of the Design-Build Period and Services Period to be delivered pursuant to subcontracts with certified Minority Business Enterprises ("MBEs") or County Based Businesses ("CBBs"). The percentage division among MBE and CBB will be set forth in the RFP.
14	Form G1 notes	The footnote uses the phrase Financing Member, which is not defined. Is it intended to mean Equity Member?	"Financing Member" was included in error; all references to "Financing Member" should instead state "Equity Member". PGCPS issued new forms as part of Addendum 1.
15	5.1. General Information	Please confirm that Form O should be submitted by the Respondent only and not by each of the Respondent's Major Participants.	This is correct.
16	5.1. General Information	Please confirm that Guarantors, which are included in the definition of a Major Participant, are not required to provide the following forms: Form K (State of Maryland Tax Certification) and Form N (Certificate of Insurance Coverage).	If the Respondent has a Guarantor, the Guarantor is required to provide these forms.
17	5.5 Financial Capabilities (Section 5.1)	Please define what it means for a P3 project in the last 5 years to have entered "financial distress". Does this mean any instances where the Project went into default with creditors or was restructured, such as on the Purple Line LRT Project?	Projects that defaulted on debt, required debt restructuring to avoid default, or required financial support from the public sector sponsor to avoid default.

18	Energy Performance Guarantee	The RFQ does not have any questions with regards to a required Energy Performance Guarantee for the Project. Noting that the Phase 1 project includes certain energy performance guarantees and assuming the same will be true for the current project, please direct Respondents to where in the RFQ we should showcase our abilities in this arena.	The RFQ contains all submission requirements.
19	5.2 Organization and Management	Please confirm that the three references required for Key Management Personnel (2.5 Key Management Personnel Information) should come from a project included in a Respondent's Form F1, Form F2, Form G1, or Form H.	The three references required for Key Management Personnel under Section 5.2.5 (Key Management Personnel Information) may have worked with the Key Management Personnel on any projects provided in the Respondent's Form F1, Form F2, Form G1, or Form H submissions.
20	RFQ: Section II: 2.2.9. Local Contracting and the Use of MBE and CBB Firms	To assist Respondents in structuring their teams, will PGCPS please clarify if its intent is to require CBBs to be subcontracted for 20% of the Project in the Design-Build Period and Services Period, as indicated by the RFQ, or 20% of the 30% required MBE subcontracting, as was the case for Phase 1?	The 30% and 20% percentages referenced in Section 2.2.9 of the RFQ are not intended to be additive. Rather, PGCPS plans to require the Developer to ensure no less than thirty percent (30%) of the Project in each of the Design-Build Period and Services Period to be delivered pursuant to subcontracts with certified Minority Business Enterprises ("MBEs") or County Based Businesses ("CBBs"). The percentage division among MBE and CBB will be set forth in the RFP.
21	RFQ: Section III: 3.1.2. Request for Proposals	<p>As part of their Final Proposal, Final Proposers will be required to submit a financial proposal that provides guaranteed fixed pricing for all construction soft costs, pre-development costs, development fees, any miscellaneous service fees, and the Services Charge, or the portion of the availability payment to be paid to the Developer for providing the Services."</p> <p>It may be impossible to guarantee pre-development costs with accuracy or certainty, especially without a firm closing date, at the time of RFP submission.</p> <p>We would like to suggest that guaranteeing pre-development costs and, more importantly, the Services Charge be removed from the requirements for the financial proposals in the RFP phase, and instead, required after building systems have been selected/finalized and the construction GMP set confirmed?</p>	We will take this under advisement. PGCPS' intention is to lock as many costs as possible while there is competitive tension in the procurement process.
22	RFQ: Section III: 3.2. Anticipated Procurement Timeline	Will PGCPS please indicate when it expects to determine if Respondent interviews will be held and if so, when the requested agenda will be provided to Respondents? Given the holiday period between the RFQ Response Submission Deadline and the Respondent interviews, sufficient advance notice of the interview date and information would be helpful to ensure adequate preparation.	PGCPS plans to inform Respondents regarding their selection for a virtual interview no later than December 22, 2022. Virtual interviews will be conducted on January 5 and 6, 2023.
23	RFQ: Section V: Submission Requirements Section 5.1, 1.5	Will PGCPS please consider allowing confidential or proprietary trade secret information within the SOQ to be submitted in sealed envelopes or separately marked USBs to help avoid any accidental disclosure of such information?	PGCPS is open to the separately marked USBs (2 copies of each USB submitted) as long as the information is also submitted digitally via eMaryland Marketplace. We are not accepting hard copies.
24	RFQ: Section V: Submission Requirements Section 5.3, 3.1-3.3	Is the intention that we refer to our included information in RFQ Section 5.4 in our response and not include within 5.3 or are you asking for duplicate Forms F1, F2, G1 in both Sections 5.3 and 5.4?	Duplicate forms are not required. Respondents should submit Form F1 as described in Section 5.4.1 and 5.4.2. Respondents should submit Form F2 as described in Section 5.4.3 and 5.4.4. Respondents should submit Form G1 as described in Section 5.5.2 and 5.5.3.

PGCPS Blueprint Schools Phase 2 Appendix C

25	RFQ: Section V: Submission Requirements Section 5.6, 6.2	Can the requested electronic version of the financial statements be provided through a secure link and shared directly with a County-designated individual, as an alternative to a pdf copy on a USB drive? We have confidentiality and security concerns with providing financial statements on a USB drive.	The financial statements must be provided through eMaryland Marketplace which is a secure platform for submission. Respondents may also provide a password protected USB as long as the password is clearly provided with submission. (2 copies of each USB submitted are required.)
26	RFQ: Section V: Submission Requirements, Sections 4.10-4.12 and Form H	Because the Respondent's Lead Member may be one of multiple parties responsible for managing the Lead Services Provider, and because the Lead Services Provider is ultimately responsible for performing the Project's maintenance scope, please consider amending Form H and the associated Submittal Requirements in Section V: Sections 4.10-4.12 to allow Respondents to include capabilities, experience, and a proposed approach from the Equity Members and the Lead Services Provider in managing and/or performing operations and maintenance on similar projects.	PGCPS does not intend to change these sections of the RFQ.
27	RFQ: Appendix B: Form B.2. - Certification, Footnote 5; Form E, Footnote 6; Form G.1, Footnotes 13 and 17	Please confirm that the reference to "Financing Member" should be to "Equity Member".	"Financing Member" was included in error; all references to "Financing Member" should instead state "Equity Member". PGCPS issued new forms as part of Addendum 1.
28	RFQ: Appendix B: Form GG2, Footnote 23	In lieu of audited financials are we able to include a signed letter from our CFO outlining our financial information?	If audited financials are not available, PGCPS can accept unaudited financial statements certified by the CFO.
29	RFQ: Appendix B: Form N - Certificate of Insurance Coverage	The content of this form, and the obligations that it creates on each Major Participant, such as naming the Board of Education of Prince George's County as an Additional Insured and referring to "General Conditions of RFP and Contract" that have not yet been provided to Respondents, indicate that this form would be more appropriately requested from Respondents/Developers for a proposal submission, once a pending contractual agreement is expected between the Successful Proposer and PGCPS, the RFP and Project Agreement have been negotiated, and the Developer has been formed. Will PGCPS please clarify if the obligations within Form N are applicable to Respondents as of SOQ submission, or if by completing the form and selecting the option "Policy will be obtained/issued on", inserting the expected date of financial close, and clarifying that the insurance obligations will be satisfied by a to-be-formed Developer, Respondents will have satisfied the obligations of this Form N for the SOQ?	Form N - Certificate of Insurance Coverage was removed from the RFQ submission requirements as part of Addendum 1.
30	2.2.9	We are pleased to see that the County and PGCPS are committed to creating and maintaining a competitive and balanced economic environment for local minority business enterprises. One way that PGCPS intends to reach this objective is by requiring the Developer to ensure no less than 30% of the Project be delivered with Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and 20% delivered with County Based Businesses (CBBs). Will businesses certified as both an MBE and CBB and providing a Commercially Useful Function (CUF) meet both the 30% MBE and 20% CBB goals?	The 30% and 20% percentages referenced in Section 2.2.9 of the RFQ are not intended to be additive. Rather, PGCPS plans to require the Developer to ensure no less than thirty percent (30%) of the Project in each of the Design-Build Period and Services Period to be delivered pursuant to subcontracts with certified Minority Business Enterprises ("MBEs") or County Based Businesses ("CBBs"). The percentage division among MBE and CBB will be set forth in the RFP.

PGCPS Blueprint Schools Phase 2 Appendix C

31	2.2.10	In Section 2.2.10, it is stated that the Developer shall facilitate and utilize a Community Investment Program which allows residents of Prince George's County to invest in the Project at an aggregate level of 10% of the overall equity in the Project. While inclusion of community residents in the Project equity is a groundbreaking and exciting idea, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regulates unaccredited investments (reg CF) and limits a company to raise a maximum aggregate amount of \$5 million through crowdfunding offerings in a 12-month period. Will PGCPS maintain a requirement for 10% community investment of overall equity if this equates to an issuance that exceeds the \$5 million per year SEC limit?	PGCPS will require 10% unless the offering is not fully subscribed. If the 10% level is greater than \$5 million, the Developer would likely be required to have a second offering assuming the first offering is fully subscribed. This may be further discussed during the RFP Phase.
32	Appendix A	Appendix A (Definitions) seems to indicate that teams are able to name more than one individual each for all of the Key Design-Build Personnel roles. Is this correct?	Correct
33	Form G.1 - Equity Member Experience	Footnote 13 of Form G.1 asks for P3 projects on which any of the Financing Members have been involved over the past 7 years. Could you please elaborate on what constitutes project involvement in your view? Specifically, if a project achieved financial close 8 years ago but did not reach substantial completion until 5 or 6 years ago, would that project be eligible for inclusion?	PGCPS is looking for projects that reached financial close within the last 7 years.
34	Form G.1 - Equity Member Experience	For sample projects included in Form G.1, could you please confirm whether there is a minimum construction completion percentage requirement as of October 1, 2022? Additionally, could you elaborate on how the construction completion percentage will be evaluated relative to the other criteria, if at all? We ask so we can determine which projects would be most relevant for inclusion. For example, some of our projects have a higher MBE equity participation but a lower construction completion percentage and vice versa.	There is not a minimum construction completion requirement as of October 1, 2022. The construction completion percentage provides an indication of the status of a sample project.
35	Page 13, Sec. 2.2.2	Will PGCPS consider a break fee between Award and Financial Close?	Any break fee will be outlined in the RFP.
36	Page 19, Sec. 3.1.2	Please clarify milestones that are required for a stipend payment.	This concept will be outlined in the RFP.
37		Would PGCPS consider a stipend higher than \$500,000 for unsuccessful proposers, given the pursuit costs for this RFP scope will far exceed this amount and create hardships for qualified and interested local businesses to participate?	PGCPS believes the current stipend reflects the level of effort for the RFP scope.
38		Would PGCPS entertain a bonus for exceeding the MBE CBB Participations as well as a damage structure currently contemplated in the Project Agreement and RFQ.	PGCPS will take this under consideration.
39		Would PGCPS consider CLB (County-Located Businesses) as part of the 20% CBB requirement?	No
40	Page 19, Sec. 3.1.2	Will the draft Project Agreement be issued with the RFP on or about January 25, 2023?	PGCPS plans to issue the draft Project Agreement with the RFP.
41		Would PGCPS consider providing a bonus structure for excellence in design and or net zero attainments that would benefit the project? If so, what would the intended structure be?	PGCPS will take this under consideration for the RFP.
42	Page 19, Sec. 3.1.2	Please define soft costs and pre-development costs.	These concepts will be further detailed in the RFP.
43		When is the anticipated Occupancy Readiness Date?	The anticipated Occupancy Readiness Date will be determined during the RFP Phase.
44	Page 19, Sec. 3.1.2	The RFQ states that a GMP must be secured by March 15, 2024, with Financial Close is to be completed by June 2024. Please confirm this date is correct.	These anticipated dates are correct.

PGCPS Blueprint Schools Phase 2 Appendix C

45	Page 19, Sec. 3.1.2	Can you provide more detail on the level of design development that will be required of the three (3) Prototype Schools and Site Plans for all six (6) schools.	The level of design that will be required for the three (3) Prototype Schools and the Site Plans for all (6) schools would be best described as conceptual. The RFP will require specific minimum information be provided with the design.
46		At what point will the Design-Build team be allowed to start the permit approval processes? We assume that the permit process will begin August 15, 2023 following the award.	There are no restrictions on the start of the permit approval process. PGCPS has no position on when the developer can begin the permit approval process.
47		During the Industry Day presentation, there was mention of a large amount of due diligence work being done. Would that effort include building investigations, a property survey including boundary, topography, environmental constraints, as well as underground utility locations? If so, can that information be made available to the teams. Further, can the teams get that in CADD format, and can it be relied upon for planning and engineering?	Invited respondents for the RFP will be provided due diligence site investigation work including boundary surveys, geotechnical reports, underground utility survey, traffic studies, environmental surveys, and related information.
48		Estimated GSF for the three (3) prototype schools varies amongst the pairs, which could have an impact on planning efficiencies and design approaches. Are the deltas in GSF anticipated amongst each pair anticipated to be only in instructional areas of the buildings or also in core and support areas?	Variations in GSF across the six schools are related to specific educational specification and programming requirements specific to particular site locations.
49		Are stakeholder / engagement meetings anticipated during the RFP phase beyond the typical one-on-one meetings held in Round 1? Two of the replaced schools include special education programs (Duckworth and Brent). Successful design for these special education programs (especially those intended to be combined/integrated with traditional ES programs) typically require a high degree of direct stakeholder engagement at the early stages.	PGCPS will facilitate stakeholder meetings during the RFP phase.
50		Please clarify which existing schools are anticipated to have off-site swing space provided for students during construction.	As of now only three schools are slated to utilize off-site swing space including, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swing Springhill Lake Elementary to old Greenbelt Middle (8950 Edmonston Rd, Greenbelt, MD 20770) • Swing Robert Frost Elementary to Meadowbrook • Swing Hyattsville Elementary to Robert Goddard Montessori