

**Continental Group Housing Privatization
Solicitation No. AFCEE-09-0001
Questions & Answers 02
22 November 2010**

No.	Questions & Answers 02	
28.	Q.	Appendix F: When should we assume the delayed homes for Eielson will be conveyed?
	A.	See Table 43A issued with Amendment 2 to the RFQ.
29.	Q.	Reference utility information in Appendix E: Please confirm electric consumption data for Edwards AFB as it seems extremely high.
	A.	Amendment 2 provides updated utility consumption data for Edwards AFB.
30.	Q.	Reference Appendix E: The consumption data for FY10 (annualized) is much lower than for FY09 for Eglin. What was the cause? What was the average number of active units in service over the period for which consumption data is provided?
	A.	The lower consumption in FY10 reflects lower occupancy at the installation. The average number of units occupied in FY09 was 997 and 685 in FY10. Monthly occupancy data is available on www.JLLPRESS.com.
31.	Q.	Reference Appendix E: The consumption data for FY10 (annualized) is much lower than for FY09 for Hurlburt. (a) What was the cause? (b) What was the average number of active units in service over the period for which consumption data is provided?
	A.	Amendment 2 incorporates updated consumption data for Hurlburt Field. This data shows an increase in consumption between FY09 and FY10, rather than a decrease. The average number of units occupied in FY09 was 335 and 319 in FY10. Monthly occupancy data is available on www.JLLPRESS.com.
32.	Q.	Are there any wetlands in parcels J, K and M at Hurlburt Field?
	A.	In Parcel HF-J (Pine Shadows), there are two drainage ditches that are wetlands that may be regulated by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection: one between McMillan Street and Weaver Avenue, and a second southwest of Harrison Drive between May Street and the end of the Harrison Drive cul-de-sac. There are no wetlands in parcels HF-K and HF-M. Nearby wetlands (and a 25 foot buffer) have been excluded from the parcels to be leased to the PO.
33.	Q.	Could you provide the State agency that is responsible for the drainage ditch between McMillan and Weaver at Hurlburt Field?
	A.	See response to Question 32 above.

No.		Questions & Answers 02
34.	Q.	Paragraph 3.3.5.1.3 – Force Protection of the RFQ states: “Senior Officer and General Officer units shall be given additional consideration for siting to include being placed on a through street instead of a cul-de-sac and being interior to the housing rather than on the periphery.” Is this correct, as most GO homes are being built on cul-de-sacs in order to provide protection from through traffic and potential speedy escape by other parties?
	A.	See Amendment 2 to the RFQ; Section 3.3.5.1.3 has been revised.
35.	Q.	Occupancy data for Hurlburt field lists 300 units as “801 Housing.” What is the status of these homes? What is the impact upon referrals? Is there a priority to filling these units?
	A.	The 801 Housing units are currently leased by the Government and utilized exclusively as housing for Target Tenants. When the Government’s right to occupy these units expires or is terminated (currently anticipated for June 2012): (a) the Government will no longer have control of how, when or to whom these units are rented; (b) the Government will no longer require that these units be rented exclusively to Target Tenants; and (c) the units could become available for use in the general rental market at market rates.
36.	Q.	Does Hurlburt Field have a tree preservation plan? Can you provide?
	A.	Yes, Hurlburt Field’s Landscape Development Plan includes Tree Preservation During Construction, Chapter 7, and Future Project Landscape Requirements, Chapter 8; Chapters 7 and 8 are posted on the Hurlburt Field due diligence page of www.jllpress.com.
37.	Q.	Does Hurlburt Field consider the CMU walls along Highway 98 as perimeter? RFQ indicates no housing constructed within 50 meters of the installation perimeter.
	A.	Yes, at Hurlburt Field the CMU wall along Highway 98 is the Installation perimeter when considering new housing construction setbacks. Note that Amendment 2 has revised Section 3.3.5.1.3 which now states in part, “[i]n determining force protection requirements, the PO shall use the Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 4-010-01 DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings dated 19 Jan 07 as guidance.”
38.	Q.	Reference RFQ Section 3.3.5.1.3, does the 100 meter Force Protection setback requirement for gates apply to the closed entry points along Highway 98 at Hurlburt for Pine Shadows and Soundside?
	A.	The closed entry points along Highway 98 at Hurlburt Field’s Pine Shadow and Soundside Neighborhoods are not considered gates when referring to any Force Protection setback requirement. Amendment 2 has amended Section 3.3.5.1.3 and states in part, “[i]n determining force protection requirements, the PO shall use the Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 4-010-01 DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings dated 19 Jan 07 as guidance.”

No.		Questions & Answers 02
39.	Q.	Reference RFQ Section 3.3.5.1.3, do the existing masonry walls at Hurlburt parallel to Highway 98 negate the 50 meter Force Protection setback requirement for Pine Shadows and Soundside Manor? If not, does the 50 meter setback start at the location of the masonry walls referenced herein or another identifiable boundary location?
	A.	The existing masonry walls that parallel Highway 98 at Hurlburt Field do not negate Force Protection setback requirements provided in the Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 4-010-01 DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings dated 19 Jan 07. The CMU wall along Highway 98 is the Installation perimeter when considering new housing construction setbacks.
40.	Q.	At Hurlburt Field, could you confirm whether or not McMillan Street from west of Weaver Avenue to east of Mayo Street is actually conveyed? The parcel maps in Appendix C appear to show that it is conveyed.
	A.	Yes, Hurlburt Field's McMillan Street, between Weaver Avenue and Mayo Street will be conveyed.
41.	Q.	At Hurlburt Field, will the shelving and mezzanine in the maintenance building be conveyed to the PO?
	A.	Yes, the shelving and mezzanine in Hurlburt Field's Housing Maintenance Facility will be conveyed.
42.	Q.	Can past performance questionnaire responses that were submitted in March for the Southern Group housing privatization project be used for the Continental Group housing privatization project?
	A.	Yes. See Amendments 1 and 2 to the RFQ.
43.	Q.	Are the Hurlburt utility maps on the website available in PDF format?" We note that they are available as PNG files and can be accessed using most photo viewing software. Is it possible to provide PDF versions of the utility maps?
	A.	Yes. The Hurlburt Field utility maps are posted on the Hurlburt Field due diligence page of www.jllpress.com .
44.	Q.	RFQ Section 3.3.10.7.3 states that all above ground utilities shall be removed and further provides that all roads for Hurlburt Parcel HF-L shall not be demolished. Should primary below grade utilities (water, sewer and gas) remain intact and in service?
	A.	Section 3.3.9.4.4 of the RFQ states, in part, that "[t]he Hurlburt Field primary system is configured in a loop system and shall 5 not be altered without prior approval by the Government." As such, primary below grade utilities in Hurlburt Field's Parcel HF-L, Live Oak Terrace, will remain intact and in service. Section 3.3.10.7.3 of the RFQ details the requirements for the geothermal heat pump systems in Hurlburt Field's Parcel HF-L, Live Oak Terrace.
45.	Q.	The link to the following document on the Eglin Due Diligence website does not function: 9. Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan. Please make available.
	A.	The document is now available.

No.	Questions & Answers 02	
46.	Q.	<p>RFQ Section 3.3.6.1.17 states “Should the PO propose to locate new housing units or renovate existing housing units within areas subject to noise levels between 65 and 70 dB, such construction and/or renovation must exhibit appropriate noise attenuation measures to achieve a minimum of 25 dB of sound attenuation.”</p> <p>We have reviewed the AICUZ information provided for Eglin AFB and it does not indicate the areas of the base that would be subject to these restrictions. Are any of the sites being conveyed that would fall under this criterion?</p>
	A.	<p>Offerors should review the JSF-Supplemental EIS for anticipated sound contours. Alternative 1A in the SEIS is the Air Force's “Preferred Alternative” for the beddown and operations of the F-35 at Eglin AFB. The preferred alternative is the alternative an agency believes would fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical, and other factors. However, it is not the Air Force's final decision and it is free to select any alternative other than the preferred alternative in the Record of Decision (ROD) on the Final EIS.</p>
47.	Q.	<p>Eglin AFB: The Eglin Supplemental Environmental Impact Draft dated Sept 2010 references “...decision to implement a portion of the JSF IJTS Alternate -1.” Should Alternate 1 be used for placement of the sound contours as the study also references the No Action Alternative which places the sound contours in a different location. The Continental Group Website, Due diligence section for Eglin AFB also references the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study with references to the 2006 AICUZ study. Which series of documents and which option should be used for placing sound contours for Parcel B?</p>
	A.	<p>See response above.</p>
48.	Q.	<p>RFQ: Page 80 Section 3.3.6.1.17 gives the PO the opportunity to develop within areas between 65 and 70 db. Is it possible to develop within the 70-75 db range if the PO incorporates a NLR of 25db?</p>
	A.	<p>No. See Amendment 2 of the RFQ regarding Section 3.3.5.5.2.</p>
49.	Q.	<p>The utility statistics (Appendix E) provided in Amendment 1 still seem to provide extraordinary utility consumption and therefore costs for Edwards and Eielson. For Edwards the total utilities, assuming the 110% run approximately \$6,500 per home whereas for Eielson they run approximately \$16,000 per home. Can we get some further guidance on this issue or will we be permitted to use the consumption data we have experienced on comparable geographic military housing locations?</p>
	A.	<p>The Government has made a good faith effort to ensure the accuracy of the utility rates and consumption data provided. Offerors are expected to complete their own due diligence to support their respective proposals.</p>
50.	Q.	<p>At McConnell AFB, would the Government consider keeping existing surplus units (such that Project End-State would exceed 364 for some period of time) if occupancy supports keeping them?</p>
	A.	<p>Proposals are required to reflect the end-state requirement of 364 units for McConnell AFB in the prescribed timeframe (5 years). Section 5.1 states, in part: “[e]xclusive negotiations may result in terms and conditions that differ from those specified in the RFQ, the appendices to the RFQ and the selected proposal.”</p>

No.		Questions & Answers 02
51.	Q.	Section 3.3 of the SON states to <u>not</u> provide design drawings, elevations, or renderings in regard to home plans and states to provide a narrative description, but Section 5.0 calls out evaluation of floor plans. Does 5.0 refer to the narrative description of the floor plans or do you want rough floor plans but not architectural drawings, elevations or renderings?
	A.	Section 3.3.6 of the RFQ states, in part: “For Offeror’s proposals, no design drawings, renderings, or elevations will be required.” However, Section 3.3.5 states, in part, that “Offerors shall provide a community development concept for each Installation that responds to military families’ needs and reinforces the connection between the families and the community.” In addition, Section 5.7.2, Subfactor 2.2 Project Concept, Element 2.2.3 Conceptual Plans of the RFQ requires, in part, that the Offeror’s Proposal demonstrate that “[d]escriptions of new construction scope and/or descriptions of renovation scope reflect concepts of modern open space planning in the living area, with good functional relationships and visual definition.”
52.	Q.	Is there room in the existing housing management office at Eglin AFB for the Project Owner’s staff?
	A.	The existing housing management office at Eglin AFB (Facility 10800) currently supports 8 Government employees and cannot accommodate additional staff as currently configured.
53.	Q.	At Eielson AFB, which units are slab on grade, crawl space, or basement?
	A.	See Table 31 as revised in Amendment 2.
54.	Q.	Will Eglin housing office be conveyed to PO?
	A.	Yes. See Amendment 2.
55.	Q.	Section 3.4.11 of the Continental Group RFQ requires an NDSU plan to include demolition. Please identify each Non-Debt-Sized Units at Edwards, Eielson and Seymour Johnson by address in the Existing Inventory (Appendix B).
	A.	Appendix B, as amended, identifies each NDSU. Section 3.4.11 requires only the HRO to provide the NDSU Plan. Section 5.8.2 states, in part, that an Offeror’s proposal needs to include “a synopsis of the approach to the...NDSU Plan...”
56.	Q.	Will there be a security fence constructed around Parcel HF-M (FamCamp) with security forces [provided by the Government] personnel if the parcel is used for new construction?
	A.	The PO is not required to construct a security fence around Parcel HF-M.
57.	Q.	Can we receive topographical maps of the housing areas at Eglin and Hurlburt? Even though the 100-year floodplain maps are available, we are interested in the topo maps in order to assess storm surge potential.
	A.	Topographical maps for Eglin AFB and Hurlburt Fields are now available on www.JLLPress.com .

No.		Questions & Answers 02
58.	Q.	Can Offerors be provided access to see the inside of at least one of the 14 planned renovated units at Hurlburt Field? It is imperative for us to do so.
	A.	The units are currently occupied and the Government is unable to provide Offerors access to the 14 units. Floorplans are available in the base document room.
59.	Q.	Will the additional head bolt outlets (HBO) be metered?
	A.	Metering for units is up to the PO. The PO will be responsible for HBO electrical usage as “common area usage” within the housing area and may choose to meter HBO’s for assigned parking spaces.
60.	Q.	What is the size of and will the heated storage areas requested in “Desired Renovation Features” requested in 3.3.7.3.3 be heated with steam or electrical?
	A.	The Government has no preference with regards to the size of the storage area or how is heated.
61.	Q.	At Edwards AFB, are yards irrigated with well water, grey water or domestic water? What about common area watering?
	A.	Common areas are watered with reclaimed water, while yards are watered with domestic water (a combination of well and AVEK (California aqueduct) water.
62.	Q.	Do bases have ADA units and are they currently ADA compliant or are they adaptable? Can you identify which units can be adapted to meet project requirements?
	A.	Appendix B of the RFQ (“Existing Inventories”) includes a “Handicap Access” column that indicates which units in the existing inventory are “handicap accessible” or readily adaptable.
63.	Q.	RFQ Section 3.3.10.7.1 requires PO to leave foundation slabs for certain units in Poquito Bayou at Eglin and completely demolish others. How many foundation slabs should Offerors assume are not to be demolished? Should pavements and utility laterals remain in affected areas as well?
	A.	See the response to question 4 in “Questions & Answers Round 1.” As provided in the “Redacted Draft Programmatic Agreement [...]” draft dated 29 September 2010, “[t]he PO shall, whenever possible, avoid all ground disturbances within the recorded limits of archaeological sites.” Accordingly in the areas identified by the installation to the HRO, the PO will not be required to remove roads, sidewalks, buried infrastructure or other appurtenances.
64.	Q.	Is minor street snowplowing to be done by the base or the PO?
	A.	Street snowplowing within the Leased Premises, together with the other services indicated in the RFQ, will be performed by the PO. Section 2.9 states, in part: “[u]pon transaction closing, provision of [snow and ice removal] to the Leased Premises by the Government (or its contractor) will end.”

No.	Questions & Answers 02	
65.	Q.	Is the demolition in Century Park South 36 units or 34?
	A.	Demolition of 36 units is required in Century Park South.
66.	Q.	Does the Government have any preference regarding the location of a community center at Eielson AFB?
	A.	No.