
**Continental Group Housing Privatization
Solicitation No. AFCEE-09-0001
Questions & Answers 03
24 November 2010**

No.	Questions & Answers 03	
67.	Q.	For Eglin, in areas where housing units and roads have been demolished recently, what has been done with underground utility infrastructure?
	A.	Underground utilities have been capped and left in place.
68.	Q.	What is the Force Protection setback for units constructed near Highway 98 at Hurlburt Field?
	A.	As provided in Item #28 in Amendment #2, “[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.”
69.	Q.	Are all of the terms of the Eielson 801 Lease purchase negotiated?
	A.	Section 3.3.8.2 of the RFQ contains the anticipated structure of the transaction and states, in part, “[t]he documents evidencing the 801 Transaction will be finalized by and among, as the case may be, the HRO, Government, and CH2M Hill during exclusive negotiations and, prior to Project closing, executed and placed into escrow until Project closing.”
70.	Q.	For Eglin, are there any drawings, maps or other references available showing/identifying housing units and/or road infrastructure as expected to be in place at the time of transaction closing?
	A.	No maps or drawings are currently available. Prior to transaction closing, demolition will occur north of Ash Street.

No.	Questions & Answers 03	
71.	Q.	RFQ Section 3.3.9.9.5 requires, to the extent feasible, sump pump discharge for the units in the Southwind Area of McConnell needs to be rerouted such that standing water drains into the existing storm drainage system. Following a site visit, we believe this problem only pertains to the PAIP housing area. RFQ Table 35 indicates repairs were completed for the PAIP sump pump drain lines in 2009, and materials provided at time of site visit indicate these repairs included rerouting of the sump pump lines. Please confirm if the recent PAIP repairs resolved this problem and the requirement no longer applies. Please also confirm that the problem was isolated to the PAIP area.
	A.	The requirement stated in the RFQ applies to the PAIP units only and was not resolved through any repairs completed by the installation. Sump pumps discharge in the front of the units via a 3” corrugated pipe that drains through the curb into the street. The corrugated piping is starting to fail and clog up causing water to back up and overflow back into the drainage system around the house. This causes sump pumps to cycle continuously. Further, the street gutters don’t slope enough to assure that the discharge flows into the storm drainage system. Accordingly, standing debris in the street stops the flow of the water causing it to pond and freeze during the winter. Further, sitting water causes curbs and road surfaces to deteriorate more rapidly. The base anticipates that one possible solution is to reconfigure the sump pump discharge line in the basement to run out of the back of the unit and connect into the storm drainage system behind the units.
72.	Q.	Understanding that the PO will be responsible for all new utility system construction, in instances where the Government owns the utility infrastructure; will the Government or PO perform the work necessary to disconnect/connect utilities to the existing systems? If the disconnects/connects will be done by the Government, how much, if any, will be charged to the PO?
	A.	The Project Owner will perform work necessary to disconnect/connect utilities in coordination with each installation. As provided in Section 3.3.9 of the RFQ (second paragraph): “All costs to install new utility services or to relocate existing utility services resulting from PO construction, renovation or demolition activities including, without limitation, labor and associated new materials costs required for underground installation shall be the responsibility of the PO.”
73.	Q.	In Section 4.12 of the RFQ, Table 48 (Note 2) states that Volumes I, II, and III may be submitted on the same CD-ROM (or CD-R or DVD-R). If we plan to submit five binders (per submittal copy), one for each factor, are we permitted to submit one CD-ROM per submittal copy, or will we be expected to submit five CD-ROMs per submittal copy?
	A.	As provided in Table 48 (as amended per item 49 of Amendment 2), 17 electronic copies are required. Using the term “submittal copy” as provided in the question: one CD-ROM (or CD-R or DVD-R) per submittal copy is required.
74.	Q.	Section 4.11, Electronic Copies, Table 48 (as amended) states that we should provide 17 electronic copies of each Factor (1-5). However, within the “Notes” section, it states “Volumes I, II, and III may be submitted on the same CD-ROM.” Please clarify if we should submit 17 CDs (1 original plus 16 copies) each for Volumes I, II, and III or 17 CDs for <u>each</u> of the five factors (i.e. 85 CDs total).
	A.	17 electronic copies are required. Electronic copies shall be submitted on a CD-ROM, CD-R, or DVD-R in a protective sleeve.

No.		Questions & Answers 03
75.	Q.	Section 4.11, Electronic Copies (page 142) states, “All CD-ROMs will be included with the ‘original’ paper copies of each volume.” Does this mean that all 17 CDs should be included in an envelope in the one original copy of each volume? Or does this mean that one CD should be provided in each paper copy of each volume?
	A.	Each of the 17 electronic copies must be provided in a separate protective sleeve. Electronic copies may be provided either in a single envelope or inserted into one of the three required volumes of each hard copy of the proposal.
76.	Q.	Edwards HCP is only a table top and doesn’t have floorplans. Please provide floorplans so that Offerors may accurately estimate costs for required renovations (e.g., replace vinyl composition tile in halls, kitchens, and family rooms throughout housing areas with ceramic tile).
	A.	Floorplans for Edwards AFB are available on the Edwards AFB Due Diligence page of JLLPress.com (item 13d on http://www.jllpress.com/Continental_Group/edwards_afb_due_diligence.html).
77.	Q.	Are design requirements based on local codes and standards?
	A.	See Section 3.3.2 of the RFQ as amended. See also Response 100, below.
78.	Q.	What are the HVAC system requirements? Are 2-zone HVAC systems required in 2-story units?
	A.	See Section 3.3.2 of the RFQ as amended. As provided in paragraph 4-4.1 of the Air Force Family Housing Guide, “[m]echanical (HVAC) systems in the AF “Standard House” will contain a single zone for non-GOQ single story houses and two zones for all GOQ’s and all two-story houses.” To the extent that the “General Officer Quarters Guide,” Volumes I-III, Office of the Civil Engineer, Directorate of Housing, August 2002 or Chapters 3 and 4 of the “Air Force Family Housing Guide For Planning, Programming, Design and Construction,” Office of the Civil Engineer, Directorate of Housing, August 2004 (the “AF Family Housing Guide”) exceed local codes and standards and other RFQ requirements, 2-zone HVAC systems would be required in 2-story units.

No.		Questions & Answers 03
79.	Q.	When there are discrepancies between the RFQ and the “US Air Force Family Housing Guide” (a.k.a., the “Blue Book”), which document takes precedence? (e.g., floor finishes)
	A.	As provided in Section 3.3.2 of the RFQ, as amended, “all new units, and all renovations (including renovations performed in connection with the midterm out-year modernization and upgrade of the Project) to the maximum extent possible consistent with the proposed scope of renovation work to be performed, must meet or exceed the greater of the following design and construction requirements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As contained in this RFQ (as may be amended); or 2. As set forth in the “General Officer Quarters Guide,” Volumes I-III, Office of the Civil Engineer, Directorate of Housing, August 2002, as may be amended or superseded; and Chapters 3 and 4 of the “Air Force Family Housing Guide For Planning, Programming, Design and Construction,” Office of the Civil Engineer, Directorate of Housing, August 2004 (the “AF Family Housing Guide”), as may be amended or superseded (see Appendix F), as applicable.” <i>(emphasis added)</i>
80.	Q.	What is the extent of the MILCON renovation in the Broadway neighborhood?
	A.	In discussion with the on-base project managers for the upcoming MILCON renovation, it is planned to be extensive but it is being managed as a design-build project, so the exact extent of the renovations is not quantified as of yet.
81.	Q.	Will the Housing Maintenance Building and the Self Help store at Eielson AFB convey?
	A.	No.
82.	Q.	Please verify the acreages are correct for Table 10 from Amendment #2. The acreages and parcel maps don’t seem to look correct.
	A.	Amendment 2 added approximately 5 acres to Parcel EiAFB-A and approximately 7 acres to Parcel EiAFB-B but also removed approximately 14 acres from Parcel EiAFB-C for a net reduction of 2 acres at Eielson AFB. These acreage changes were not reported in Amendment 2.
83.	Q.	Will the community dumpster and recycling areas near Parcels EiAFB-A and EiAFB-B be included in the Leased Premises?
	A.	Yes. Also see Response 82, above.
84.	Q.	During our visit to Eielson AFB, it appears that some of the construction underway will not be complete prior in the next year and so may not be conveyed at closing. Please clarify.
	A.	Offeror proposals should reflect information provided in the RFQ and appendices as Amended. See Table 43A (Eielson AFB MILCON Development Program Phasing) for estimated conveyance dates.

No.		Questions & Answers 03
85.	Q.	What type of offices [are located] in the co-located building?
	A.	As provided in Section 3.3.5.2 (Administration Facility), the Project Owner is required to provide and maintain a co-located management office at each Installation. Offices should accommodate Project Government employees as specified in Sections 3.3.5.2.1-3.3.5.2.6. The Government anticipates office types will accommodate a mixture of staff members, facilitate administrative functions and assure smooth and effective management of Project administrative functions at each installation.
86.	Q.	What is the current occupancy rate at each installation?
	A.	Updated occupancy data is available on JLLPress.com.
87.	Q.	Reference Section 3.4.4.6 Table 45: At Eielson AFB the Key & Essential Personnel count (38) and the Designated Quarters count (38) are the same. Please verify.
	A.	See Amendment 2. The number of number of required Designated Quarters at Eielson is 12.
88.	Q.	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?
	A.	No. See Amendment 2 and Response to Question 48 in Question and Answers Round 2.
89.	Q.	Please clarify for Eielson AFB that the homes in Rainbow Court and the homes in Century Park South (Buildings # 5136 to 5144, 5196 to 5198 and 5211) do not convey. These homes were highlighted and shown on the housing maps provided [during a housing tour].
	A.	The improvements listed (by facility number in the question) are not included in Appendix B and do not convey to the PO. The listed facilities are not included in the Leased Premises shown in Appendix C.
90.	Q.	Regarding McConnell AFB can you confirm that the existing basements for the “as-is” homes satisfy the Air Force's requirements for tornado shelters? Are we to assume we are not required to provide tornado shelters for these homes?
	A.	The Project Owner is not required to add tornado shelters to existing homes at McConnell AFB (see Sections 3.3.6.1.18 and 3.3.6.3.5 of the RFQ).
91.	Q.	For the existing housing office at McConnell AFB how large (for how many employees, staff or visitors) should we size the additional tornado shelter?
	A.	As provided in Section 2.7.12.5, the storm shelter located within the Housing Management Office accommodates up to 5 individuals. As provided in Section 3.3.5.2.5, the PO is required to provide office space for 4 Government employees within the shared management office and “adequate storm shelter space for all Government and PO Housing Management Office employees.” Therefore, the additional tornado shelter must, at a minimum, accommodate all but one of the PO’s staff (as there is room for that staff member in the existing storm shelter).

No.		Questions & Answers 03
92.	Q.	Regarding Eglin AFB, the supplemental EIS dated 9/10, there are maps and studies related to the noise contours. Please confirm the page number and the noise contour map we should reference for the correct AICUZ study.
	A.	See Response to Question 46 in Questions and Answers Round 2.
93.	Q.	Please provide the parcel / neighborhood and if possible addresses of the 625 Non-Debt-Sized Units to be excluded from debt sizing at Edwards AFB, Eielson AFB and Seymour Johnson AFB.
	A.	The information requested has been provided in Amendment 2.
94.	Q.	Section 4.11 Electronic Copies: The first paragraph calls for electronic submittals to be compatible with “Microsoft Office 2003 (Excel, Word, PowerPoint). However, Section 4.11.1 Financial Pro Forma states that “all financial spreadsheets shall be submitted in a format compatible with MS Excel 2007.” Is the financial pro forma specifically required in Excel 2007 format, while the remainder of the electronic submittal is required to be compatible with MS Office 2003 (including any other Excel spreadsheets)?
	A.	See Amendment 2. The financial pro forma may be submitted in a format compatible with either MS Excel 2003 or MS Excel 2007.
95.	Q.	Section 3.3.5.1.3 Force Protection: First paragraph states that (1) new housing units shall be at least 50 meters from the installation perimeter and (2) new housing units shall be at least 100 meters from existing installation gates. Second paragraph states that "the PO shall use the Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 4-010-01 DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings dated 19 Jan 07 as guidance. Question 1: Does off-base housing qualify as an existing installation? Question 2: The DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings dated 19 Jan 07, states under 1-6.8.1 Family Housing with 12 Units or Fewer per Building, These buildings are exempt from all provisions of these standards. This seems to contradict 3.3.5.1.3 in the RFQ referencing the 50 meter set back.
	A.	See Amendment 2 for revised setback requirements. WRT Question 1: all conveyed housing units in this Project are on-base. WRT Question 2: See Response 37 to Question and Answer Round 2.
96.	Q.	The RFQ does not specifically state that the following items are excluded from the page count: table of contents (detailed for each volume and overall table of contents), letters of interest (Factor 1), phasing schedules (Factor 2), and illustrative materials (Factor 4). Are all of these items excluded from the page count?
	A.	As provided in Table 48, supporting data do not count against the page limits. Tables of contents, letters of interest and illustrative materials are excluded from the page count. Phasing schedules provided in conjunction with the Financial Pro Forma are excluded from the page limits.

No.		Questions & Answers 03
97.	Q.	As a follow up to Question 18 from Round 1, will the Government construct perimeter fencing for Parcel HF-M (Fam Camp)?
	A.	Currently, the Government does not plan to construct perimeter fencing or security gate at Parcel HF-M. See also Response 56 to Question and Answer Round 2.
98.	Q.	Were the recently constructed units at Edwards AFB constructed to any LEED standards?
	A.	No. The units were not designed to meet specific LEED standards.
99.	Q.	On our tour of Eglin we noticed and confirmed with the housing personnel that the units are occupied by various ranks (regardless of rank designation as specified in Appendix B) in order to maintain occupancy. With exception of the SOQ homes, the information in Appendix B is then not accurate and there is no way to tell what rank is in what unit. Can we get a list by rank of who occupies each unit? It would be impossible to accurately reflect a minimum number of units online by rank bedroom type (as required by the RFQ, Section 3.3.10.6.2, element 2.2.2, p 147) without accurate information of who occupies each unit. If this accurate list is not available, are we to assume the rank designations for each unit as specified in Appendix B for purposes of the proposal?
	A.	Rank designations for the 126 Hidden Oaks units in Parcel EgAFB-D listed in Appendix B are correct. The installation has temporarily re-designated units in order to increase occupancy prior to transaction closing. The listing of occupied units with the rank of the current occupant has been posted to www.JLLPress.com .
100.	Q.	Please identify the state or local Building Code for Hurlburt Field.
	A.	The PO will bear the responsibility for complying with RFQ design and construction requirements. (RFQ, Section 3.3.10). These requirements include "city, county, or state building codes, standards, and regulations, as they may be amended, that would apply to like development activities outside each respective Base and within the county in which such Base is situated and applicable requirements of federal law, to include 15 USC § 2227." (RFQ, Section 3.3.2). In addition, any reviews of proposed designs by the Government "are separate and apart from any design or plan reviews required by the applicable code enforcement authorities." (RFQ, Section 3.3.10).
101.	Q.	Please provide the demographic unit mix for 193 NDS units at Seymour Johnson AFB.
	A.	See Appendix B for a detailed listing of unit inventory and designations.

No. Questions & Answers 03		
102.	Q.	Eielson AFB: According to the RFQ, site maps and tour, residents at Eielson AFB use refuse transfer stations, not curb-side pickup, due to safety concerns. However, the refuse collection stations are outside of the lease lines and do not convey to the PO. Relatedly, the Facilities Maintenance Plan section of the RFQ (3.4.5) states that the HRO shall prepare a plan that includes a list of minimum maintenance items, including "Curbside Refuse Collection, Bulk Trash collection, and Recycling". Please clarify if Eielson intends to change the transfer station pickup to curb-side refuse collection, and if the base will continue to have garbage picked up at transfer stations since they are outside of the lease line.
	A.	The refuse and recycling stations at Eielson AFB will be part of the Leased Premises (see Amendment 2). The RFQ does not require the PO to change to curb-side refuse and/or recycling collection. Rather, Section 3.4.5 states only that the "following types of maintenance are the minimum that shall be addressed in the Facilities Maintenance Plan: [...] Curbside Refuse Collection, Bulk Trash (Christmas trees, etc.) Collection, and Recycling..." (emphasis added). As provided in Section 2.9 of the RFQ, upon transaction closing, provision of refuse and recycling services to the Leased Premises by the Government (or its contractor) will end.
103.	Q.	What are Hurlburt Field's future plans for the Live Oak Parcel?
	A.	The Installation is developing plans for a "town center" though no project has been finalized or funded at this time.
104.	Q.	Please provide maps with a scale for Eglin and Hurlburt housing areas
	A.	Utility maps for each installation provide a scale in feet.
105.	Q.	RFQ Appendix C – It appears that the McConnell AFB General Concept Map with Appendix C contradicts the neighborhood designations in Appendix B. The map (released 8 October) includes Capehart East units in the PAIP neighborhood and PAIP units in the Spicer neighborhood. This can be seen by the rooflines; the unit addresses in Appendix B also document the discrepancy. Please clarify and issue a corrected map as necessary.
	A.	See Appendix C revised as part of Amendment 2.
106.	Q.	Please provide information regarding the contractor currently performing demolition at McConnell AFB?
	A.	Contact information for the contractor currently performing demolition at McConnell is provided below. Michael Byrd bhate associates 1603 13th Avenue South Suite 300 Birmingham, AL 35205 (205) 918-4000 Office mbyrd@bhate.com

No.		Questions & Answers 03
107.	Q.	In Amendment 1, it states that offerors can provide past performance questionnaires from “other housing privatization solicitations” and lists the names of PRESS contractors for the Air Force procurement. Because the Army solicitations are contracted through the USACE, are offerors who have past performance questionnaires from other housing privatization solicitations that did not use PRESS contractors precluded from presenting prior past performance questionnaires?
	A.	<p>No. Section 4.15.1.6 does not preclude offerors from submitting questionnaires regarding non-Air Force projects (provided that the requirements of the solicitation regarding these questionnaires are otherwise met). Section 4.15.1.1 states, in part: “The Offeror shall provide documentation for similar residential developments of at least \$25 million and at least 100 units that have been completed within the past 10 years.”</p> <p>The purpose of the amendment to Section 4.15.1.6 (Item 51 in Amendment 2) is to allow offerors who submitted past performance questionnaires on 2010 Air Force solicitations (i.e., Southern Group, JBER, and/or Western Group) to request such questionnaires be used also in connection with the Offeror’s Continental Group proposal.</p>
108.	Q.	The existing inventory unit quantities do not match the project Development Demographic Tables as shown in the RFQ. This seems to be a question/issue on all bases. For example, at Edwards AFB, Ref: RFQ page 16, Table 14, a total of 191 JNCO (E1-E6) 2 bedroom units are being conveyed. The existing inventory tables reflect a total of 90 JNCO (E1-E6) 2 bedroom units. Please explain why there is a difference.
	A.	Table 14 reflects the project demographics that the PO is required to maintain at Edwards AFB: 191 JNCO two-bedroom units, 53 JNCO three-bedroom units, and 57 JNCO four-bedroom units for a total of 301 JNCO units required. With respect to the Non-NDSU units in the existing inventory, there are 68 two-bedroom units, 158 three-bedroom units, and 75 units with at least four bedrooms, or 301 JNCO units conveyed. The conveyed inventory exceeds the requirement.
109.	Q.	Item#24 of Amendment #2 indicates that facility #10800 (Housing Office) will be conveyed. However, Item #29 then states, “Unless reconfigured, the conveyed facility #10802 can accommodate up to 8 PO employees”. Please provide clarification as to whether or not this was a typo such that Item #29 was supposed to reference #10800 not #10802.
	A.	The text in Item #24 of Amendment #2 is not in error. The Eglin AFB Housing Office is facility #10800 and the building across the street is facility #10802. As provided in Response 52 in Question and Answer Round 2, Facility 10800 currently supports 8 Government employees and cannot accommodate additional staff as currently configured. Facility 10802 is currently occupied by Government employees and/or contractors working on housing related projects. There will be space for the PO in this facility at closing, though the conveyance of these 2 facilities will not alleviate the PO of the requirement listed in Section 3.3.5.2 of the RFQ to “provide and maintain a co-located management office at each Installation.”

No.		Questions & Answers 03
110.	Q.	RFQ Appendix C - Could more detailed lease parcel boundary information be provided, preferably in a format such as AutoCad? It is difficult to distinguish the exact parcel boundary lines using the aerial view provided in Appendix C. More defined parcel boundaries would greatly assist in developing conceptual site plans.
	A.	Please see items 13.tt and 13.uu on the McConnell AFB Due Diligence page of JLLPress.com. http://www.jllpress.com/McConnell_AFB_Due_Diligence.html
111.	Q.	Section 3.3.6.2.3 of the RFQ states that the PO shall install a lockable cabinet capable of supporting a 20" deep network switch and 30 pound UPS unit with 20 amp dedicated outlet. Is the PO responsible for purchasing it?
	A.	Yes.
112.	Q.	Please provide the AAFES and MWR POC's for McConnell.
	A.	The Government will provide these POC's to the HRO upon request.
113.	Q.	How will Hazardous waste be treated? For example, at McConnell AFB, will the PO be responsible for the waste generator identification number and management of the hazardous waste?
	A.	Section 3.5.8 of the RFQ specifies that the PO shall submit its Hazardous Waste Management Plan for review and the PO shall follow the approved plan, obtain its own Environmental Protection Agency hazardous waste generator identification number, and manage the PO's hazardous waste from generation to disposal
114.	Q.	How are the concrete basements being disposed of in the current demolition project at McConnell AFB?
	A.	The concrete is being taken off-base.
115.	Q.	At McConnell AFB, has there been any additional lead based paint or asbestos sampling done for the current demo project?
	A.	The base is currently testing window and door caulking in the Capehart units being demolished for PCB/asbestos in the caulking. Those windows, doors and frames were replaced in the 1990s and may contain PCB/asbestos in the caulking.
116.	Q.	Is there room in the existing housing management office at Edwards AFB for the Project Owner's staff?
	A.	There is room for approximately 12 employees in the existing Housing Management Office. At closing, the Government anticipates that there will be 9 Government employees and space for up to 3 PO staff personnel. As provided in Section 3.3.5.2.1, the PO will need to provide office space for 5 Government employees within the shared management office. The Government anticipates that during the transition period, the number of Government employees located in the Housing Management Office will be reduced to 5.
117.	Q.	Is there any type of irrigation system in the leased premises at Seymour Johnson AFB?
	A.	No.

No.		Questions & Answers 03																
118.	Q.	Is there any type of irrigation system in the leased premises at Edwards AFB?																
	A.	<p>In addition to irrigation systems for the common areas throughout the Leased Premises, there are irrigation systems for lawns and plants for housing units as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="583 435 1696 1101"> <thead> <tr> <th>Housing Area</th> <th>Irrigation System Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Parcel EdAFB-A Juniper Ridge</td> <td>Occupant-controlled system</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parcel EdAFB-B Joshua Acres</td> <td>Occupant-controlled system</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parcel EdAFB-C Mountain View</td> <td>Occupant-controlled system</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parcel EdAFB-D Mesquite Meadows</td> <td>Operated by the housing maintenance contractor</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parcel EdAFB-E Tamarisk Plains</td> <td><u>60 units on the west side of the parcel</u>: irrigation systems are operated by the housing maintenance contractor; <u>39 units on the east side of the parcel</u>: irrigation systems are controlled by occupants</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parcel EdAFB-F Palo Verde Heights</td> <td>Occupant-controlled system</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Parcel EdAFB-G Acacia Hills</td> <td><u>Prestige and FGO units</u>: occupant-controlled automatic sprinkler systems <u>SNCO units</u>: operated by the maintenance contractor</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Housing Area	Irrigation System Description	Parcel EdAFB-A Juniper Ridge	Occupant-controlled system	Parcel EdAFB-B Joshua Acres	Occupant-controlled system	Parcel EdAFB-C Mountain View	Occupant-controlled system	Parcel EdAFB-D Mesquite Meadows	Operated by the housing maintenance contractor	Parcel EdAFB-E Tamarisk Plains	<u>60 units on the west side of the parcel</u> : irrigation systems are operated by the housing maintenance contractor; <u>39 units on the east side of the parcel</u> : irrigation systems are controlled by occupants	Parcel EdAFB-F Palo Verde Heights	Occupant-controlled system	Parcel EdAFB-G Acacia Hills
Housing Area	Irrigation System Description																	
Parcel EdAFB-A Juniper Ridge	Occupant-controlled system																	
Parcel EdAFB-B Joshua Acres	Occupant-controlled system																	
Parcel EdAFB-C Mountain View	Occupant-controlled system																	
Parcel EdAFB-D Mesquite Meadows	Operated by the housing maintenance contractor																	
Parcel EdAFB-E Tamarisk Plains	<u>60 units on the west side of the parcel</u> : irrigation systems are operated by the housing maintenance contractor; <u>39 units on the east side of the parcel</u> : irrigation systems are controlled by occupants																	
Parcel EdAFB-F Palo Verde Heights	Occupant-controlled system																	
Parcel EdAFB-G Acacia Hills	<u>Prestige and FGO units</u> : occupant-controlled automatic sprinkler systems <u>SNCO units</u> : operated by the maintenance contractor																	
119.	Q.	At Hurlburt Field, are there irrigation systems in the leased premises?																
	A.	Yes, the GOQ/SOQ units on Hume Drive in Parcel HF-K (Soundside Manor) have irrigation systems that controlled by the tenant.																

No.		Questions & Answers 03
120.	Q.	With respect to desired renovation features for Edwards AFB listed in 3.3.7.3.1, how many units “need” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. new self-cleaning ovens, b. energy-saving, quiet dishwashers c. built-in microwave ovens?
	A.	The desired renovation features for Edwards AFB listed in 3.3.7.3.1, would lead to the installation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 614 self-cleaning ovens (all units except 127 in FY06 MILCON); b. 450 energy efficient, quiet dishwashers (Mountain View, Joshua Acres, Juniper Ridge); and, c. 741 built-in microwave ovens
121.	Q.	Edwards AFB: If possible, can you provide the total number of homes that contain two tiered garage floors (left versus right side of the garage). We are currently evaluating the modification of the single car garage openings into a two car garage format and we noticed several single car garages had a two tiered garage floor whereby either the left or the right side of the garage was approximately three to four inches higher than the other. In order to safely convert these garages into a two car format we would need to make both sides the same height so this request has cost implications. Please do not confuse this request with the fact that most garages have an elevated slab on the wall opposite the garage door for storage.
	A.	There are 95 units with the step-up garages, all in east Parcel EdAFB-B (Joshua Acres).
122.	Q.	With respect to desired renovation features for Edwards AFB listed in 3.3.7.3.1, how many units “need” porcelain sinks?
	A.	The Desired Renovation Feature for Edwards AFB specified in 3.3.7.3.1 applies to 164 units (46 2-BR modified, 40 3-BR, 78 4-BR).
123.	Q.	Edwards AFB: During our tour it was mentioned that a study / evaluation had been performed regarding the amount of block walls (in linear feet) that are desired. Can you provide these estimates in linear feet if at all possible?
	A.	Desired Renovation Feature for Edwards AFB specified in 3.3.7.3.1 applies to approximately 11,000 linear feet of chain link fencing to be replaced with block walls in Parcel EdAFB-C (Mountain View).
124.	Q.	Related to Seymour Johnson, RFQ section 2.7.3.6 indicates the Government owns the gas distribution system. Section 3.3.9.6.6 conflicts this stating gas within the Leased Premises is not owned by the Government. Please clarify.
	A.	See Amendment 2 to the RFQ.
125.	Q.	Does furniture in the McConnell Housing Maintenance Bldg convey
	A.	No.

Questions & Answers 03		
126.	Q.	Item #8 within Amendment #2 states that 118 units within Eielson AFB are Non-Debt-Sized Units (NDSUs). However, within the revised Appendix B, there are 154 NDSUs located at Eielson AFB. Please clarify the number of NDSUs at Eielson AFB. Additionally, per the revised Appendix B, 36 of the 42 NDSUs within Century Park South (EiAFB-C) are “Demolition Required” units. Please clarify if these 36 units intended to be Demolition units, NDSUs or both. If they are intended to be both No-Debt and Demolished, would demolition need to occur within the Initial Development Period and be funded from the Demolition Reserve Account?
	A.	Amendment 3 resolves the discrepancies noted. There are 118 NDSUs at Eielson AFB. Appendix B has been revised such that the “Demolition Required” units are no longer labeled as NDSUs.
127.	Q.	Regarding Eglin AFB, the supplemental EIS dated 9/10, there are maps and studies related to the noise contours. Please confirm the page number and the noise contour map we should reference for the correct AICUZ study.
	A.	See Response #46 in Questions and Answers Round 2.
128.	Q.	On the new appendix E: is there a typo on the McConnell natural gas rates and consumption. Is the rate and consumption in different units (MCF, KCF) for a reason?
	A.	See Appendix E as revised via Amendment 3. At McConnell AFB the unit of measurement for the rate and for consumption is KCF.
129.	Q.	The updated general concept map for Edwards AFB (shown in Appendix C as provided in Amendment 2) includes the “Community Park” between Palo Verde and Tamarisk Plains. However, Amendment 2 did not include any new parcels for Edwards and in fact the acreage was reduced due to the reduction in acreage from Joshua Acres. Can you confirm if the lease lines have changed and additional acreage has been added or if that area should not have been highlighted?
	A.	The Community Park is not part of the Leased Premises.
130.	Q.	We need further clarification on the force protection...Q&A Round #1, item #18 states, “The Project owner is not required to construct a security fence around Parcel HF-M”, while Amendment #002 states, “...community development concept shall demonstrate site design elements (such as gates, fences, setbacks, traffic patterns and calming measures, lighting and landscaping designs) to enhance the security of tenants from terrorist risks, discourage undesirable traffic and minimize access from surrounding communities...” Does this new amendment in any way alter the Government’s previous position regarding Parcel HF-M?
	A.	No. The Government does not require the PO to construct a security or perimeter fence around Parcel HF-M.

No.		Questions & Answers 03
131.	Q.	In Volume III - Factor 5: Past Performance - Section 4.15.1.2 – Project Experience Narrative (page 150) states that Offerors need to “provide 15 copies each” of illustrative or other materials that demonstrate similar experience. Are these excluded from the page count? Also, are they required to fit within the binder or can they be provided separately?
	A.	As provided in Note 1 of Table 48, “supporting data, such as mandatory forms, financial pro formas, resumes, financial statements, cost estimates, engineering calculations, drawings, and catalog cuts that are attached or appended to Parts A, B or C of Volume I, or similar supporting data (attached or appended) for Volumes II and III, do not count against the page limits indicated above. Such items that are included within Volume I do count against the page limits.” Illustrative materials should be contained in the appropriate volume and as provided in Section 4.6.3, “each volume shall be submitted in a loose-leaf 3-ring binder.”
132.	Q.	McConnell AFB - Are 3131 Spicer Court #2 and 3133 Spicer Court #2 currently occupied by E9s and therefore subject to the Prestige Family Housing restrictions?
	A.	There are no restrictions on E-9 Prestige Units; however, there are essential elements in determining Prestige Housing suitable for Air Force Chiefs. Prestige Housing requirements are provided in RFQ Section 3.3.6.2.1 and the US Air Force Family Housing Guide. The two Prestige Units in Spicer Court #2 do not meet all the standards for Prestige Units.
133.	Q.	Section 3.2 states that "NOI resulting from the NDSUs shall not be...shown as a source of construction funds during the IDP", "NOI resulting from the NDSUs shall be placed into the Demolition Reserve Account", and "Once the Demolition Reserve is fully funded, 100% of the NOI from the NDSUs shall be distributed into the Reinvestment Account". In addition, Section 4.13.1.2 states that Sources and Uses for the NDSU must be submitted separately from that of the Core Units. Based on these references, it is clear that any IDP construction work on NDSUs cannot be paid using NDSU NOI but it is unclear whether any work can be completed using Core Unit Financial Projections. Can the Air Force please provide clarification on this topic?
	A.	NOI from the "core" (i.e. non-NDSU units) cannot support operations, maintenance, renovations or other costs associated with the NDSUs. The Government does not anticipate Offerors will propose any development funds for units identified as NDSU units. In accordance with Section 4.7.7 of the RFQ, the HRO will provide a Reinvestment Plan showing how it intends to "protect and enhance the Property through reinvestment in the Property in the form of quality-of-life improvements which will directly benefit the property residents." Any reinvestment in the NDSUs will be governed by the terms of Section 3.4.7.
134.	Q.	Section 3.2.1.2 of the RFQ indicates that the project owner’s equity requirement is based on “3.5% of Total Development Costs (as such term is defined in Appendix K)”. But Appendix K does not include the term “Total Development Costs”, but rather “Total Project Costs”; is “Total Development Costs” synonymous with “Total Project Costs” for purposes of calculating the equity investment requirement?
	A.	Yes, the two terms are synonymous.

No.		Questions & Answers 03
135.	Q.	The financial structure slides presented during the Industry Forum indicated that the project was financed assuming a 1.50 debt service coverage ratio for the private financing. Does the Government expect that each proposal assume a 1.50 debt service coverage ratio or should each Offeror utilize a debt service coverage ratio and other financing terms as provided by private lenders, unless otherwise specified in section 3.2 of the RFQ?
	A.	<p>Industry Forum presentations are illustrative of the Government Notional Concept. Proposal requirements are as stated in the RFQ (as amended).</p> <p>Section 3.2.1.1 states, in part, “Each Offeror shall provide letters of interest from at least three (3) of the approved financing firms Each letter of interest must assume an all-in interest rate of 7.80% per annum and <i>disclose</i> the principal amount of the loan, repayment terms (including any interest only period), origination from financing fees, and <i>debt coverage ratios</i> and <i>reserve requirements.</i>” (<i>emphasis added</i>)</p> <p>In addition, Section 3.2.1.6 of the RFQ states, in part, “for transactions involving a GDL, the expected combined debt service coverage ratio <i>must be demonstrated to not be less than 1.15 for any one (1) year.</i>” (<i>emphasis added</i>)</p>
136.	Q.	<p>Per Section 3.2.1.2 “The PO shall make an equity contribution in the amount of no less than 3.5% of Total Development Costs (as such term is defined in Appendix K).” Appendix K does not include a definition of Total Development Costs, but does show “Total Project Costs” as the sum of Infrastructure, Construction, Demolition, Landscaping, Contingency, Construction Period Interest, Architecture/Engineering Fees, Insurance, Consultant Fees, Development Fees, Financing Transaction Fees, Commissions, Reserves, Contingency, Credit Support, Environmental Analysis, and Surveys, Permits, Inspections, Other.</p> <p>Please clarify if Total Development Costs for the Continental Group would include Debt Service, 801 Lease Buy-Out costs, Capitalized Interest, and Pre-Development Costs.</p>
	A.	Total Development Costs include the 801 Acquisition Cost, Capitalized Interest, and other "Pre-Development" costs identified by Offerors.
137.	Q.	The Development Budget in Appendix K asks for costs broken down by unit as well as by square foot costs. Since a portion of the total construction costs for the project will include costs other than those incurred strictly for the construction of new housing units (i.e. development of community centers, sports complexes, tennis courts, etc.), calculating the total cost of the project based solely on cost per square foot calculated using the housing square footage, the cost per square foot will be higher than might be anticipated. Can Appendix K be expanded with additional line items and foot notes/explanations to accurately capture all of the costs of the project?
	A.	Offerors may incorporate additional line items and cost measurements into Appendix K to supplement the existing categories insofar as it enhances transparency and provides additional detail to the Government related to development costs, operating revenues and expenses, fees, capital repair items, and account funding.

No. Questions & Answers 03		
138.	Q.	Does the Government expect that Offerors will treat identified NDSU units as adequate “as-is” units and thus not incur any development costs to improve the units through renovation or replacement during the IDP? What if Offerors assume that NDSU units require some level of renovation improvement in order to improve the marketability of the unit and thus generate cash flow to fund the Demolition Reserve Account?
	A.	The notional project concept does not include any renovation or other costs to be incurred by the Project Owner on the improvement of NDSU units and the Government does not anticipate any Offeror submitting a proposal which includes costs to be incurred on the NDSU units. Per Section 3.2.3.8 of the RFQ, the only allocation of project funding to be utilized on the NDSU units are funds equal to the cost of demolishing units at Eielson AFB; the balance of the cost to demolish the NDSU units is to be funded solely through NOI generated from the operation of the NDSU units. Any reinvestment in the NDSUs will be governed by the terms of Section 3.4.7.
139.	Q.	<i>RESERVED</i>
	A.	<i>RESERVED</i>
140.	Q.	Can the 12-month debt coverage reserve be funded with a letter of credit or is cash required?
	A.	The Project Owner is required to fully fund the Debt Service Reserve Account at closing in accordance with Section 3.2.3.7 of the RFQ. A letter of credit does not satisfy this requirement. See Question and Answer Round 4.
141.	Q.	Page K-12 of Appendix K (Mandatory Forms) states that the Total Debt Service Coverage Ratio shall be no less than 1.05 on an annual basis. However, the RFQ states (Sections 3.2.1.6; 4.13.1.1; and 5.6.1) that for transactions involving a GDL, the expected combined debt service coverage ratio must be demonstrated not to be less than 1.15 for any one year. Please clarify if the ratio noted in Appendix K is a mistake and, if so, provide a revised Appendix K.
	A.	The requirements are as stated in the RFQ. Appendix K will be amended to match this requirement.
142.	Q.	Edwards AFB: Can you provide a map that indicates which homes in Acacia Hills and Tamarisk Plains require upgrades as part of the 164 units needing ceiling fans, trash enclosures etc?
	A.	The requested map has been posted to JLLPress.com .
143.	Q.	For McConnell AFB, does the desired feature for a "full basement" need to meet full FEMA 320 requirements?
	A.	Yes. As provided in Section 3.3.6.1.18 requires all new units to include tornado shelters. Pursuant to Section 3.3.2, this desired feature must meet or exceed the greater of the requirements of the RFQ (See, e.g., Section 3.3.6.1.18) or the Air Force Family Housing Guide (See, e.g., Section 4-12.2 thereof), or the General Officers Quarters Guide, as applicable.

No. Questions & Answers 03		
144.	Q.	Can the Project Owner use land outside of the Leased Premises for Storm Water Management ponds?
	A.	Subject to Applicable Laws and any existing or future storm water compliance requirements applicable to the Government or the Project, the Government may be willing to consider negotiating with the HRO regarding entering into a license or easement at market rates in connection with the use of such land; however, offerors should not rely on the availability of land outside the Leased Premises for this purpose, unless otherwise expressly provided in the due diligence materials.
145.	Q.	Can we have electronic copies of the topography maps for the installations posted to the due diligence websites?
	A.	Topography maps for Eglin AFB and Hurlburt Field have been posted to www.JLLPress.com . Additional topography maps will be posted as they become available from the installations. The Government will not guarantee that the topography maps of the other four installations becomes available prior to the end of the solicitation period.
146.	Q.	Section 3.3.5.4.2, Site Development Design Requirements for Eglin AFB, indicates that “no areas along the shoreline shall be cleared of existing vegetation”? Given the desired feature to “build new GOH, SOH, and Prestige units on waterfront in Parcel EgAFB-B,” please clarify the prohibition.
	A.	As provided in Section 3.5 of the RFQ, the PO “shall comply with Applicable Laws, and local environmental laws and regulations.” These include the MHPI 2010 US Fish and Wildlife Services Concurrence Regarding Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation. Additionally, the PO will follow applicable requirements of the Installation's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. The PO will be prohibited from taking any action that violates the INRMP. In connection therewith, the PO may submit requests to the Installation (and the Installation will review such requests in its sole discretion) to identify areas of the waterfront where existing vegetation may be maintained to provide water views to residents, provided that such maintenance occurs in compliance with the INRMP and under such other conditions set by the Installation. In no instance will native vegetation be removed and the area reseeded, nor will the PO be permitted to clear-cut existing vegetation.
147.	Q.	Within Appendix E (as amended 16 Nov 2010), please clarify how "Line cost of 15%" on the Eielson steam rate affects the rates and consumption figures provided. Is that cost already included within the 13.8324 MBTU steam rate?
	A.	Line loss is incorporated in the steam rate provided. A 15% line loss factor is used by the Government to calculate steam rates while a 10% line loss factor is used by the Government to calculate other utility rates (e.g., electric, water, sewer and natural gas). Line loss occurs throughout the system and is therefore not captured by measured consumption.
148.	Q.	Are Offerors required to assume that they must invest equity at closing equal to 3.5% of the cost of the Eielson AFB Section 801 Housing acquisition? Relatedly, can Offerors include this cost in the calculation of any proposed Developers Fee?
	A.	See response to question 136. Offerors are required to include 801 Acquisition Cost in Total Development Costs and therefore the basis of the required equity contribution will include the 801 Acquisition Cost of \$37.8M provided in Section 3.2 of the RFQ. The Government will not comment on the basis of any proposed Developers Fee.