

ADDENDUM NO. 1

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
Stony Brook University - Mixed-Use Residential Development**

Date – February 9, 2026

FORM B - RFQ QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
1		Can you clarify whether the construction services component of the project will be procured through a competitive public bidding process?	This project is being procured through a public procurement process. The intent is that the selected developer will partner with the construction contracting community, and such partners may be included as part of the developer’s SOQ submission. Prospective partners are encouraged to reach out to one another to explore potential teaming arrangements for this project.
2		Is the University expecting the development team to relocate the existing track and athletic field?	The track and field complex is currently located within the development site. As part of the enabling work for this project, that asset will be relocated to another on-campus location. Developers should treat the relocation as an existing condition of the project, and proposals should account for this in site planning, phasing, and overall layout. The relocation may be included as part of the early work to be undertaken by the developer under the PDA.
3		Can you speak to procurement plans for the larger energy system at Stony Brook?	<p>The Project is required to comply with New York State Executive Order No. 22 (EO 22), which mandates that new development on State-owned land achieve net-zero carbon emissions. Accordingly, the mixed-use residential development is expected to be designed as an energy-efficient, low-carbon facility with on-site energy generation, load management, and demand reduction, such that operational energy needs are met through renewable and other sustainable solutions.</p> <p>At this time, the energy infrastructure contemplated under this procurement is intended to serve only the mixed-use residential development. Energy systems are envisioned as an integrated component of the overall Project, not as a standalone or separately procured utility project. While the Project may interconnect with existing</p>

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
			<p>campus utility systems for resiliency, coordination, or transitional purposes, the design intent is for the Project to operate in a largely self-supported manner from an energy standpoint.</p> <p>Respondents are encouraged to embed their energy strategies holistically within their proposed approach to building massing, envelope performance, system efficiency, load balancing, phasing, and long-term operations and maintenance. Solutions should be scalable, flexible, and capable of adapting over time as the University's broader campus energy and utility strategies evolve. The University places value on approaches that do not constrain future campus-wide utility planning and that allow for potential interoperability with campus systems in the future, when appropriate.</p> <p>Any expansion of energy infrastructure beyond what is proportional to serve the needs of the Project is outside the scope of this RFQ and would be subject to separate consideration and approval by the University.</p>
4		<p>Will SBU make available the results of a geothermal boring conducted at another site on campus to the selected partner?</p>	<p>Yes. The thermal conductivity test report from geothermal borings conducted at another campus location for a separate project will be provided to the down-selected teams invited to the RFP phase for reference only. Site conditions may vary.</p>
5		<p>Are you structuring the leases as a master lease with the university or would the leases be directly with the students or workforce residents</p>	<p>For student housing, the University will serve as the primary interface. All leasing, rent collection, payments, and related financial and legal arrangements for student housing will be between SBU and the students.</p> <p>Workforce housing will follow a more traditional real estate model, with leases and related arrangements entered into directly between the developer and the workforce housing residents.</p>

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
6		<p>For the upcoming deadline, could you please clarify whether respondents are expected to assemble and propose a full project team at this stage, or if key team members (such as the contractor and civil engineer) we should plan to select after the first round? Additionally, are there any preferred consultants or partners you would like respondents to consider including on their team?</p> <p>We also want to confirm the distinction between the Statement of Qualifications and the transmittal letter. If these are separate submissions, could you please advise on the required content for each and the due date for the transmittal letter?</p>	<p>Project Team Composition at This Stage At the RFQ stage of the procurement, respondents are not required to assemble or commit a fully contracted project team. The purpose of the RFQ is to evaluate the qualifications, experience, and capacity of the respondent and its proposed development team. Key team members that directly inform qualifications and delivery credibility should be identified, including the lead developer, operations and maintenance lead, financial or investment partner, design lead, GC/CM lead, and energy partner. Other team members, such as the civil engineer and specialty consultants, may be identified on a preliminary or indicative basis. Final team composition may be refined in subsequent phases of the procurement, subject to RFP requirements and University approval.</p> <p>Preferred Consultants or Partners The University does not have preferred consultants or partners for this procurement. Respondents are responsible for assembling teams they believe are best suited to deliver the Project in accordance with the RFQ and future RFP requirements.</p> <p>Statement of Qualifications vs. Transmittal Letter The Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) and the transmittal letter are separate submission components. The SOQ should include all information required under the RFQ, including qualifications, experience, and required forms. The transmittal letter should provide a brief introduction to the submission, identify the respondent, confirm acknowledgment of addenda, and include any required certifications or statements specified in the RFQ. Both the SOQ and the transmittal letter are due at the same time and must be submitted by the deadline stated in the RFQ.</p>
7		<p>The RFQ indicates that project examples should be completed within the last ten (10) years. Several of our most relevant and comparable projects strongly reflect our experience, capacity, and approach to work of this nature.</p> <p>Please confirm whether projects that are substantially complete or currently under construction may be</p>	<p>For purposes of this RFQ, respondents may include one (1) project that has achieved substantial completion as a project example. All remaining project examples must be fully completed and currently operating.</p> <p>The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the project examples demonstrate not only delivery capability through construction, but also operational performance, long-term functionality, and outcomes in use, which are critical considerations for this procurement. Completed and operating projects allow the University to evaluate</p>

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
		included as project examples, provided that sufficient details on scope, delivery, and performance are clearly demonstrated?	<p>performance across key dimensions such as operations, maintenance, lifecycle execution, user experience, and post-completion integration, elements that cannot be fully assessed for projects that are still under construction.</p> <p>Projects that are still under construction and have not yet achieved substantial completion should generally not be included as project examples</p>
8		<p>“Font and Layout - Standard 8½ × 11-inch format, minimum 11-point type, clearly numbered sections, and pages”. Form D, in particular, contains a significant amount of detailed information and is challenging to complete clearly within these constraints while maintaining readability and logical layout.</p> <p>Please confirm whether Form D may be submitted on an 11 × 17-inch format using a 10-point font? This adjustment would allow the information to be presented more clearly and consistently, supporting both formatting and ease of evaluation.</p>	Yes. Form D may be submitted in an 11 × 17-inch format using a minimum 10-point font, provided that the content remains clear, legible, and well organized. All other RFQ submission requirements, including section numbering, page labeling, and overall formatting standards, must continue to be met.
9		We respectfully request consideration of a 60-day extension to the RFQ submission deadline, to allow us to submit a fully responsive and quality proposal. Additional time would enable our team to develop a more informed understanding of the existing facilities and energy needs.	<p>The University recognizes that the RFQ requires thoughtful coordination and appreciates the feedback regarding the response timeline. At this time, SBU intends to proceed with the RFQ schedule as issued to maintain overall project momentum and align with internal planning and approval milestones.</p> <p>The RFQ is structured to focus on qualifications and experience rather than fully developed technical or commercial proposals, and respondents are not required to assemble or contract a complete project team at this stage.</p> <p>SBU will continue to evaluate the procurement schedule as the process progresses and will communicate any changes via addendum, should adjustments be warranted.</p>
10	1.3	While we acknowledge that project revenues are anticipated to cover the availability payment, please confirm if SBU will be the counterparty for the availability payment. If not, please detail who this	As the counterparty to the Project Agreement, SBHDC will have sole liability and responsibility for any amounts due and payable under the Project Agreement. SBHDC’s payment obligations under the Project Agreement will be funded from (i) Project generated revenues (ii) an SBHDC established contingency and (iii) amounts SBHDC receives from Stonybrook University under its Facilities

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
		counterparty is and how their commitment will be structured.	Management Agreement, which are intended to cover unanticipated funding shortfalls, and in each case will be subject to Stonybrook University's internal and State approval. A detailed funding whitepaper will be provided at the RFP stage to the shortlisted proposers.
11	1.3	Can the University and/or the Evaluation Committee please provide a draft availability payment agreement document or term sheet to help provide more detail around the anticipated structure? The terms of this will influence partnering/teaming.	<p>At the RFQ stage, the University is not providing a draft availability payment.</p> <p>The purpose of the RFQ is to assess respondents' qualifications, experience, and overall approach, rather than to solicit final commercial or contractual proposals. However, the University welcomes high-level input or feedback from respondents on potential commercial structures, delivery approaches, or financing considerations that could inform the combined student and workforce components of the project. More detailed information regarding the anticipated commercial and contractual terms will be provided to shortlisted teams as part of the RFP.</p> <p>This approach is intended to ensure that all shortlisted respondents receive the same level of detail and can respond on a consistent and comparable basis.</p>
12	1.10	What are the University's expectations of the Development Team with regards to the ownership and operation of the co-gen facility?	<p>The University does not intend for the Development Team to own or operate the co-generation facility. Any energy systems developed under this procurement are expected to be project-serving and integrated with the mixed-use residential development.</p> <p>Stony Brook University is served by a combination of existing campus energy assets and third-party energy providers under arrangements that are outside the scope of this procurement. The configuration, ownership, and operational responsibilities for Project-serving energy infrastructure will be addressed as part of the overall DBFOM structure and further defined during the RFP and PDA phases.</p>
13	2.1	Is the proposed parking lot exclusive to the student housing, workforce housing or both?	The proposed parking is intended to support the student housing and retail components of the project. Parking needs associated with the workforce housing component will be included in the RFP.

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
14	2.1	Has the University completed a market study for the workforce housing project?	Yes. The University has completed a market and demand analysis for the workforce housing component of the project. The results of this analysis have informed the University's programmatic planning and will be shared in greater detail in the RFP
15	2.1	Is there an affordability requirement for the workforce housing?	Workforce housing is intended to supplement regional housing options and support the University's ability to attract and retain its workforce by providing alternative housing opportunities. The University seeks to maximize revenue generation for the workforce housing component by allowing developers to set rental rates and retain associated revenues. It is the University's intent for the combined workforce and student housing components of the project to be financially self-sustaining.
16	2.1	Is there a desired program for the workforce housing to support the University's workforce?	<p>The University has undertaken planning and analysis to inform the potential role of workforce housing in support of its institutional needs, specifically to serve Stony Brook Medicine medical residents and Stony Brook University- and Stony Brook Medicine-affiliated employees only.</p> <p>At the RFQ stage, the intent is to evaluate respondent qualifications and experience rather than to finalize detailed programmatic requirements. Information regarding the total workforce housing bed count and unit mix assumptions is provided in Section 1.8 of the RFQ. Additional information regarding the workforce housing program will be provided to shortlisted teams during the RFP phase.</p>
17	2.1	Is the University able to provide more detail on the retail envisioned for the site? Is a market study for retail available?	The University envisions retail offerings that foster a sense of place and complement its academic, residential, and workforce housing environments, creating a cohesive campus experience. The appropriate scale and mix of retail will be further evaluated during the RFP stage, in conjunction with revenue risk allocation and its impact to potential financial structures. The University has not conducted market studies for retail at this time.

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
18	2.2	Will the cost to relocate the track and field complex be paid for by the University outside of the project?	<i>Refer to Question 20.</i>
19	2.2	Will the non-student scope be required to follow Brookhaven zoning requirements and approval process?	<p>Stony Brook University is a state institution located on state-owned property and, as such, is exempt from local zoning regulations and local building permit jurisdiction. The University serves as the authority having jurisdiction and is responsible for administering associated permitting and inspection processes.</p> <p>Depending on the project scope and specific work activities, approvals or permits may be required from applicable state and county agencies, which may include, but are not limited to, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, New York State Department of Health, New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets, Suffolk County Department of Public Works, Suffolk County Department of Health Services, and the Suffolk County Water Authority.</p>
20	2.2	What is the current plan and schedule for the relocation of the existing track and athletic field? Where will the existing track and athletic field be relocated on the campus? Is design and relocation scope of work currently under contract? Does the existing track and athletic field need to be maintained in place until the new track and field is constructed?	<p>The relocation of the existing track and athletic field is considered part of the enabling work associated with the Project.</p> <p>While planning is underway, a final relocation site, detailed design, implementation schedule, and approach to sequencing have not yet been established. The University's intent is to maintain continuity of athletic operations to the extent practicable, and assumptions regarding interim operations and timing will be further evaluated as part of the next phase of the procurement.</p> <p>The manner in which the relocation is addressed within the overall Project structure, including scope, sequencing, and coordination with other Project elements, will be further defined during the RFP and PDA phases. Elements of the relocation may be included as part of early work undertaken under the Project Development Agreement.</p>

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
21	2.3	This section states that the University will provide an anticipated rental rate schedule during the RFP phase. Will this differ from the guidance of \$1,900 - \$2,075 currently listed in the RFQ?	The rental rate guidance of \$1,900–\$2,075 provided in the RFQ is anticipated to remain consistent through the RFP phase. The rental rate schedule will be included in the RFP.
22	2.3	Is the Availability Payment intended to fund any operational shortfall given the University’s desire to maintain a prescribed level of affordability?	The University seeks to retain rate-setting authority for the student housing component and therefore anticipates retaining demand risk for that portion of the project. Conversely, the University intends for developers to set rental rates for the workforce housing component in order to maximize revenues, with developers retaining the associated demand risk. It is the University’s intent that the combined workforce and student housing components be structured to be financially self-sustaining.
23	Section 3.1	To ensure the Project receives the strongest possible value proposition, we recommend eliminating the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) stage following the RFP submission. Including a BAFO stage in the procurement process can create unintended incentives, as bidders may withhold their best offer during the initial round in anticipation of a subsequent opportunity to improve their proposal. Removing the BAFO stage encourages all bidders to submit their most competitive offer upfront, thereby streamlining the process and enhancing value for the Project.	<p>The University has structured the procurement process, including the potential use of a Best and Final Offer stage, to support a competitive, transparent, and value-focused evaluation.</p> <p>At this stage, the procurement process will proceed as described in the RFQ. SBHDC will determine at the RFP stage and based on the proposals received whether a BAFO stage is appropriate.</p>
24	Section 3.4	We believe a second round of RFQ questions following the issuance of the addendum would be beneficial to all Respondents and propose a two-business day turnaround time as sufficient and allow SBHDC to maintain the original procurement schedule.	<p>This addendum responds to questions received during the initial RFQ question period.</p> <p>The University will reopen the RFQ question period for a second and final round of questions. The second question period will open upon issuance of this addendum on February 9, 2026, and will close at 5:00 PM ET on February 12, 2026.</p> <p>Responses to second-round questions, if provided, are anticipated to be issued by addendum on February 16, 2026, in advance of the SOQ submission deadline. No additional rounds of RFQ questions are anticipated.</p>

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
25	4	<p>Would SBHDC consider increasing the page limit for Section 6 – Preliminary Development Concept from 5 pages to 10 pages, and correspondingly increasing the overall proposal page limit from 40 pages to 45 pages?</p>	<p>The University will allow Section 6 – Preliminary Development Concept to be expanded from 5 pages to 10 pages, with the overall SOQ page limit increased from 40 pages to 45 pages.</p> <p>Respondents are reminded that brevity, clarity, and organization are critical to the evaluation process. The University will prioritize the quality and substance of responses over the volume of material submitted.</p>
26	4.2	<p>Throughout the RFQ, does “team members” refer to firms or individuals?</p>	<p>As used throughout the RFQ, “team members” may refer to both firms and key individuals, depending on context.</p> <p>Respondents should identify firms where organizational roles, contractual responsibility, and capacity are relevant, and key individuals where experience, leadership, and role clarity are important to understanding the proposed team.</p>
27	4.2	<p>Section 3 requires identifying the lead development entity, key partners, construction firm, and long-term operator(s), plus roles and reporting lines. If a respondent’s developer and long-term operator for both housing and energy are entities within the same company (i.e., a single partner and single intrinsic point of accountability), does SBHDC prefer they be presented as one integrated delivery platform or as separate “partners,” and how should that be reflected in the organization chart and role descriptions?</p>	<p>Please provide the entity name for each of the developer and long-term operator and treat them separately for purposes of the organization chart and role descriptions. However, please also indicate the name of the common parent entity in the organization chart and descriptions and describe the affiliated nature of the developer and operator. The intent is to establish a single counterparty for negotiation and contractual purposes.</p>

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
28	4.2, Section 3	<p>One bullet on Page 22 reads: “Describe the role of each team member and prior working relationships.”</p> <p>A later bullet reads, “Indicate whether firms proposed have worked together before on similar projects.” Isn’t this redundant?</p>	<p>The referenced bullets are related but not duplicative. One requests a description of each team member’s role and relevant prior working relationships, while the other asks whether proposed firms have worked together previously on similar projects.</p> <p>Respondents may address these points concisely and, where appropriate, cross-reference information to avoid unnecessary repetition.</p>
29	4.2, Section 4.1	<p>Please clarify what is meant by “contract number” in the Relevant Project Technical Experience section.</p>	<p>The “contract number” field is intended to capture a formal contract or agreement identifier where one exists.</p> <p>If a project did not have an assigned contract number, respondents may note “not applicable” and should ensure that the project can be clearly identified through the project name, owner, and other reference information provided.</p>
30	4.2, Form D	<p>On Form D, please clarify what is meant by “Annual Total O&M Value” in \$2026. Are you looking for this year’s figure or an average over the entire term of the ground lease?</p>	<p>“Annual Total O&M Value” refers to the respondent’s best estimate of the annualized operations and maintenance cost, expressed in 2026 dollars, for the applicable project.</p> <p>Where O&M costs vary over time, respondents should provide a representative annual value (for example, an average annual amount over the contract term), normalized to 2026 dollars, rather than a single-year snapshot or cumulative total.</p>
31	4.2	<p>Please clarify the correct appendix reference for Section 5, first bullet regarding financial statement requirements for the lead developer, contractor, and equity member.</p>	<p>The financial statement requirements referenced in Section 5 are set forth in Appendix F – Financial Statement Requirements.</p>
32	4.2	<p>Section 5 – Financial Capability: Since financial statements are required from multiple entities, will SBHDC allow each entity to submit its financial statements directly to SBHDC Procurement under separate cover (e.g., separate email/direct link), rather than through the prime respondent’s combined submission? This will better maintain the confidentiality of sensitive and proprietary information.</p>	<p>Yes, Respondents should submit their responses to Section 5 only, directed to: Email: procurement@sbhdc.org Subject Line: “Mixed-Use Residential Development RFQ – Section 5 – [INSERT PRIMARY CONTACT COMPANY NAME] – [INSERT ENTITY NAME]”</p>

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
33	4.2	Please clarify the correct appendix reference for Section 7, fourth bullet (“Required certifications and forms included in Appendix A”).	<p>The “required certifications and forms” referenced in Section 7 are included in Appendix G – Policy Alignment & Compliance Acknowledgment Form.</p> <p>Respondents should complete and submit Appendix G as part of their SOQ in accordance with the RFQ instructions.</p>
34	Form D – Section 4.2 Relevant Project Financial Experience	Please clarify that Footnote 1 of Form D can include the experience of an Equity Member.	Yes. Footnote 1 of Form D may include relevant experience of an Equity Member.
35	4.2, Form D	On Form D, please clarify what is meant by “annualized lifecycle costs.”	The average annual lifecycle costs for the project required to maintain the asset at the contracted performance standard over the Project term.
36	4.2, Section 5	The last bullet lists the following: “payment and performance bond for at least 50% of the value of the Project; equity funding letters; and financially responsible party support letters / parent entity guarantees.” Are we required to provide all of these items?	These items are required to be submitted at the RFP stage. At the RFQ stage, 4.2 Section 5 states that the RFQ response should include a statement that these items can be provided at the RFP stage. The text states respondents must provide: “A statement confirming the respondent’s ability to provide information during the RFP stage if shortlisted by SBHDC: payment and performance bond for at least 50% of the value of the Project; equity funding letters; and financially responsible party support letters / parent entity guarantees.
37	4.2, Section 7	Are the “required certifications and forms” referring to Form G in Appendix G?	See Question No. 33.

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
38	Section 5 . 8	Please clarify whether the retail and parking components of the Project will be included in the availability payment or are both income streams considered ancillary revenue?	<p>Retail and parking components of the Project are not anticipated to be included in the availability payment.</p> <p>Revenues generated from these components are expected to be treated as ancillary revenue. Parking rates will be required to be consistent with University parking rates applicable to students and visitors. Further details will be included in the RFP.</p>
39	6.2	While we acknowledge this requirement, is the University open to considering alternative strategies that provide a similar level of sustainability and ultimate look and feel? If so, a matrix related to these items would be helpful. This matrix could illustrate where the University is open to deviation from existing standards as well as areas where they are not.	<p>The University is focused on achieving the sustainability objectives outlined in the RFQ and applicable State and University policies, rather than prescribing a single technical solution or design approach at this stage.</p> <p>Respondents may propose alternative strategies that achieve comparable or superior sustainability outcomes and align with the overall intent and performance objectives described in the RFQ.</p> <p>The University does not intend to provide a prescriptive matrix of acceptable deviations at the RFQ stage. Further discussion of sustainability approaches and design flexibility will occur during the RFP phase.</p>
40	Section 6	Could SBHDC please clarify the assumptions underlying the determination of the “\$1,900 to \$2,075 per bed per month in 2029 dollars”? In addition, we would appreciate further detail regarding the comparable analysis that informed this price range. Specifically, if a market comparables study of similar housing was conducted, could that analysis or a summary thereof be shared with all bidders?	The \$1,900 to \$2,075 per bed per month rental rate is a prescribed rate established by SBU Campus Residences, based on comparisons with other SBU campus student housing options, anticipated amenities, and internal policies.
41	6 sub bullet 5	The University states that they prefer site-built construction. Does this mean that the University will deprioritize any proposals that are not fully site built?	<p>The University’s stated preference for site-built construction is intended to communicate overall performance, quality, and durability objectives, rather than to prescribe a specific construction methodology.</p> <p>Respondents are encouraged to propose construction approaches that they believe best advance the Project’s objectives, including construction quality, financial</p>

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
			feasibility, life-cycle cost performance, constructability, schedule, sustainability, and long-term operational outcomes. The RFQ is intended to solicit thoughtful, well-reasoned approaches and innovative ideas aligned with these objectives, rather than to require respondents to infer or conform to a preferred construction modality.
42	6.5	Pursuant to the requirement to execute a project labor agreement, can the University please provide a draft PLA format or term sheet to help teams understand what will be expected under this agreement? The terms of this will influence partnering/teaming.	SBU will provide PLA information at the RFP stage solely to shortlisted proposers.
43	Section 6.8	Could SBHDC please clarify the meaning of “resulting contract” as currently drafted? Our understanding is that this refers to either the Project Development Agreement (PDA) or any subsequent concession agreement; however, we believe further definition would be helpful to avoid ambiguity.	<p>Any “resulting contract” is intended to refer to the PDA and Project Agreement. Language will be clarified as follows:</p> <p>“The Respondent acknowledges and agrees that, any resulting contract, the PDA and Project Agreement will require Respondent (or the applicable affiliated party) to indemnify, defend and hold harmless SBHDC and The People of the State of New York, including the State University of New York, including SBU, against all claims, suits, actions and liability to all persons on the leased Project premises, including occupants, contractors, subcontractors, guests, invitees, members of the public, and Respondent’s employees, whether real or personal, or for personal injuries arising out of use or occupation of the property.”</p>
44	6.2	Please confirm the intent of Appendix G (Policy Alignment & Compliance) Acknowledgment Form at the RFQ stage. Since the Stony Brook University Sustainability and Design Standards (including a minimum of LEED Silver) will not be available until the RFP stage, should respondents acknowledge compliance only with policies currently available and applicable at RFQ?	<p>At the RFQ stage, respondents are asked to acknowledge compliance with policies that are currently available and applicable.</p> <p>Where referenced standards or requirements will be further defined or issued during the RFP phase, respondents are acknowledging their general intent to comply with applicable State and University policies as they are finalized and applied to the Project.</p> <p>Additional details regarding specific standards, including the Stony Brook University Sustainability and Design Standards, will be provided to shortlisted teams during the RFP phase.</p>

No.	RFQ Section	Question(s)	SBDHC Response
45	6.3	Will the project contain minimum requirements regarding MWBE / SDVOB participation for both the construction and operations?	Yes. The enabling legislation requires compliance with Article 15-A of the New York State Executive Law, and the Project is considered a state project for these purposes. More detailed requirements regarding minimum MWBE and SDVOB participation, applicable to both construction and operations, will be included in the RFP.
46	O&M Service Provider	We noted that the RFQ did not contained a section pertaining to the O&M Service provider although the Pre-bid conference sited long term asset value and the importance of energy performance. Do you plan to issue an addendum requesting information on the O&M service provider?	<p>The RFQ is intended to provide context for how respondents may demonstrate their qualifications and suitability as a long-term partner in achieving the University’s operational, financial, and sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Respondents are not required at this stage to identify a specific O&M service provider. To the extent respondents choose to do so, they may describe their general approach to operations and maintenance, including how long-term performance, reliability, and lifecycle outcomes would be addressed within their proposed delivery model. More detailed information regarding O&M roles and responsibilities may be requested during the RFP phase.</p>
47	Appendix G	Section 1 requires proposers to acknowledge a series of applicable policies, including “Any successor or implementing regulations issued by SUNY or the Office of General Services (OGS).” How open ended is this obligation intended to be from a timing perspective?	See Question No. 44. The acknowledgment reflects standard compliance with applicable policies as they are finalized and applied.

48	Section 2	<p>During the pre-bid conference, the University noted that the student housing and workforce housing elements of the Project could potentially be delivered concurrently. The RFQ, however, refers to these elements as Phase 1 and Phase 2. Please clarify whether these elements are required to be delivered sequentially or whether concurrent delivery may be considered.</p>	<p>References in the RFQ to “Phase 1” and “Phase 2” were intended to distinguish between different programmatic components of the Project, rather than to prescribe a required sequencing or delivery timeline.</p> <p>As noted during the pre-bid conference, the University may consider delivery approaches in which the student housing and workforce housing components are delivered concurrently, if determined to be in the best interest of the Project.</p> <p>Respondents should not assume that the student housing and workforce housing components must be delivered sequentially and are encouraged to describe delivery approaches that appropriately address the relationship, timing, and integration of the Project components.</p>
49		<p>Are you able to provide a list of pre-bid conference attendees?</p>	<p>A list of firms that participated in the Pre-bid Conference is included below</p>

Table 1: List of Firms that participated in the Pre-Bid Conference on February 02, 2026.

(listed in alphabetical order)

1	Albanese Organization Inc.	20	Gitto Group	39	Page (Stantec)
2	Altus Group	21	GMH Communities	40	Plenary
3	American Campus Communities	22	Goshow Architects	41	PRWT Services, Inc.
4	American Global	23	Grace Design Studios	42	Radnor Property Group
5	Aptitude Development	24	Greystar	43	Servitas
6	Aurora Contractors	25	Harrison Street	44	Shiro Matsui
7	Brightcore Energy	26	HKS	45	Suffolk
8	Capstone Development Partners	27	Jacobs	46	Swinterton
9	CBT Architects	28	JLC Infrastructure	47	Thornton Tomasetti
10	Center Stream	29	Johnson Controls	48	Tikehau Capital North America LLC
11	Centrio Energy	30	Kaplan Kirsch	49	Turner Construction
12	Consigli	31	Keystone Global	50	Urbahn
13	Creative Energy	32	Kiewit	51	Vanderweil
14	Dattner Architects	33	KSQ Design	52	Veolia
15	DBI Projects	34	Langan	53	Wendel Companies
16	DeSimone	35	Macquarie	54	WEXFORD Science + Technology
17	Fengate Asset Management	36	Maxxima	55	WSP
18	Gilbane Building Company	37	Morgan Stanley		
19	Gilbane Development Company	38	Nixon Peabody LLP		