



Questions and Answers (Q&A)

Investing in Resilient Infrastructure:

Program & Project Management Office Services for the Development of Multipurpose Community Facilities in Puerto Rico

Question # 1:

Reference:

The RFP instructs proponents to review the U.S. Treasury's Puerto Rico CPF Allocation and the PRBP Five-Year Action Plan for scheduling context but does not explicitly state the CPF period of performance end date or any interim expenditure milestones required by Treasury.

Question:

What is the current CPF period of performance end date for Puerto Rico's MPCF allocation?

Response:

As per CPF guidelines:

"Projects must reach substantial completion before December 31, 2026. Substantial completion is defined as the date for which the Project can fulfill the primary operations that it was designed to perform, delivering services to end-users. At substantial completion, service operations and management systems infrastructure must be operational. Recipients may request extensions beyond this timeframe to the extent that factors outside of the Recipient's control have impacted Project delivery timelines. Treasury will approve extension requests on a case-by-case basis.



Question # 2:

Reference:

A detailed list of MPCF sites will be provided to the selected proponent during project initiation.

Question:

2(a) Are all 34 MPCF sites already formally identified and confirmed by PRBP and the respective municipalities, or are some sites still subject to change or substitution?

2(b) Can PRBP share, at a minimum, the regional distribution of the 34 sites (e.g., by FEMA region, by metropolitan vs. rural classification, or by general island geography – north, south, east, west, central) to allow proponents to better estimate travel, permitting complexity, and municipal engagement resources without disclosing specific addresses?

Response:

2(a) All 34 sites have been formally identified.

2(b) The PRBP will be sharing a map with the general location for each MPCF to provide an overall idea of the regional distribution at the end of this document. "

Question # 3:

Reference:

Each MPCF will be created by renovating existing buildings... the budget for each MPCF facility is expected to vary depending on the size and complexity of the renovation scope.



Question:

3(a) Based on PRBP's preliminary assessment of the 34 buildings, what is the anticipated average level of renovation intensity?

3(b) Has PRBP conducted – or does it plan to conduct before contract award – preliminary building condition assessments (PCAs) or facility audits for any of the 34 sites?

3(c) If preliminary cost estimates per facility are available, could PRBP provide a range (minimum / maximum / average) to inform proponents' resource planning?

Response:

3(a) Intensity of renovations will vary on the site condition. For context, each site was designated with a cost per square foot base on site conditions. Rate range from \$85 at a minimum to \$195 being the highest.

3(b) Preliminary audits were executed for most sites have been executed.

3(c) Cost estimates per facility range between approximately \$247,960 to \$3.7 million."

Question # 4

Question:

4(a) Can PRBP provide the total estimated construction and renovation budget for the 34 MPCFs collectively, or at minimum a per-facility budget range (e.g., low, mid, high tiers)?

4(b) What is the total CPF allocation specifically designated for the MPCF program? This information is essential for the PMO to appropriately scale



cost management, procurement oversight, financial reporting, and CPF compliance resources.

Response:

4(a) A cost per square foot was assigned depending on the condition of each facility. To assist in the analysis, at the end of this document, PRBP will include additional information so that proponents will be able to evaluate the allocations per facility, as well as the respective cost per square footage.

4(b) At the moment, the total allocation for MPCF program is \$39,012,998.95 which will be distributed across all MPCF sites. There is also a contingency amount which will be available to all facilities as the need arises which will not be disclosed at this time. "

Question # 5:

Reference:

Language consistently uses 'The PMO may serve...,' 'Key activities may include...']

Question:

Does PRBP intend all listed activities to be performed as a mandatory baseline unless otherwise directed, or are some activities genuinely optional/conditional based on PRBP's direction post-award?

Specifically:

(a) Are all 12 subsections of the SOW considered mandatory for pricing purposes?

(b) Are the listed 'Key activities' within each subsection intended as an exhaustive list, a representative baseline, or a ceiling?



(c) Does PRBP anticipate issuing task orders or work authorizations to activate specific activities, or will the PMO be expected to perform all listed activities continuously from contract start

Response:

All listed activities are expected to be provided, however the level of effort may vary depending on the actual needs of the municipality and the amount of technical assistance that may be required. "

Question # 6:

Reference:

Different levels of engagement, support, and oversight will be necessary from the PMO provider depending on the individual municipal capacities to self-manage.

Question:

Has PRBP conducted or does it plan to conduct a baseline municipal capacity assessment prior to contract award?

Based on PRBP's knowledge of the 34 participating municipalities, what is the general distribution of municipal capacity for managing federally funded capital projects – specifically:

(a) How many municipalities have prior experience managing HUD, FEMA, CDBG, or similar federal construction grants?

(b) Does PRBP anticipate that the majority will require intensive PMO support, or that most municipalities have sufficient internal capacity to self-manage significant portions of the work?



Response:

PRBP does have access to baseline municipal capacity assessments, however this information will only be shared with selected proponent once contract is executed.

Regarding the intensity of the PMO support, the premise is that most municipalities will have sufficient capacity to manage self-manage most of the work, however the PMO must anticipate providing technical assistance, as well as ensure that they have sufficient resources to ensure adequate monitoring of all municipal activities to ensure compliance with established requirements. "

Question # 7

Question:

Has PRBP established, or does it intend to establish before PMO contract award, a program-level architectural and engineering (A/E) design services contract or pre-qualified vendor list from which municipalities may select design consultants?

Or will each of the 34 municipalities be expected to independently initiate and complete its own A/E procurement from the beginning?

If individual procurements are required, has PRBP estimated how many municipalities currently have A/E firms under contract or pre-qualified for this type of work?

Response:

Each municipality is expected to independently initiate and complete its own A/E procurement.



At this time, PRBP has not determined how many municipalities currently have A/E firms under contract or pre-qualified for this type of work. "

Question # 8:

Reference:

Support municipalities in the acquisition of CPF cost allowable supplies and equipment.

Question:

8(a) Regarding technology equipment for the MPCF facilities (workstations, telemedicine systems, network equipment, cybersecurity hardware, AV/display systems, UPS/backup power): (a) Will PRBP procure technology equipment centrally through a program-level contract, or will each municipality independently procure its own equipment?

8(b) Is the PMO expected to develop technical specifications and review technology equipment RFPs/bids at the municipal level?

8(c) Are technology equipment costs included within each municipality's CPF construction budget, or are they funded through a separate line item or contract?

Response:

8(a) Each municipality will independently procure its own equipment. PRBP may require centralized procurement for some specialized equipment, however a determination has not been made yet.

8(b) The PMO may be required to develop technical specifications and review technology equipment RFPs/bids at the municipal level.



8(c) Estimates for technology equipment costs were developed as a part of each municipalities budget and will be provided to the selected proponent.

Question # 9

Question:

What contract type does PRBP anticipate for the PMO services engagement – Firm Fixed Price (FFP), Time & Materials (T&M), Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF), or a hybrid structure? Will task orders or individual work authorizations be issued to activate specific SOW elements? Are there not-to-exceed (NTE) ceilings contemplated for any cost categories? Understanding the contract structure is essential for proponents to properly structure their price proposals and assess financial risk.

Response:

PRBP prefers Time & Materials (T&M), or a hybrid structure. If the vendor will propose a hybrid approach, it must clearly justify why this structure is needed over a T&M structure.

Question # 10

Question:

What is the anticipated base contract term for the PMO services engagement? Does PRBP anticipate including option years or renewal periods? Is the contract term expected to align with the CPF period of performance end date, and if so, will the contract automatically terminate at that date or include provisions for program wind-down activities beyond the CPF period?



Response:

Contract term will align with CPF period of performance (12/31/2026). Any extensions may be considered in the case that approval is received by Treasury (case-by-case basis) to extend POP for any of the facilities.

Question # 11

Question:

Does PRBP anticipate that all 34 MPCF projects will be initiated and enter construction simultaneously, or will they follow a phased or prioritized sequencing? If a phased approach is planned, does PRBP have a preliminary sequencing model (e.g., Cohort 1 of 10 sites, Cohort 2 of 12, Cohort 3 of 12) or a priority list of municipalities based on readiness, CPF expenditure urgency, or community need? Understanding the construction sequencing is critical for the PMO's resource ramp-up plan and Integrated Master Schedule

Response:

PRBP anticipates that most MPCF projects will initiate and enter construction at approximately the same time, however timing may vary dependent on how long the bidding process and the design process take."

Question # 12

Question:

Has PRBP, OMB, or any current PRBP contractor or technical advisor already developed technology standards, equipment specifications, reference network architectures, or cybersecurity baselines for the MPCF facilities? If so, will these documents be made available to the selected PMO at contract initiation? If not, does PRBP expect the PMO to develop



MPCF technology standards as part of the contract scope, and if so, does PRBP have preferred technology platforms or vendors already under consideration?

Response:

Some standards and specifications have been prepared by internal PRBP staff, however this should not be considered as an expansive list and may be subject to change (if necessary). Information will be made available to the eligible vendor. "

Question # 13

Question:

For each of the 34 MPCF sites: (a) Has broadband service at or above 100 Mbps/20 Mbps already been confirmed as available and serviceable? (b) Have ISP service agreements or CPF-funded broadband construction contracts been executed to bring service to any sites that currently lack adequate connectivity? (c) Will the PMO be expected to coordinate ISP connectivity procurement, installation scheduling, or service delivery for any of the 34 sites, or is this managed entirely by PRBP or a separate broadband contractor?

Response:

The PRBP considers that this question is not relevant for the services being procured via this RFP process."



Question # 14

Question:

Are any of the 34 MPCF sites designated or intended to serve as anchor institutions, network nodes, or Points of Presence (PoPs) within Puerto Rico's BEAD-funded broadband network infrastructure? If so, will the MPCF PMO be expected to coordinate with the BEAD program's ISP, network designer, or program office on technical integration requirements, fiber entry specifications, or network demarcation standards? Is there a BEAD Program PMO or technical team with whom the MPCF PMO would need to formally interface?

Response:

No coordination with the BEAD program will be required as a part of the scope of work.

Question # 15:

Reference:

Support collecting, synthesizing, and submitting all required reports to PRBP and the Grant Administrator'; Program Closeout: 'Coordinate with Grant Manager for any additional close-out activities necessary.

Question:

Who is the 'Grant Administrator' and/or 'Grant Manager' referenced in Section 3.2 of the SOW? Specifically: (a) Is this an existing PRBP contractor providing grants management services, and if so, will the selected PMO be provided with their contact information and reporting requirements at contract initiation? (b) Is this an internal OMB function? (c) Will the PMO be expected to submit reports directly to the U.S. Treasury or any other federal agency as part of CPF compliance reporting? Understanding this



entity's identity and role is necessary to properly design the PMO's reporting and documentation workflows.

Response:

15(a) Contact information for the Grant Administrator and reporting requirements will be provided upon contract initiation.

15(b) No

15(c) While the PMO will be expected to capture information which will be used to comply with the CPF reporting requirements, they will not be expected to prepare any reports which will be submitted directly to treasury staff. This task will be a responsibility of the PRBP and the Grant Administrator."

Question # 16:

Reference:

This RFP also excludes Grants Management services, along with some Outreach responsibilities that PRBP will keep in-house.

Question:

Does PRBP have a dedicated internal project management team or program management office specifically for the MPCF program, or will the contracted PMO serve as the primary program management function? Who will serve as PRBP's primary point of contact (COR equivalent) for the PMO contractor? How many PRBP staff members does the PMO's Program Director expect to coordinate with on a regular basis? Does PRBP have existing program management tools, reporting formats, or data systems that the PMO will be required to use or interface with?



Response:

While the PRBP does have internal resources which lead any efforts directly related to projects under the CPF program, the vendor will be expected to serve as the primary project management function. The amount of personnel with which the PMO will coordinate may vary, it is expected that the total amount of personnel will not exceed 3. There may be some additional coordination required with the Grant Administrator.

PRBP is evaluating the implementation of several technological tools, however a final decision has not been made."

Question # 17:

Reference:

This RFP also excludes...some Outreach responsibilities that PRBP will keep in-house.; Develop and implement a stakeholder engagement plan, including communication protocols...in conjunction with PRBP's outreach team.

Question:

Can PRBP clarify the division of responsibilities between the contracted PMO's stakeholder engagement scope and PRBP's internal outreach responsibilities? Specifically: (a) Is the PMO expected to organize or participate in public community meetings or town halls at the 34 municipalities? (b) Is the PMO responsible for communications with elected municipal officials, or will PRBP handle elected official engagement? (c) What does 'in conjunction with PRBP's outreach team' mean operationally — will PRBP's outreach staff attend PMO-facilitated meetings, or will there be a separate PRBP-managed outreach track that the PMO supports administratively?



Response:

PMO will not be expected to participate in any public community meetings or town halls, however they will be responsible for leading communications with designated POC for each municipality in conjunction with the PRBP project team. No communication with Municipalities will be had without the PRBP's prior knowledge. PRBP will participate in most PMO facilitated meetings on a case-by-case basis. "

Question # 18

Question:

Does PRBP anticipate that Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements will apply to PMO contractor personnel, specifically those performing construction site visits, field oversight, or construction management support activities at the 34 MPCF sites in Puerto Rico? If so, has a wage determination been issued for the relevant labor classifications, and will PRBP make that determination available to proponents prior to proposal submission?

Response:

As per CPF guidelines, Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements not applicable. For further guidance, please reference <https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/coronavirus/assistance-for-state-local-and-tribal-governments/capital-projects-fund>. "

Question # 19:

Reference:

Contracting with Small and Minority Business, Women's Business Enterprises, and Labor Surplus Area Firms, 2 C.F.R. Sec. 200.321

**Question:**

Does PRBP have specific small business, MBE/WBE, HUBZone, or Section 3 subcontracting percentage goals or requirements for the PMO services contract awarded under this RFP? If so, what are the applicable percentage thresholds, and will PRBP require a Small Business Subcontracting Plan as part of the contract? Alternatively, does the 2 CFR 200.321 requirement referenced in Section 6.4 apply exclusively to the construction and A/E design contracts that municipalities will procure, and not to the PMO services contract itself?

Response:

Pursuant to applicable 2 C.F.R. Sec. 200.321, Contractor is expected to take necessary affirmative steps to assure that small businesses, minority businesses, women's business enterprises, veteran-owned businesses, and labor surplus area firms are used in subcontracting when possible."

Question # 20:**Reference:**

References Attachment A (Form 1), Attachment B (Form 2), Attachment C (Form 3), Attachment D (Form 4); RFP document text at paragraphs [469], [481], [499], [507-51

Question:

Attachments A (Form 1: Proponent Information), B (Form 2: Proponent Qualifications), C (Form 3: Proponent References), and D (Form 4: Cost Template – including Cost Templates 1 and 2) are referenced as required components of a complete proposal submission, but do not appear to be included in or attached to the RFP document currently posted on www.smartisland.pr.gov. Can PRBP confirm the location where these



forms can be accessed, or post them as separate downloads on the Smart Island portal immediately? This is a critical gap as proponents cannot submit a technically compliant proposal without the required forms.

Response:

Please reference pages 35-44 of the RFP for the solicited forms."

Question # 21

Question:

Is there a total page limit for the technical proposal document (exclusive of appendices and required attachments/forms)? Are there page limits for any individual sections beyond the 3-page Executive Summary limit? Regarding the 10 MB PDF submission limit: given that a complete proposal with resumes for all key personnel, 3-5 qualification tables per team member, three years of audited financial statements, and all four required attachment forms may approach or exceed 10 MB. Will PRBP provide guidance on acceptable compression or format specifications?

Response:

Proponents should reference pages 19 - 25 regarding any applicable requirements for the technical proposal document.

Regarding the compression or format specifications, proponents should submit main documents via the platform and make all efforts to send a separate zip file via the FAQ email or get in contact with OMB before the deadline so that can discuss any further alternatives.



Question # 22:

Reference:

Figure 1. RFP Timeline

Question:

Would PRBP consider a two-week extension of the proposal deadline, for submittal on March 20, 2026?

Response:

Due to timeline constraints, the PRBP will not consider any extension request at this time.

Question # 23:

Reference:

Section 3.2 indicates municipalities are the primary responsible parties for procurement, permitting, construction, and overall program progress, while the PMO “may provide” support. Clarity on boundaries will help ensure that PMO activities do not imply assumption of municipal responsibilities.

Question:

Please confirm that municipalities remain the Responsible Entities/owners for all MPCF projects and that the PMO’s role is limited to advisory, monitoring, reporting, and coordination. The PMO will not perform subrecipient responsibilities such as executing procurements, issuing owner decisions, serving as applicant of record, approving contractor payments, or certifying compliance.



Response:

All selected facilities are owned by each municipality. PMO's role will be advisory, monitoring, reporting, coordination and providing technical assistance (as needed). While the PMO will not be expected to directly manage subrecipient responsibilities, they will be expected to provide support to municipalities on these activities (as needed), particularly to ensure management of grant funded activities in compliance with applicable requirements. "

Question # 24:

Reference:

Some parts of Section 3.2 use "ensure compliance" in contexts where PMO does not have operational control over municipalities. We seek alignment of wording with the PMO's support role.

Question:

May we interpret "ensure compliance" for the PMO as: monitor and verify compliance, document findings, recommend corrective actions, and escalate non-compliance to PRBP—without assuming operational control or issuing compliance certifications?

Response:

Although some type of certification or validation may be required, this interpretation would be correct.

Question # 25:

Reference:

Section 3.2.3 authorizes the PMO to advise on procurement strategies and to support the preparation and review of RFPs, bids, and contracts,



while the RFP clearly states that municipalities remain the primary responsible parties for procurement activities. Because the PMO has no legal or contractual authority to act as a procuring entity on behalf of municipalities, the PMO cannot prepare, issue, or execute municipal bid packages. Consistent with federal requirements incorporated in §6.5, the PMO's support role must remain advisory, focused on compliance, documentation readiness, and reporting. To ensure PRBP maintains visibility over program wide procurement progress, the PMO can provide monthly procurement status reports summarizing milestones, risks, delays, readiness, and municipal actions, without performing procurement execution itself.

Question:

Please confirm that municipalities are solely responsible for preparing, issuing, and executing all procurement (bid/RFP) packages and that the PMO has no authority to perform procurement execution. Further confirm that the PMO will not: (a) issue solicitations on behalf of municipalities; (b) receive bids or proposals as the procuring entity; (c) chair or vote on evaluation committees; (d) make or approve award decisions; or (e) sign procurement records as the procuring entity. Under this framework, PMO support will be limited to: Reviewing municipal bid documents, Providing compliance checklists, templates, and advisory memoranda, Offering observations and recommendations to PRBP and municipalities, and Preparing monthly procurement status reports to keep PRBP informed of program wide progress, risks, and upcoming municipal actions.

Response:

Municipalities will be solely responsible for preparing, issuing, and executing all procurement (bid/RFP) packages and that the PMO has no



authority to perform procurement execution, however the PMO may be required to provide technical assistance to municipalities on any one of these conditions."

Question # 26:

Reference:

Section 2.7 requires the selected Proponent to be free of real or perceived conflicts. When a PMO provides advisory support on a specific municipal procurement, additional clarity helps avoid any perception of organizational conflict.

Question:

Please confirm that PMO personnel/firms who provide advisory support for a specific municipal procurement will be ineligible to propose on that same procurement (and its directly related scopes) to avoid organizational conflicts of interest.

Response:

Given that the services being procured with this RFP are of an oversight nature, proponents will not be eligible to propose on that same procurement with any of the municipalities with respect to the SOW for any of the corresponding facilities to avoid any organizational conflicts of interest.

Question # 27:

Reference:

Section 3.2.5 states the PMO may assist municipalities in identifying, preparing, and submitting necessary permits. To maintain the



municipality's role, we want to confirm who will be applicant of record for permits.

Question:

Please confirm the municipality (or its designated A/E) will remain the permit applicant of record and signer. The PMO's role will be limited to checklists, document assembly, scheduling, and tracking, reporting—not legal filing responsibility.

Response:

This interpretation is correct.

Question # 28:

Reference:

The PMO is tasked with reporting and documentation, and with supporting permitting. Under HUD environmental processes, responsibilities such as preparing or certifying Environmental Review Records rest with the Responsible Entity, not a PMO contractor. We seek to affirm the PMO's supporting—not certifying—role.

Question:

Please confirm the PMO will not act as the Responsible Entity and will not prepare or certify the Environmental Review Record or issue environmental determinations. The PMO's activities will be limited to tracking statutory consultations, organizing administrative materials, and reporting status and risks.

Response:

This interpretation is correct.



Question # 29:

Reference:

Section 3.2.4 envisions coordination of design activities, reviews, and support in managing design consultants. We seek to confirm that the PMO's design support remains non-certifying and does not substitute the services of licensed professionals.

Question:

Please confirm the PMO will not sign/seal plans, issue technical certifications, or provide restricted engineering/architectural services; those will be performed by licensed professionals procured by municipalities. PMO design support will be limited to coordination, schedule tracking, and non-certifying reviews.

Response:

While the PMO will be expected to provide technical support on some of these activities, PMO design support will be limited to coordination, schedule tracking, non-certifying reviews and in developing standard design components to standardize municipal designs for each facility.

Question # 30:

Reference:

Section 3.2.6 assigns the PMO oversight and reporting responsibilities during construction. To preserve the required separation among the contractor, municipality, A/E, and PMO roles, it is important to clarify that decisions associated with payment certification, change order approval, and construction acceptance remain the responsibility of PRBP and/or the municipality.



Question:

Please confirm that the PMO will not direct construction means and methods; will not act as the resident inspector; will not certify pay applications or approve change orders as the owner's certifier; and will not certify substantial or final completion. The PMO's role will be limited to reviewing and recommending payment applications and change orders, while final approval authority remains with PRBP and/or the Municipality and their designated A/E/CM.

Response:

While this interpretation is mostly correct, the PMO will be expected to provide ad hoc advisory and technical support (as needed) top municipalities for some of these activities. However the PMO will not absolve the Municipality of these responsibilities"

Question # 31:

Reference:

Section 3.2.2 requires a Project Plan for each municipality within 45 days of contract signature. The Project Plan necessarily depends on detailed, accurate, and timely information from each municipality regarding scope, readiness, staffing, procurement status, constraints, and other project-specific details. Because the PMO does not control the municipalities, cannot compel them to provide inputs, and is not responsible for municipal execution, requiring the PMO to author the Project Plan may create unrealistic expectations and misallocate responsibility. A more practical and governance-aligned approach is for the municipality to prepare its Project Plan, while the PMO reviews, validates, and provides observations and recommendations to PRBP to



ensure consistency, completeness, and alignment with program requirements.

Question:

Please confirm that the Project Plan is ultimately the responsibility of each municipality, since they control the underlying project information, decisions, constraints, and readiness inputs. Under this interpretation, the PMO's role would be to review municipal Project Plans, assess completeness and alignment with PRBP program requirements, identify risks or gaps, and provide written observations and recommendations to PRBP for decision-making—rather than the PMO preparing and owning the Project Plans directly.

Response:

This interpretation is correct, however PRBP ask that all proponents keep in mind that they will need to provide Ad Hoc advisory and technical assistance to municipalities on these components.

Question # 32:

Reference:

To maintain clarity on allowability and to prevent overlap with municipal contractors, it is helpful to anchor billing to distinct advisory/monitoring deliverables or pre-authorized T&M, with screening for potential duplication.

Question:

Please confirm PMO billing will be limited to distinct advisory/monitoring deliverables (and pre-authorized T&M), and that PRBP will screen for overlap with municipal scopes to prevent double billing or duplication of benefits.



Response:

Confirmed; however, PRBP asks that vendors note that there is a specific preference for Time and Materials invoicing structure.

Question # 33:

Reference:

The RFP provides a Schedule of Key Dates for the procurement process (issuance, question deadlines, submission deadlines), but it does not define the contract duration or the PMO's period of performance. To prepare a compliant and comparable cost proposal, proponents must understand the length of the contract, including the base period and any potential option years. Without a defined contract period, each proponent would be forced to make its own assumptions about duration, which would result in inconsistent cost proposals, undermine evaluation fairness, and make it impossible for PRBP to compare pricing on an equal basis.

Question:

Please specify the intended contract duration, including the base period and any option periods, so that all proponents can prepare consistent and comparable cost proposals. Without a defined contract term, each proponent will necessarily assume a different period of performance, making pricing non-comparable and preventing PRBP from conducting a fair and uniform evaluation.

Response:

Vendors should consider the CPF period of performance end date (12/31/2026). Any further extensions may arise contingent on any



applicable Treasury approval for extension the POP for any of the facilities.

Question # 34:

Reference:

A model agreement helps responders align exceptions, insurance endorsements, and compliance certifications and deliver a more precise price proposal.

Question:

Please provide the Model Agreement (or list of required clauses and exhibits) that PRBP intends to use for this procurement.

Response:

Draft agreements will not be provided at this time. Proponents are advised to refer to the Comptrollers Contract registry for further guidance.

Question # 35:

Reference:

Several sections reference dashboards and a communication repository (e.g., SharePoint/Teams). Understanding whether municipalities will enter/update their project data in a central system affects the PMO's data management approach and level of effort.

Question:

Will municipalities be required to upload/maintain their project information in a PRBP-designated centralized system that the PMO will



use to generate program reports? If yes, please describe the expected cadence, minimum data fields, and access controls.

Response:

While the PRBP would like to establish this protocol on a monthly basis, no specific system has been selected/implemented.

Question # 36:

Reference:

The RFP states municipalities are primary responsible parties. In practice, some municipalities may need more hands-on assistance. For pricing and risk allocation, we need to understand whether (and how) the PMO could be authorized to perform additional tasks temporarily.

Question:

If a municipality lacks the resources/expertise to carry out its responsibilities, may PRBP authorize the PMO to perform specific tasks beyond advisory/monitoring? If so, under what conditions, by what authorization mechanism (e.g., written PRBP task order), and how would such work be priced (e.g., pre-approved T&M rates) and limited to avoid role conflicts?

Response:

Yes, by written request and approval on behalf of the PRBP. Vendors should maintain same rate as for the base agreement and, if any rates are (or should be) adjusted in consideration of this component, the vendor should clearly identify the change and provide a detailed justification as to why the rate will be adjusted.



Question # 37:

Reference:

Municipal reimbursement packages submitted to PRBP typically require extensive supporting documentation to meet federal allowability and documentation standards. The RFP does not explicitly assign invoice compliance review to the PMO.

Question:

Is the PMO responsible for compliance reviews of municipal invoices submitted to PRBP? If yes, please confirm that the PMO may add the appropriate positions (e.g., financial compliance analysts) to the team structure and cost forms, and provide the expected review standards and turnaround times or will this task be assigned to the PRBP Grants Manager?

Response:

Yes, the vendor may add the appropriate components in consideration of these requirements and the PMO will be expected to provide work in collaboration with the Grant Administrator.

Question # 38:

Reference:

Given the breadth of the scope and interdependencies, responses to initial questions may surface additional items that merit clarification so all proponents can price consistently.



Question:

After PRBP posts answers to the first round of questions, may proponents submit a second set of questions within seven (7) calendar days to finalize assumptions for the price proposal?

Response:

Due to timeline constraints, the PRBP will not consider any further question submission. "

Question # 39:

Reference:

Accurate travel/logistics planning and cost estimating depend on site locations and dispersion across the island.

Question:

Please provide the list of the 34 MPCF facility locations (municipality/site) available for planning purposes.

Response:

The PRBP will be sharing a map with the general locaiton for each MPCF to provide an overall idea of the regional distribution at the end of this document."

Question # 40:

Reference:

Level of effort varies by whether each facility is in planning, design, procurement, or construction. Readiness status is essential for staffing phasing and schedule risk.



Question:

For each MPCF, please indicate current stage (e.g., planning, design, procurement, construction) and any critical path constraints known at this time.

Response:

At the moment, all Municipalities are in the planning phase and taking the necessary steps to begin the design phase, including any applicable procurements."

Question # 41:

Reference:

Section 3.1 states that each MPCF renovation will have a budget that "varies depending on the size and complexity of the renovation scope." Determining the appropriate PMO staffing levels, discipline requirements, risk management approach, reporting intensity, and construction oversight effort depends directly on the magnitude of the renovation budgets. Without at least budget ranges per project—or, at minimum, the total program budget allocated for the 34 facilities—it is not feasible to develop a realistic and defensible staffing plan or cost estimate for PMO services.

Question:

To allow proponents to accurately estimate the required level of effort, staffing, and cost, please provide the estimated budget for each of the 34 MPCF projects. If individual project values are not yet available, please provide the overall renovation program budget and any available budget ranges or tiers (e.g., small, medium, large facilities) so that proponents may appropriately size their teams and develop realistic



assumptions for project oversight, reporting, and management workload.

Response:

To assist in the analysis, an additional attachment will be included in which proponent will be able to evaluate the allocations per facility, as well as the respective cost per square footage. "

Question # 42:

Reference:

The RFP requires the PMO to provide a Project Plan per municipality within 45 days, while municipalities retain management responsibility. We want to ensure the PMO is not accountable for municipal execution outcomes.

Question:

Please confirm the PMO's "Project Plan" deliverable is advisory/management in nature (templates/schedules/risks/communications) and that municipalities will own execution decisions, updates, and approvals for their plans.

Response:

While the PMO will be expected to provide technical assistance to municipalities on these components, however this interpretation is correct. "



Question # 43:

Reference:

The SOW asks the PMO to review and provide feedback on design documents. The expected depth of technical review (peer-level vs. administrative/conformance) drives team composition and effort.

Question:

Please clarify whether PMO design reviews are intended as (a) administrative/conformance reviews for scope, functionality, and schedule; or (b) technical peer reviews by licensed professionals. If (b), please specify expected disciplines and deliverable standards.

Response:

While PMO will be centered around establishing design components to ensure a certain level of standardization of MPCF designs, the PMO's design review will in fact be intended as a conformance review for scope, functionality and schedule in nature. "

Question # 44:

Reference:

The SOW describes identifying permits and coordinating with agencies. Typically, the A/E performs technical permitting tasks, with the PMO facilitating schedules and documentation flow.

Question:

To avoid role confusion, may we interpret Permitting Support as PMO coordination/scheduling/tracking and documentation readiness, while the A/E performs technical submissions and addresses agency comments as applicant of record?



Response:

This interpretation is correct.

Question # 45:

Reference:

Multiple stakeholders are involved (PRBP, municipalities, A/E, contractors). For planning, we need to know who will issue RFPs and award contracts for design and construction services.

Question:

Which entity will issue and award the design and construction procurements (municipalities, PRBP/OMB, or other)? If variations exist, please describe the scenarios and PMO coordination expectations.

Response:

Municipalities will be responsible for procurement activities, however the PMO will be expected to monitor, review and provide assistance (as needed) on all procurement activities. "

Question # 46:

Reference:

Standard minimum qualifications for key roles improve comparability across proposals and ensure baseline capabilities for program delivery.

Question:

Will PRBP define required key positions and minimum qualifications for those roles to standardize proposal baselines? If not, should proponents propose and justify role definitions and quals that meet the SOW?



Response:

Proponents should propose and justify role definitions and qualifications which they consider necessary to ensure the projects success.

Question # 47:

Reference:

Providing indicative FTE/dedicated time guidance per key role would align pricing baselines and reduce variance driven solely by staffing assumptions.

Question:

Will PRBP provide target FTE ranges or assumed dedication levels per key role to standardize pricing.

Response:

PRBP will not be providing FTE ranges or assumed dedication levels. Proponents should leverage their expertise in similar projects on what is necessary to ensure the programs successful implementation."

Question # 48:

Reference:

Attachment D requires respondents to provide labor rates and then separately calculate profit and overhead using fields G–J. Because many firms use fully burdened labor rates or fully burdened deliverable pricing, separating overhead and profit can reduce comparability across proposals and introduces inconsistency in cost modeling. Clarifying whether fully burdened rates are acceptable will ensure consistent pricing formats across all proponents.

**Question:**

May proponents present fully burdened labor rates or deliverable pricing (inclusive of overhead and profit), and thereby remove fields G–J from the Cost Template? If not, please confirm that PRBP requires unburdened base labor rates with separately itemized overhead and profit, and that overhead/profit may not be embedded within labor rates or deliverable prices.

Response:

Proponents will be required to provide unburdened labor base labor rates with separately itemized overhead and profit.

Question # 49:**Reference:**

Cost Template 2 lists each deliverable with a “Number of Units = 1,” suggesting that each deliverable is priced as a single fixed unit. However, the RFP does not clarify how deliverables will be invoiced—whether as fixed-price deliverables, hourly work billed against time spent, or recurring deliverables priced individually. Clear invoicing requirements are essential to structure pricing, staffing, and internal PMO controls for recurring and one-time deliverables.

Question:

How does PRBP intend deliverables to be invoiced? Specifically: (1) Are deliverables fixed-price per deliverable regardless of hours expended? (2) Alternatively, are they to be invoiced based on hourly rates tied to actual time spent? (3) For recurring deliverables (e.g., bi-weekly or monthly reports), how many occurrences per year should be assumed,



and should each be priced separately or bundled? (4) Will PRBP implement a deliverable acceptance/approval process that triggers invoice eligibility?

Response:

The PRBP would prefer to be invoiced based on hourly rates tied to actual time spent. For any hybrid structures, the vendor should provide sufficient information to both inform how the amount for the deliverable was calculated and justify why that approach would be preferred."

Question # 50

Question:

Please confirm the expected start date of PMO services.

Response:

As soon as the procurement process is completed. Estimated start should be March/April."

Question # 51

Question:

Will all 34 Municipalities be expected to begin participation at the same time? Or will the program be phased?

Response:

All municipalities will be expected to begin at the same time, however the level of support will vary.

Question # 52



Question:

If phased, please provide the anticipated sequencing and the preliminary program schedule referenced in Attachment E.

Response:

All municipalities will be expected to begin at the same time, however the level of support will vary.

Question # 53

Question:

Is the PMO required to set up on-site offices for each of the 34 projects?

Response:

No, however the PMO should have the capacity and necessary staff to make recurring visits to all sites."

Question # 54

Question:

Must the PMO maintain a constant on-site presence, or is a periodic or hybrid oversight approach acceptable?

Response:

A periodic or hybrid approach would be acceptable."



Question # 55

Question:

Has the list of 34 Multipurpose Community Facilities (MPCFs)—including municipality, address, and building type—been finalized?

Response:

Yes, the list of all 34 MPCFs has been finalized."

Question # 56

Question:

Have all properties been identified and legally procured, or are any sites still awaiting acquisition or lease agreements?

Response:

All properties are owned by the respective municipalities."

Question # 57

Question:

Is baseline facility data (e.g., square footage, condition assessments, prior studies) available for the 34 properties? If not, is the PMO responsible for gathering this information during project initiation?

Response:

Baseline data is mostly available, however additional condition assessments and studies may be required. "



Question # 58

Question:

Who will be responsible for procuring any special studies that may be required?

Response:

Any special studies will be the sole responsibility of each municipality, however PMO may be required to provide some technical assistance to municipalities in procuring said studies, or ensuring that they have the adequate technical considerations. "

Question # 59

Question:

Will PRBP provide standard procurement templates (for RFPs, scopes, contracts), or must the PMO develop these?

Response:

PMO would be expected to develop standard templates in coordination and with the PRBP. "

Question # 60

Question:

Will PRBP issue standard design criteria or prototype layouts for MPCFs, or should the PMO plan for each facility to be independently programmed and designed?



Response:

While some standard design criteria have been identified, the PMO will be expected to develop standardized design criteria and help ensure that municipal design comply with these criteria.

Question # 61

Question:

Is the PMO required to perform formal constructability or cost validation reviews during design, or is its role limited to coordination and schedule tracking?

Response:

PMO will be expected to perform some cost validation reviews during the design phase, as well as coordination and schedule tracking.

Question # 62

Question:

Will any facilities require hazardous materials assessments or remediation (e.g., asbestos, lead paint)? If so, is this outside the PMO's scope?

Response:

PRBP considers that this is outside of the scope of the PMO.

Question # 63

Question:

What is the expected frequency of site visits during construction (e.g., monthly, based on milestones, or as needed)?



Response:

Frequency may vary depending on the facility, however the PMO will be expected to provide a monthly status update on all facilities.

Question # 64

Question:

Please provide estimated construction budgets per facility. Do budgets vary significantly among them?

Response:

To assist in the analysis, an additional attachment will be included in which proponent will be able to evaluate the allocations per facility, as wells as the respective cost per square footage.

Question # 65

Question:

Does PRBP anticipate external audits or monitoring reviews during design or construction that would require additional PMO support beyond routine reporting?

Response:

No external audits of monitoring reviews are expected.

Question # 66

Question:

Will PRBP supply standard reporting formats and dashboards, or will the PMO need to create them?



Response:

Some annual and quarterly reporting formats have been developed from a compliance standpoint, however the PMO will be expected to create additional standard reporting formats and dashboards to ensure adequate monitoring of all projects. "

Question # 67

Question:

Are closeout documents/reports required per facility only, or will PRBP also require a program-level summary?

Response:

PRBP will require both a program level summary, as well as a closeout documents/reports per facility."

Question # 68

Question:

Section 3.2 of the RFP notes municipalities are responsible for procurement, permitting, construction, and overall progress. Some may have more expertise than others; will PRBP provide a municipal capacity assessment to help determine varying support needs, to allow for proper resource allocation?

Response:

Municipal Capacity Assessments will be shared with the selected vendor."



Question # 69

Question:

What is the anticipated level of decision-making authority for the PMO relative to PRBP and municipalities?

Response:

Any decisions as they relate to the services being procured with this RFP will fall under the sole responsibility of the PRBP. PMO shall make sure to monitor, document, analyze and provide recommendations to the PRBP.

Question # 70

Question:

Who holds ultimate responsibility versus advisory duties regarding schedule, cost, and quality outcomes?

Response:

PMO responsibilities will be limited to Advisory, Monitoring, and providing Technical Assistance on these components.

Question # 71

Question:

Can you confirm that grants management activities are fully excluded from the PMO scope, including CPF compliance tracking tied to municipal spending?



Response:

Grant Management Activities are excluded from the PMO scope, however the PMO may be required to consider information which is required to ensure compliance tied to municipal spending.

Question # 72

Question:

In Attachment D - Cost Template: Should ""Number of Units"" for each subsection be considered as one unit for the entire program, or should costs be divided among the 34 facilities?

Response:

The proponent may include additional information or breakdowns in the pricing section of their proposal, however for the form, the proponent the number of units should be for the entirety of the program.

Question # 73

Question:

Column [D] of Cost Template 2 shows the formula for [D]Task Cost as [C] (Task Unit Cost) x [E] (Maximum Cost). Please confirm if this is correct; if not, provide the correct formula.

Response:

Column D of Cost Template 2 was included by mistake, please disregard.



Question # 74

Question:

The Cost templates (1 & 2) found in Attachment D calculate overhead and profit separately, without adding profit to the overhead. In service industries, standard service cost is usually calculated by first combining indirect overhead with direct unit costs (labor and materials), then applying a profit percentage to this total. Can the cost form be updated to reflect this approach?

Response:

PRBP request that proponents complete the form in the format provided. However, with the understanding of how these costs are usually calculated, the proponent may provide additional information as part of the proposal to clearly delineate other financial information which may not be captured with the current form. "

Question # 75

Question:

Should proponents include travel, lodging, and per diem expenses within labor rates/overhead, or as separate reimbursable costs?

Response:

For the Cost Template form, proponents should consider including these costs within the labor rate/overhead; however the PRBP would also like for proponents to include these costs within their proposal as a separate reimbursable cost.



For context, within the proposal, PRBP will permit for proponents to include a Cost proposal which is separate from the cost template form as to obtain a complete understanding of the proposed budget and to include any additional information which may not be captured with the cost template form.

Question # 76

Question:

Should staffing for all positions cover the full five-year program duration, or can staffing levels adjust by phase (planning, design, construction, closeout)?

Response:

Staffing levels should only cover expenses for the implementation phase (12/31/2026) and not consider the 5-year period for the operation of each facility. Any further extensions on time on funds would be dependent on any extension being approved for any of the facilities in consideration of the CPF period of performance end date.

Question # 77

Question:

Is completion of both Cost Template 1 and Cost Template 2 required by PRBP?

Response:

Even if the proponent includes a more detailed and granular pricing proposal, the completion of both forms is required. "



Question # 78

Question:

Should the total for Cost Template 1 match exactly with the total in Cost Template 2?"

Response

Each form should stand on its own as PRBP is trying to get a full understanding of the total resource cost, as well as an approximate cost per SOW component. Proponents should include a separate cost proposal within their proposal to capture any additional information which is not fully covered by the Cost template forms and to have a more complete understanding of their budget.

Question # 79

Question:

Please provide a copy of the draft contract or standard professional services agreement, and include insurance, indemnification, and liability limitations.

Response:

Draft agreements will not be provided at this time. Proponents are advised to refer to the Comptrollers Contract registry for further guidance.

Question # 80

Question:

Is there a page limitation for the response?



Response:

Proponents should reference pages 19 - 25 regarding any applicable requirements for the technical proposal document.

Question # 81

Question:

Is there a page size limitation for this response?

Response:

Proponents should reference pages 19 - 25 regarding any applicable requirements for the technical proposal document.

Question # 82

Question:

Are Section titles, subsections, graphics, and headlines allowed to be in a different font or more than 12 point Arial?

Response:

Proponents should reference pages 19 - 25 regarding any applicable requirements for the technical proposal document.

Question # 83

Question:

Can PRBP provide a sample contract for services under this RFP?

Response:



Draft agreements will not be provided at this time. Proponents are advised to refer to the Comptrollers Contract registry for further guidance.

Question # 84

Question:

Is there an expected list of key positions required for this RFP or is proponent supposed to recommend key positions for delivery of scope of work?

Response:

Proponents should leverage their expertise and recommend key positions for successful delivery of the scope of work.

Question # 85

Question:

What is the expected contract duration for this RFP?

Response:

Contract term will align with CPF period of performance (12/31/2026). Any extensions may be considered in the case that approval is received by Treasury (case-by-case basis) to extend POP for any of the facilities.

Question # 86

Question:

Please confirm whether the 34 MPCFs will be delivered concurrently or in phases. If phased, can PRBP share the intended phasing logic and an indicative count of facilities per phase?



Response:

While the progress of each facility may vary per municipality, the intent is for all MPCFs to be delivered concurrently.

Question # 87

Question:

If PRBP cannot release full site addresses, can you indicate the number of MPCFs per geographic region (north, south, east, west, central)?

Response:

To assist in the analysis, an additional attachment will be included in which proponent will be able to evaluate the allocations per facility, as wells as the respective cost per square footage.

Question # 88

Question:

Does PRBP have an estimated timeline distribution for planning, procurement, design, permitting, construction, and closeout across the 34 sites?

Response:

PRBP has a programmatic estimated timeline as per the approved CPF plan for MPCF facilities, however there will still be a need for each municipality to develop their own more specific timelines.



Question # 89

Question:

Does PRBP require the PMO to use specific collaboration or data platforms (e.g., SharePoint, MS Teams, Power BI), or may proponents propose their own?

Response:

PMO should consider MS Office 365 applications, however proponent's vendors may propose their own tools which they consider most effective. They must however consider all applicable GPR requirements for these types of tools and must have established adequate procedures for eventual transfer of information to the GPR. "

Question # 90

Question:

Will PRBP issue standard design criteria or reference design packages for MPCFs, or is the PMO expected to create and manage program-wide design standards?

Response:

PMO expected to develop program-wide design standards which must be adhered to by municipalities.

Question # 91

Question:

Should proponents assume that all permit-related interactions be led by the municipalities and their A/E consultants?



Response:

Yes, PMO will be limited to identification, monitoring and tracking of all applicable permit related activities in conjunction with the municipality.

Question # 92

Question:

Does PRBP expect a minimum frequency of on-site PMO construction visits, or should proponents propose a risk-based, site-specific approach?

Response:

Proponent may propose their own risk-based and site-specific approach.

Question # 93

Question:

Will PRBP evaluate the reasonableness of proposed level of effort (FTE justification) in addition to the total price as part of the Pricing and Solution & Approach criteria? Level off effort (FTE justification) in addition to the total price as part of the Pricing and Solution & Approach criteria? -of-effort (FTE justification) in addition to the total price as part of the Pricing and Solution & Approach criteria?

Response:

PRBP will evaluate the reasonableness of proposed level of effort (FTE justification) in addition to the total price as part of the Pricing and Solution & Approach criteria.



Question # 94

Question:

Should proponents assume that contractor and design consultant procurement for each MPCF will be staggered, or will all municipalities procure at approximately the same time?

Response:

Timing will vary by Municipality.

Question # 95

Question:

Will municipalities be required to adopt the PMO's documentation repository and naming conventions, or will some be permitted to use their existing systems?

Response:

Municipalities will be permitted to use their own systems, however the PMO must ensure that they capture all of the necessary documentation and establish their own set of naming convention in agreement with the PRBP.

Question # 96

Question:

Should the PMO assume responsibility for validating CPF cost allowability at the transaction level (invoices, materials, equipment), or will a separate grants management function handle that review?



Response:

Assistance may be required to validate and organize transaction information, however the actual cost allowability analysis will be done in conjunction with the grant administrator."

Question # 97

Question:

Please confirm if the Cost Templates 1 & 2 are complimentary – meaning, Cost Template 1 + Cost Template 2 = Total Cost, or simply different templates to reflect one single Total Cost Proposal?

Response:

Each form should stand on its own as PRBP is trying to get a full understanding of the total resource cost, as well as an approximate cost per SOW component. Proponents should include a separate cost proposal within their proposal to capture any additional information which is not fully covered by the Cost template forms and to have a more complete understanding of their budget.

Question # 98

Question:

Please Confirm that associated capital costs are covered by the Owner, and the cost proposal is only for professional services to manage and deliver the identified scope of work

Response:

All associated capital cost will be covered by the Municipality and cost proposal is only for professional services to manage and deliver the identified scope of work.



Question # 99

Question:

Based upon the purpose of the RFP, we are assuming that no existing fiber/broadband service is available at the existing 34 MPCPs, and the program manager will be responsible for managing the overall effort getting broadband service to each site. If this is the case, can the owner provide clarification on how far away existing service is located (meet-me point at street, additional fiber needed spliced in at a backhaul and run, etc.) and clarity on required work effort (i.e., overhead vs underground, utility conflicts, local permitting, etc.) running broadband service to each individual site?

Response:

This function will not be a part of the scope of the PMO. Some technical analysis and advisory may be required; however this component will be managed directly by each municipality."

Question # 100

Question:

Can you provide any further clarity on the planned or expected amount of renovation work required at the individual MPCP sites? Are there other improvements, (i.e., upgrades to existing electrical service system, interior or exterior building modifications, etc.) that will also be necessary to make the broadband service operable.

Response:

Planned or expected renovation work varies by site. For context, the PRBP assigned a cost per square foot for each ranging from \$85 - \$195 depending on the apparent condition of the MPCF. For those cases in



which the condition appeared to be deteriorate, the scope will include all activities necessary to fully renovate the space.

Question # 101

Question:

Confirmation that the lump sum price proposal will be total compensation to complete the identified scope of work. Would the owner entertain, selection of the most qualified firm and then negotiation of a contract / task order(s) based upon the agreed amount scope of work.

Response:

Please reference Section 5.2 of the RFP for further guidance.

Question # 102

Question:

If new service is required, would the owner entertain other possible technical solutions, i.e., microwave?

Response:

PRBP does not consider this to be a component of the proposed SOW.

Question # 103

Question:

Please provide clarity on page count and or page limit.

Response:

Proponents should reference pages 19 - 25 regarding any applicable requirements for the technical proposal document.



Question # 104

Question:

How many different municipalities are we looking to work with? Is it one building per municipality or are there multiple buildings per? This will determine how many kick-off meetings, project plans, etc. we will need to handle.

Response:

There will be a total of 34 municipalities (one facility per municipality).

Question # 105

Question:

Is the Confluence platform a requirement or desired platform for PRBP PMO delivery?

Response:

This is not a requirement for the PRBP PMO delivery. Any platforms proposed will be at the sole discretion of the proponent, however if included, they should make sure that cost allocated toward the platform development or set up are not excessive, and that they clearly justify its use case.



Question # 106

Question:

Please confirm the formula for column D of cost template 2.

Response:

Column D of Cost Template 2 was included by mistake, please disregard.

Question # 107

Question:

Please confirm that we can modify the number of units in column b of cost template 2.

Response:

No, as per the cost template, the Columns A and B of the Cost template represent each component of the SOW included in the RFP. The intent is to have a cost breakdown per each component of the SOW.

Question # 108

Question:

Please confirm the total hours in Column C of cost template 1 are per month?

Response:

No, it refers to total estimated hours for the full period of performance of the contract and the corresponding services.



Question # 109

Question:

Please confirm that the projects requested in section 4.3.5 are the ones that will be used in section 4.3.6? If not, please explain the difference.

Response:

Correct, this form should be used for both to comply with the requirements of both sections.

Question # 110

Question:

The audited financial statements requested in section 4.3.8 are for the previous 3 years. Please Confirm that the years are 2024, 2023, & 2022.

Response:

Correct, proponent should provide audited financial statements for 2024, 2023 and 2022.



OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

OMB

GOBIERNO DE PUERTO RICO

Attachment A





Attachment B

Facility #	Square Footage	Cost per SQ
1	6450.00	190
2	5361.00	190
3	5237.00	125
4	4200.00	85
5	4032.00	125
6	3453.00	110
7	4500.00	125
8	4100.00	110
9	7746.00	80
10	4405.00	190
11	7000.00	115
12	3226.00	150
13	3665.00	85
14	3087.00	85
15	11000.00	140
16	1200.00	90
17	1364.00	125
18	1000.00	90
19	4162.60	90
20	1400.00	90
21	800.00	85
22	1800.00	85
23	3630.00	85
24	4020.00	150
25	2067.00	85
26	3256.00	125
27	1800.00	125
28	1925.00	110
29	1800.00	190
30	1100.00	90
31	1622.00	110
32	3475.00	190
33	2760.00	110
34	1250.00	85
Total	117893.60	



OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

OMB

GOBIERNO DE PUERTO RICO

Page was intentionally left blank