

**Division of Financial Management  
Department of Procurement  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
45 W. Gude Drive, Suite 3100  
Rockville, Maryland 20850**

**May 19, 2026**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**The following are questions and responses regarding  
RFP No 4604.1 Consultant for School Consolidation and Closures Study for Elementary and Middle Schools and  
Countywide Elementary and Middle School Boundary Study**

Question 1	If firms wish to propose optional or supplemental services beyond the defined scope, is there a preferred way those should be presented within the proposal?
Answer 1	<b>MCPS prefers that any optional or supplemental services be listed separately and not included as part of the scope requested.</b>
Question 2	Does all the information need to be in the same order that it's numbered in each section, or just the sections need to be in that exact order?
Answer 2	<b>The sections should be in order.</b>
Question 3	Can you clarify what is meant by "Must have ability to use MCPS planning zones"? Do the planning zones already exist as GIS shapefiles, or will the consultant be expected to create shapefiles?
Answer 3	<b>The planning zones, which we call School Analysis Zones (SAZs), are in ESRI file geodatabase or shapefile format. The consultant will be expected to use the SAZ GIS files in the process of rezoning school boundaries.</b>
Question 4	Who is the intended audience for data dashboards? Internal district staff, external stakeholders, both?
Answer 4	<b>Data dashboards are intended for everyone particularly external stakeholders.</b>
Question 5	Can MCPS share a budget range or estimated contract value for this engagement?
Answer 5	<b>We are not disclosing a budget amount at this time. Our goal is to foster a competitive environment that encourages offerors to propose innovative, cost-effective solutions and their absolute best pricing based on the outlined scope of work.</b>
Question 6	Does MCPS have existing translation/interpretation services for the multilingual engagement requirement, or is the consultant expected to provide this?
Answer 6	<b>MCPS does have in-house interpretation services for certain languages and can bring in</b>

	<b>other services as needed, however any technical assistance the consultant can provide in terms of translation and interpretation would be useful.</b>
Question 7	<p>Task 3.0 references a "holistic portfolio review and assessment of all MCPS facilities." Could MCPS clarify what this review is expected to encompass? Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What data and documentation will MCPS provide to support the portfolio review (e.g., facility condition assessments, existing utilization reports, capital improvement plans, site surveys)?</li> <li>○ Are consultants expected to conduct independent facility assessments or site visits, or will the review rely solely on data provided by MCPS?</li> </ul>
Answer 7	<b>MCPS will furnish facility condition assessments for many of the schools, existing utilization reports, capital improvement plans, and site surveys for all properties. The consultants may need to conduct independent facility assessments and site visits as required.</b>
Question 8	The RFP asks consultants to "determine adequate community information meetings" but does not specify a minimum number. Could MCPS provide any guidance on the expected number of community meetings, either as a floor or as a reference point from comparable countywide planning processes MCPS has undertaken previously (e.g., prior boundary studies or facility planning efforts)
Answer 8	<b>MCPS anticipates at minimum of 12 in-person and 4 virtual community meetings in SY26-27 and a minimum of 12 in-person and 4 virtual community meetings in SY27-28.</b>
Question 9	Has MCPS established a budget or budget range for this engagement? Any guidance on the anticipated investment would help consultants develop a cost proposal that is realistic and aligned with MCPS's expectations.
Answer 9	<b>Please see the response to question 5.</b>
Question 10	Beyond the datasets referenced (e.g., enrollment projections and planning zones), does MCPS maintain standardized data or methodologies related to facility condition and utilization, and will these be made available to the selected consultant?
Answer 10	<b>MCPS has recently completed facility condition assessments for all schools. They are available online and will be utilized during this process. Utilization information will be shared for all schools as outlined in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) documents.</b>
Question 11	What is the expected budget for the project?
Answer 11	<b>Please see the response to question 5.</b>
Question 12	Can MCPS provide high-level expectations for the number of schools included in the analysis and the scale of stakeholder engagement across both phases?

<b>Answer 12</b>	<b>Approximately 250 facilities and properties (including closed schools and future sites) will be included in the part 1 analysis and 150-175 schools will be included in the part 2 boundary study. MCPS expects robust stakeholder engagement with multiple meetings held in person and virtually.</b>
Question 13	Is there a budget range or ceiling MCPS has in mind for this work?
<b>Answer 13</b>	<b>Please see the response to question 5.</b>
Question 14	How many elementary and middle schools (including closed sites) are we looking at for the Phase 1 review?
<b>Answer 14</b>	<b>Please see the response to Question 12.</b>
Question 15	Does MCPS have a rough expectation for the number of community meetings per phase?
<b>Answer 15</b>	<b>Please see the response to question 8.</b>
Question 16	Is there currently a consultant handling related work, and if so, would there be a handoff/transition period?
<b>Answer 16</b>	<b>There should not be a handoff/transition period.</b>
Question 17	If multiple awards are made (as noted in Section 6), how would the work be split?
<b>Answer 17</b>	<b>That would be determined but the evaluation committee. This cannot be determined until the committee is able to review the offers and determine what would be in the best interest of MCPS.</b>
Question 18	What GIS/ESRI data will MCPS provide, and what would we need to develop on our own?
<b>Answer 18</b>	<b>MCPS will provide shapefiles of the SAZs, elementary school boundaries, and middle school boundaries. The consultant needs to develop multiple boundary change options from at least 4 options each for elementary and middle school boundaries for the first round of public meetings. There will be more than one round of options presented.</b>
Question 19	Could you share the six Regional Program Model boundaries, since alignment with them is required?
<b>Answer 19</b>	<b>A copy of the regional program map is attached. See MS2027 and HS2027.</b>
Question 20	Would MCPS consider ISO 27001 or NIST 800-171 in place of SOC 2 Type 2 for firms not storing student data?
<b>Answer 20</b>	<b>Yes, we would like to see the results of the third-party assessor for either or both. We would also require the assessment report and not solely the certification.</b>
Question 21	Is there any flexibility on the \$5M cyber liability insurance requirement for planning consultants?
<b>Answer 21</b>	<b>Yes, there is flexibility and MCPS is interested in knowing whether the consultant is providing any cyber liability insurance.</b>

Question 22	<p>In the Technical Requirements, the distinct parts of the proposal are listed as the following. Is it correct that our proposed approach to Tasks 1-6 would be included in section C?</p> <p>A. Qualifications of the Firm and Individuals  B. Additional Qualifications  C. Document qualifications and experience related to the following topics as they apply to completion of tasks outlined in section 3.0  D. Management Team and Approach  E. Cost/Fee Structure</p>
Answer 22	<b>Yes.</b>
Question 23	<p>The RFP describes Phase 1 (consolidation/closure study) and Phase 2 (boundary study) as sequential, with Board of Education action on Phase 1 anticipated in May 2027 before Phase 2 begins. If the Board delays or significantly modifies Phase 1 recommendations, how will that affect the consultant's scope and timeline obligations for Phase 2?</p>
Answer 23	<b>It is possible that the Phase 1 decision could affect Phase 2 and if that were to happen MCPS would revisit the established timelines for deliverables with the consultant.</b>
Question 24	<p>The RFP references the MCPS Regional Program Model launching in August 2027, with the expectation that boundary study outcomes align to six program regions. Can MCPS share the current regional boundary definitions and any constraints or assumptions that the consultant must incorporate from the outset?</p>
Answer 24	<b>Yes, MCPS will share all of this information.</b>
Question 25	<p>The RFP notes that the Board recently adopted boundary resolutions related to Woodward, Northwood, Wootton, and Damascus high schools. To what extent are the feeder patterns and elementary/middle attendance zones affected by those decisions already fixed, and which are still subject to revision through this study?</p>
Answer 25	<p><b>While recently changed feeder patterns are considered they are one of four factors in MCPS policy FAA, so each school in this study will still be evaluated regardless of whether it was impacted by a recent boundary study.</b></p> <p><b>One of the four factors to be considered in boundary studies is stability of school assignment, so further impact to families of students impacted by the recently adopted boundary resolutions at the secondary level will be taken into consideration. In many cases students were recently reassigned to different middle and high schools and it will be important to distinguish between geographic areas that have been subject to recent change, effectively implementing beginning in the 2027-2028 school year through the 2031-2032 school year and those that have not.</b></p> <p><b>Facility utilization is another factor that must be considered. Facilities that are underutilized may either be brought up to the desired range by gaining students from other schools, or facilities that will become underutilized and have the ability to send students to other nearby schools are considered for consolidation or closure.</b></p>

	<p><b>Demographic considerations are one of the four factors that must be considered and include the rate of free and reduced meals (FARMS) and EML (emergent multilingual learners) as well as schools’ current positions in “tiers” which determine staffing and Title 1 and community schools status which determines additional resources schools may be eligible to receive.</b></p> <p><b>Geography is one of the other factors that must be considered. MCPS has many split articulations, “island assignments” and non-contiguous boundaries that will need to be examined during this study to determine whether it makes sense to clean them up.</b></p>
Question 26	The RFP mentions that enrollment projections already exist for current attendance zones, and that new projections will need to be developed only for reassigned geographies. Who within MCPS is responsible for developing those new sub-geography projections, the consultant, MCPS staff, or jointly?
Answer 26	<b>The consultant will be responsible for developing the new sub-geography projections along with guidance from MCPS staff.</b>
Question 27	Can you clarify that the consultant will utilize the current state of MCPS's facility <u>condition</u> data, and that updated <u>condition</u> data will not be required to be conducted by the consultant as part of the overall facility portfolio review and assessment?
Answer 27	<b>Yes, the consultant will use the most current facility condition data as it is available. There however may be some facilities such as closed schools that were not part of the condition assessment and while some information is available about their conditions that MCPS can provide to the consultant it will not be as comprehensive as that which we have for the current open school facilities.</b>
Question 28	Can the consultant utilize its own boundary data analysis and mapping tool set if it is compatible with the ESRI platform?
Answer 28	<b>If the consultant wishes to use its own boundary data analysis and mapping tool set compatible with the ESRI platform, yes, however its capabilities and limitations will need to be described in great detail so that MCPS can evaluate.</b>
Question 29	The RFP calls for "a combination of in-person and virtual meetings" across two rounds of consolidation/closure options and two rounds of boundary options but does not specify the expected number of meetings or geographic distribution. What is MCPS's expectation for the total number of community engagement events in both rounds, and will the consultant be expected to facilitate sessions across all parts of the county?
Answer 29	<b>Please see Question 8. The consultant will be expected to facilitate sessions across all parts of the county.</b>
Question 30	Who is responsible for logistical support at community meetings: room reservations, translation/interpretation services, AV setup, printing of materials? Will the consultant be expected to cover those costs within the proposal budget, or will MCPS provide those services directly?

<b>Answer 30</b>	<b>MCPS will provide the logistical support and cover the cost for the community meetings including reserving rooms, arranging for translation and interpretation, AV setup, and printing maps and handouts.</b>
Question 31	The RFP references Board Policy ABA on community engagement, which emphasizes culturally responsive and antiracist engagement. Does MCPS have existing relationships with community-based organizations or trusted messengers in underrepresented communities that the consultant would be expected to work through, or is the outreach strategy fully at the consultant's discretion?
<b>Answer 31</b>	<b>Yes, MCPS has existing relationships with community-based organizations and individuals in underrepresented communities and MCPS will take the lead on outreach with these groups.</b>
Question 32	The RFP asks the consultant to "examine the Paired Schools model at the elementary level to see if any unpairing studies should be undertaken." Can MCPS provide information on the Paired School Model?
<b>Answer 32</b>	<b>The paired school model is currently Kindergarten through second at one school paired with third through fifth grade at the "paired school". In one instance two grades 3 through 5 schools are paired with one "primary" or grades K-2 school. In the rest of the instances, it is a 1:1 pairing.</b>
Question 33	Does the district have a total budget in mind for this engagement?
<b>Answer 33</b>	<b>Please see the response to Question 5.</b>
Question 34	Does the district intend to consider academics, operations, building conditions, etc., as a part of this transformation process?
<b>Answer 34</b>	<b>Yes, it is MCPS' intent to consider operations, building conditions, academic programs, and several related considerations.</b>
Question 35	To what extent does MCPS expect consultants to work closely with district demographers / planners vs. an independent, consultant-led process?
<b>Answer 35</b>	<b>MCPS expects consultants to work very closely with the district's planning team and demographer with frequent meetings and internal reviews.</b>
Question 36	What does MCPS anticipate the public-facing role of district leadership will be in community engagement?
<b>Answer 36</b>	<b>District leadership will have a strong public-facing role side-by-side the consultant during community engagement. The consultants will always be joined by MCPS representation.</b>
Question 37	What is the most recent Facility Condition Assessment that would be made available to support this process?
<b>Answer 37</b>	<b>Please see the most recent Facility Condition Assessments on this website <a href="https://ww2.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/departments/facilities/FCI/">https://ww2.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/departments/facilities/FCI/</a></b>

Question 38	Has MCPS initiated any community engagement to begin developing evaluation criteria and metrics?
<b>Answer 38</b>	<b>No, MCPS has not yet initiated any community engagement to begin developing evaluation criteria and metrics.</b>
Question 39	Is there any documentation from previous facilities planning efforts that can be made available for review?
<b>Answer 39</b>	<b>Yes.</b>
Question 40	Will the consolidation analysis consider changes to specialized programs (e.g. magnet schools, alternative schools, etc.)?
<b>Answer 40</b>	<b>The consolidation analysis will have spin-off programmatic considerations however those would be handled by MCPS, not the consultant.</b>

  
 Angela McIntosh Davis  
 Director

AMD

Please indicate your receipt of this notice by signing below and returning with your proposal.

Accepted By: \_\_\_\_\_

(Name & Title) Name of Company: \_\_\_\_\_