Union Station
REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

EXHIBIT 1

Washington Union Station
P3 Financial Advisory Services Consultant

RFQ REQUEST FOR INFORMATION LOG

Date	RFI #	Reference[1]	Bidder Question	Addendum & Date	Reference[1]	USRC Response
9/16/2026	**1.1**	Section 5.2, pp. 13 to 15; Section 5.3, p. 15; Exhibit B-2, pp. 35 to 36	Conflicts arising from affiliate relationships with prospective private partners Section 5.2.2 requires disclosure of known, discovered, potential or perceived Conflicts of Interest, both direct and indirect, by the date set forth in the Procurement Schedule. Where an Offeror is part of a global financial institution that maintains lending, capital markets and advisory relationships with infrastructure investors, developers and operators who may reasonably be expected to participate in the future master developer procurement, does USRC consider such pre-existing or prospective commercial relationships to constitute a Conflict of Interest requiring disclosure at the RFQ stage, or only those relationships that relate specifically to the Project? If disclosure is required at the relationship level, will USRC accept a project-specific mitigation framework based on information barriers, personnel segregation and clearance protocols? Given that Section 5.2.2 provides that a decision will be made on whether proposed mitigation measures are adequate, will USRC confirm the adequacy of proposed mitigation measures prior to the SOQ Close Date?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Section 5.2, pp. 13 to 15; Section 5.3, p. 15; Exhibit B-2, pp. 35 to 36	USRC encourages Offerors to identify and disclose any matters they believe may be relevant under the Conflict of Interest standard set forth in Section 5.2.2 and to provide any information (including proposed mitigation measures) they consider appropriate to assist USRC's review. USRC will evaluate any disclosures and proposed mitigation measures submitted by Offerors based on the particular facts and circumstances presented and in accordance with the RFQ.
9/16/2026	**1.2**	Section 2.3.1.5, p. 6; Section 5.3, p. 15; Exhibit A, pp. 28 to 29	Downstream restrictions on the Consultant and its affiliates Exhibit A contemplates that the Consultant will support USRC through solicitation, negotiation and financial close, including compliance with lending and federal requirements, and Section 2.3.1.5 identifies experience with TIFIA, RRIF and Private Activity Bonds as a required qualification. Will USRC confirm whether the Selected Offeror and its affiliates would be restricted, during the term of the Services Agreement or thereafter, from (i) advising, financing or investing alongside bidders in the master developer procurement, and (ii) acting as underwriter, placement agent, arranger or lender in connection with Project financings, including any Private Activity Bond issuance or federal credit programme facility? If such restrictions are contemplated, will they apply at the level of the contracting entity or across all affiliates under common control, and will USRC address their scope and duration in the form of Services Agreement to be issued to Shortlisted Offerors on October 14, 2026?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Section 2.3.1.5, p. 6; Section 5.3, p. 15; Exhibit A, pp. 28 to 29	USRC will address the rights, obligations, and requirements applicable to the Selected Offeror in the RFP and/or the Services Agreement. To the extent relevant, such documents may address matters relating to conflicts of interest, procurement integrity, and performance of the Services. USRC reserves the right to determine the appropriate scope and application of any such requirements.
9/16/2026	**1.3**	Section 6.4.1.1, p. 19; Section 7.2.1.3, p. 23	Municipal advisor status, licensure and the Capacity pass/fail requirement Section 7.2.1.3 establishes as a pass/fail Minimum Requirement that the Offeror present evidence that it is authorized to perform the Services in the District of Columbia and maintains any licenses necessary to perform the Services. Section 6.4.1.1 requires documentation of any required licenses. The RFQ does not identify any specific license or registration. Will USRC clarify (i) what form of evidence of District of Columbia authorization it considers sufficient to satisfy Section 7.2.1.3; (ii) whether USRC intends the Consultant to act as a municipal advisor to USRC within the meaning of Section 15B of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the rules of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, and accordingly whether SEC municipal advisor registration is expected and (iii) whether the requirements of Sections 6.4.1.1 and 7.2.1.3 apply to the Offeror only, or also to each proposed subconsultant and, where the Offeror is a Joint Venture, to each JV Member individually?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Section 6.4.1.1, p. 19; Section 7.2.1.3, p. 23	For purposes of Section 7.2.1.3, Offerors should provide evidence demonstrating that they are authorized to do business in the District of Columbia, such as applicable business registration, formation, or qualification documents, together with documentation of any licenses required to perform the Services (as determined by the Offeror). USRC will evaluate compliance with the Minimum Requirements based on the information submitted by each Offeror and in accordance with the RFQ. Offerors should provide information for the Offeror and any other entities that would be performing the Services to the extent required by the RFQ. USRC will evaluate compliance with the Minimum Requirements and other RFQ requirements based on the information submitted in each SOQ.

9/16/2026	**1.4**	Section 2.4, pp. 6 to 7; Section 6.4, p. 19; Section 7.2.1, p. 23; Exhibit B-4, p. 39	Insurance requirements and self-insurance The RFQ does not set out insurance requirements, does not require evidence of insurance as part of the Section 6.4 forms and business documents, and does not include insurance among the Minimum Requirements in Section 7.2.1. Section 2.4.1 provides that USRC reserves the right to update, modify or supplement its requirements prior to execution of the Services Agreement. Will USRC confirm (i) that no evidence of insurance is required at the RFQ stage; and (ii) whether insurance requirements are expected to be imposed under the Services Agreement, and if so, whether the required coverages, limits and endorsements will be disclosed to Shortlisted Offerors with the form of Services Agreement on October 14, 2026 so that they can be assessed before Proposals are prepared? Further, certain Offerors do not procure third-party commercial insurance for professional liability and comparable exposures, and instead maintain a formal self-insurance programme supported by the balance sheet of the ultimate parent, which in many cases carries a credit profile materially stronger than that of a commercial carrier meeting a typical minimum rating threshold. Will USRC confirm whether self-insurance, evidenced by a letter of self-insurance and audited financial statements of the responsible entity, is acceptable in satisfaction of any such requirement, whether in whole or in part? If USRC requires certificates of insurance from an admitted or rated carrier, will USRC identify the coverages and limits contemplated, and confirm whether a waiver, alternative compliance mechanism or negotiated accommodation would be entertained, given that Section 2.4.3 provides that the USRC Supplementary General Provisions are non-negotiable and not subject to modification?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Section 2.4, pp. 6 to 7; Section 6.4, p. 19; Section 7.2.1, p. 23; Exhibit B-4, p. 39	USRC is not requiring evidence of insurance coverage status as part of the RFQ submission process unless otherwise expressly stated in the RFQ. USRC reserves the right to update, modify, or supplement its requirements with respect to the insurance that must be obtained and maintained by the Selected Offeror prior to execution of the Services Agreement. Requirements applicable to the Selected Offeror, including any insurance-related requirements, will be addressed in the RFP and/or Services Agreement, as applicable. USRC is not providing additional guidance at the RFQ stage regarding specific insurance requirements, acceptable forms of coverage, self-insurance arrangements, alternative compliance mechanisms, waivers, or other insurance-related matters that may be addressed in future procurement documents.
9/16/2026	**1.5**	Section 5.1.2, p. 13; Section 5.6, p. 16; Section 6.4.2, p. 19	Treatment of affiliated entities under the Offeror structure provisions Section 5.6.1 defines a Joint Venture as a contractual arrangement or legal entity formed by two or more entities, and Section 5.6.2 imposes joint and several liability on each JV Member. Where an Offeror intends to deliver the Services using personnel employed by two or more affiliated legal entities under common ultimate ownership, will USRC treat that Offeror as a single entity for purposes of Sections 5.6 and 6.4.2, or as a Joint Venture requiring a JV letter and joint and several liability from each affiliate? Relatedly, will USRC confirm whether the restriction in Section 5.1.2 on a company or affiliate participating on behalf of more than one Offeror is assessed at the level of the contracting entity or at the level of the ultimate parent group?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Section 5.1.2, p. 13; Section 5.6, p. 16; Section 6.4.2, p. 19	Offerors should clearly identify all entities participating in their proposed team structure, including any affiliated entities that would be performing Services, and describe their respective roles in the performance of the Services. USRC will evaluate compliance with Sections 5.1, 5.6, and other applicable RFQ requirements based on the information submitted and the particular facts and circumstances presented by the Offeror. USRC reserves the right to make determinations regarding organizational structures, affiliations, and participation arrangements in accordance with the RFQ based on the information submitted by the Offeror.
9/16/2026	**1.6**	Section 6.6, Selection Question 3, pp. 20 to 21; Section 6.6.2, p. 20	Reference Project eligibility and client confidentiality Selection Question 3 requires three Reference Projects performed within the past five years, together with a client contact name and contact details, and provides that USRC may conclude that no reference was given where it cannot validate a Reference Project. Will USRC clarify (i) whether "performed within the past five (5) years" refers to engagements active at any point during that period or only to engagements completed within it; (ii) whether mandates that are well advanced but have not yet reached financial close or contract award are eligible, given that sub-item (i) of the required response calls for the final outcome or current status; (iii) whether engagements performed on the private sector or sponsor side of a P3, as distinct from the public sector side, qualify as "similar services" for purposes of Section 6.6.2; and (iv) how USRC would prefer an Offeror to treat a Reference Project subject to a client confidentiality undertaking that prevents identification of the client or the release of a client contact, including whether a redacted description accompanied by an alternative reference would be acceptable?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Section 6.6, Selection Question 3, pp. 20 to 21; Section 6.6.2, p. 20	(i) Reference Projects may include projects performed within the past five years, whether completed during that period or substantially performed during that period. Please provide a level of specify regarding the level of responsibility/involvement on each reference project. (ii) Projects that have not yet reached financial close or final implementation may be submitted, provided the Offeror clearly describes the current status and relevance of the engagement. (iii) Engagements performed on the private sector and sponsor side are also permitted. USRC will consider the relevance of each Reference Project based on the nature of the services provided and the experience demonstrated by the Offeror (including its level of responsibility in the Reference Project). (iv) Where confidentiality obligations limit the information that may be disclosed, Offerors should provide as much information as reasonably possible while complying with applicable confidentiality requirements. USRC reserves the right to determine whether sufficient information has been provided to evaluate the Reference Project information submitted by the Offeror.

9/16/2026	**1.7**	Section 1.2.1.5, p. 4; Sections 2.1.3 and 2.1.4, p. 5; Exhibit A, pp. 28 to 29	Scope perimeter and the First Phase calendar year 2026 target Exhibit A states that USRC aims to complete the First Phase activities, including Value-for-Money analysis, Public Sector Comparator, business case development, detailed financial modeling of Station revenues and expenses, development and partner fees, and Cost and Schedule Risk Assessment, in calendar year 2026, while the Procurement Schedule contemplates that the form of Services Agreement and an updated Scope of Services will not be issued to Shortlisted Offerors until October 14, 2026. Will USRC confirm whether the calendar year 2026 First Phase target is being re-based in light of the procurement timetable, and whether revised phasing will be reflected in the updated Scope of Services issued with the RFP? In addition, will USRC clarify (i) how the outputs of the Federal Railroad Administration rail optimization study referenced in Section 2.1.3 are expected to sequence into the Consultant's First Phase analysis; and (ii) whether the Station's existing commercial arrangements, including the third-party property management and parking management arrangements described in Section 1.2.1.5, and the state of good repair and existing concourse improvement projects excluded from the Project under Section 2.1.4, fall within the Consultant's analytical perimeter for revenue, expense and debt capacity modeling?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Section 1.2.1.5, p. 4; Sections 2.1.3 and 2.1.4, p. 5; Exhibit A, pp. 28 to 29	As described in the RFQ, the Scope of Services included in Exhibit A is intended as a high-level summary of the anticipated Services that would be requested from the Selected Offeror, and USRC reserves the right to modify or supplement the scope, schedule, sequencing, and other requirements relating to the Services during the procurement process. Additional information regarding the Scope of Services, Project schedule, and phasing may be provided, as appropriate, in the RFP and related procurement documents. The Consultant's responsibilities, including coordination with related Project workstreams, use of available studies and analyses, and the assumptions and inputs to be considered in connection with the Consultant's work, may be further addressed in the RFP and any updated Scope of Services.
9/16/2026	**1.8**	Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3, pp. 6 to 7; Exhibit B-1, pp. 31 to 34; Exhibit B-4, p. 39	Applicability of federal flow-down requirements to a professional services contract Section 2.4.2 advises that the RFP and any resulting contract must conform to applicable federal requirements, citing among others Small Business requirements, Buy America(n) under 49 U.S.C. § 22905(a) and Davis-Bacon wage rates. Section 2.4.3 provides that the USRC Supplementary General Provisions at Exhibit B-4 are non-negotiable and that requests to change them or related FRA grant flow-down requirements will be denied. Will USRC clarify which of these requirements it considers applicable to a contract for financial advisory services, as distinct from a construction or manufactured-goods contract, in particular whether Davis-Bacon wage rates and Buy America(n) domestic preference obligations are expected to apply to the Services, and if so, in what manner? Will USRC also confirm whether any Small Business, subcontracting or participation goals will be established for this procurement, and if so, whether they will be set out in the RFP and how they will be evaluated?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3, pp. 6 to 7; Exhibit B-1, pp. 31 to 34; Exhibit B-4, p. 39	The selected consultant will be required to comply with applicable federal requirements associated with the Project and any related FRA grant funding sources. Additional information regarding applicable federal requirements, including any flow-down provisions, will be provided in the RFP and/or proposed Services Agreement. Offerors should not assume that all examples cited in the RFQ will apply in the same manner to all categories of Services and should make their own determination at this stage about which requirements are likely to apply based on their experience with similarly situated projects. Any applicable small business or participation requirements will be identified in the procurement documents as appropriate.
9/16/2026	**1.9**	Section 7.3.2, p. 24; Section 7.4.2, p. 24; Section 7.5.1, p. 25; Section 8.2.1.22, p. 26	Evaluation weightings and pre-shortlist diligence Section 7.3.2 lists the evaluation criteria in order of importance and Section 7.5.1 provides that each Selection Committee member will assign a numerical score, but the RFQ does not set out a scoring scale or the relative weightings applied to each criterion. Will USRC publish the scoring scale and the weighting applied to each of the five criteria, or confirm that the stated order of importance is the only weighting that will be applied? Separately, in light of the rights reserved under Sections 7.4.2 and 8.2.1.22, does USRC currently intend to conduct Reference Project client reference checks, request additional information or supporting documentation, or hold interviews or confidential one-on-one meetings with Offerors prior to the announcement of the shortlist on October 14, 2026? If so, will Offerors be given advance notice so that Key Personnel and client contacts can be made available within the timeframes established by USRC?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Section 7.3.2, p. 24; Section 7.4.2, p. 24; Section 7.5.1, p. 25; Section 8.2.1.22, p. 26	USRC intends to evaluate SOQs in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in Section 7.3.2 of the RFQ. The evaluation criteria are listed in order of importance. USRC does not anticipate publishing additional information regarding scoring scales or weightings during the RFQ phase. As set forth in the RFQ, USRC reserves the right to conduct reference checks, request additional information or supporting documentation, interview Offerors, and/or hold confidential one-on-one meetings as part of the evaluation process. USRC will determine whether to undertake any such activities based on the needs of the procurement process and will communicate with affected Offerors as appropriate.

9/16/2026	**1.10**	Section 6.1.5, pp. 17 to 18; Section 6.2.2, p. 18; Section 6.4.1.1, p. 19; Section 6.6, p. 20; Table of Contents, p. 2	Consolidated administrative and formatting clarifications Offeror requests clarification of the following administrative points so that the SOQ conforms precisely to the required format: (i)The Selection Questions section is numbered inconsistently. The Table of Contents refers to "6.6 Section 6: Selection Questions," the heading at Section 6.6 reads "Section 4: Selection Questions," and the table at Section 6.2.2 lists Selection Questions as the fourth required section. Which section number should be used on the section tab and in the SOQ table of contents? (ii)Section 6.4.1.1 states that executed forms and business documents shall not count towards "the page limits set forth in Section 6.5.1 below," although page limits also appear in Section 6.6. Please confirm that forms and business documents are excluded from all page limits in the RFQ. (iii)Section 6.1.5.5 requires that responses include the text of the questions. Please confirm whether the reprinted question text counts toward the page limits prescribed for each Selection Question. (iv)Section 6.1.5.1 permits organizational charts on an 11" x 17" page layout while Section 6.1.2 requires a single .pdf submission. Please confirm that an 11" x 17" page may be embedded within the single searchable .pdf, and that the sequential page numbering required by Section 6.1.5.2 continues across it. (v)Please confirm whether USRC applies any maximum file size or attachment limit for the SOQ submission to bids@usrcdc.com, and the preferred method of delivery should the submission exceed it.	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Section 6.1.5, pp. 17 to 18; Section 6.2.2, p. 18; Section 6.4.1.1, p. 19; Section 6.6, p. 20; Table of Contents, p. 2	(i) Offerors may follow the structure set forth in the RFQ's required submission sections. Minor discrepancies in section numbering will not be grounds for disqualification provided the submission is clear, contains all required information and is organized consistently with the RFQ's requirements. (ii) Forms and business documents required pursuant to Section 6.4 are excluded from applicable page limitations. (iii) The reprinted Selection Question text required by Section 6.1.5.5 will not count toward the applicable page limits. (iv) An 11" x 17" organizational chart may be included within the single searchable PDF submission. Sequential page numbering should be maintained throughout the SOQ. (v) The maximum file size is 20 MB.
9/16/2026	**2.1**	Pg. 4, Section 1.2.1.5; Pg. 15, Section 5.3.1	Section 1.2.1.5 of the RFQ states that "USRC engaged Jones Lang LaSalle ("JLL") as its third-party property manager for the Station and Colonial Parking as its third-party manager for the parking garage connected to the Station." Are these two entities also considered "Restricted Parties" under section 5.3.1 of the RFQ?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Pg. 4, Section 1.2.1.5; Pg. 15, Section 5.3.1	Offerors should review Section 5.3 of the RFQ and evaluate their circumstances accordingly. USRC is not providing additional entity-specific determinations regarding Restricted Party status during the RFQ phase. Any determinations regarding Restricted Parties may be made in accordance with the RFQ and based on the particular facts and circumstances presented.
9/16/2026	**2.2**	Pg. 5, Section 2.1.3	What is the timeline for the FRA's rail optimization study, described in Section 2.1.3?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Pg. 5, Section 2.1.3	USRC may indicate in the RFP process whether this information is available.
9/16/2026	**2.3**	Pg. 4, Section 1.2.1.4	Operational control of the Station transferred to USRC on January 1, 2026 under a Cooperative Agreement among USDOT, FRA, Amtrak and USRC. Can USRC describe Project governance at a high level, including how Project decisions will be approved, and what other interagency coordination or approvals are anticipated?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Pg. 4, Section 1.2.1.4	The selected Consultant will be expected to support USRC in connection with Project development, procurement, and implementation activities as further described in the RFQ and any subsequent procurement documents. Additional information regarding Project governance, stakeholder coordination, and approval processes may be provided during subsequent phases of the procurement process, as appropriate.
9/16/2026	**2.4**	Pg. 28, Exhibit A	What existing data, reports, or models (e.g. ridership forecasts, revenue studies, asset condition assessments) will be made available to the Consultant to develop the Value-for-Money, Public Sector Comparator, Cost and Schedule Risk Assessment, or other associated analyses?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Pg. 28, Exhibit A	USRC anticipates making available relevant information, studies, reports, data, and other materials reasonably necessary to support performance of the Services, subject to availability, confidentiality restrictions, and procurement considerations. The nature, scope, and timing of information to be made available to the selected Consultant may be further addressed in the RFP and/or Services Agreement. Offerors should base their SOQs on the information currently provided in the RFQ. Additional Project information, including available studies, analyses, reports, and other supporting materials, may be provided during subsequent phases of the procurement process, as appropriate.
9/16/2026	**2.5**	Pg. 28, Exhibit A	Exhibit A states USRC aims to complete First Phase activities in calendar year 2026. In precedent transactions, activities included in First Phase activities (including development of analytical models, detailed financial modeling of Station revenues and expenses, preparation of a Value for Money analysis, preparation of a Public Sector Comparator and development of a Project business case) have taken multiple months to complete. Given the RFP will not be issued until after shortlisting on October 14, 2026, can USRC provide more detail on the anticipated contract award or notice-to-proceed dates?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Pg. 28, Exhibit A	USRC continues to evaluate the Project schedule and procurement timeline. USRC may provide additional information regarding the procurement schedule, scope, and sequencing of services as appropriate during subsequent phases of the procurement process and the schedule is subject to change at USRC's discretion.

9/16/2026	**2.6**	Exhibit B-5, Pages 40-44	In Exhibit B-5, pages 40-44, we respectfully ask USRC to consider the following modifications to the Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Agreement to align to our professional standards and organizational structures typical in the industry: •In 2. Confidential Information, please rewrite (i) as follows to reflect organizational structures typical in our industry: "…is or becomes generally available to the public other than as a result of a disclosure by or through Recipient or any of its directors, officers, members, partners, principals, employees, agents, affiliates, vendors, subcontractors, or independent contractors (individually, a "Recipient Party" and…" •At the end of 5. Return of Confidential Information, please add the following to permit us to retain a copy for our records in order to maintain compliance with professional standards: "Notwithstanding the foregoing, Recipient may retain a copy of Confidential Information, including, without limitation, information received, developed, or otherwise relating to this engagement, in order to comply with its contractual obligations and applicable professional standards."	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	Exhibit B-5, Pages 40-44	USRC expects Offerors responding to the RFQ to execute the form of NDA that was attached to the RFQ. To the extent that any Offerors determine it is necessary to add or modify the confidentiality provisions set forth in the NDA, such Offeror is free to propose changes to the form of Services Agreement that addresses the revised confidentiality language sought by the Offeror (although, as noted in the RFP, Offerors are discouraged from seeking extensive changes to the form of Services Agreement) .
9/16/2026	**2.7**	General	Could USRC consider holding a pre-proposal conference or informational session for prospective offerors?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	General	No
9/16/2026	**3.1**	General	Could you please confirm (1) whether USRC expects to engage outside counsel for this project via a separate solicitation, or (2) whether USRC expects any legal services to be performed under any contract resulting from this current solicitation?	**Addendum #1 9/23/2026**	General	Yes, we have real estate and general counsel engaged for USRC's benefit. However, offerors should advise on what other legal services the scope will necessitate, outline them and include them in their proposal.

Note 1: indicate RGQ, RFP, Drawing, Specification, etc. page, section, detail, number, etc.