THE PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM IS TO PROVIDE ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

NOTE: Similar requests for information that were received from different Contractors have been grouped under a single addendum item where appropriate, with a single comprehensive answer provided.

The following items offer clarifications that <u>do not change</u> any requirements of the RFP documents.

Item 1-1Question:We are looking at the Montgomery College's A/E Task Order Services for Three Campuses
and Leased Facilities RFP and have a few questions:
For Schedule E : Building Enclosure Consultant and Schedule I: Facilities Conditions
Assessment Consultant, can you provide examples of any planned/typical projects, and/or
examples of projects previously done under those categories so we can have a more clear
idea of what would be required? For Schedule E and Schedule I, are those typically lead by
a specific type of engineer or architect? If it's an engineer, please clarify what type of
engineer leads those projects.

<u>Answer:</u> We are looking for specialist firms in those categories. For building envelope consultant, they will provide peer review during design process, they will be our 3rd party Cx agent during construction, they will also be retained to evaluate building envelope systems on existing building. They will troubleshoot any building envelope breaches and provide a repair solution... just to list a few scenarios.

For Facilities Conditions Assessment consultants, they typically will conduct facility conditions survey, perform life cycle cost analysis, and estimate probable costs for deferred maintenance, and assign priority for assets replacement. They will typically be asked to place the survey results and cost estimate in a database so information can easily be retrieved for project assignment or budget requests.

- Item 1-2 Question: Are we permitted to prime in one schedule of services category and serve as a subconsultant on other categories?
 - <u>Answer</u>: It is the intention of this RFP to select single firms (up to three highest scored) for each service category. Sub-consultant information is not required to include in the proposal submission, but will be determined based on each task order project needs after the contract award. We also do not intend to have join venture firms or temporary partnership formed just for this solicitation.
- Item 1-3 <u>Question</u>: Are both Parts I and II of the GSA 330 Form required?

Answer: Yes. Both Parts I and II of the GSA 330 Form are required.

Item 1-4:	<u>Question:</u>	We are to complete a GSA SF330 as well as the Questionnaire. However, many of the questions in the Questionnaire mirror sections of the SF330 – is it appropriate for us to reference those sections as our answers, rather than repeat our material?
	<u>Answer</u> :	Firms can refer duplicated Part I information to answers appeared in the Qualification Questionnaire if so choose. Cited have to be clear and easy to follow as each reviewer has limited time to review the submitted packages. Disorganized submission may hamper the scoring potentials.
ltem 1-5	Q <u>uestion</u> :	Can you tell me if MDOT is the correct certifying agency when selecting firms to fulfill the MBE goal?
	<u>Answer</u> :	As the College does not have small business certification program in place, we accept all types of SBE certificates issued by the public agencies in Maryland, DC and northern Virgina, such as MDOT, locate counties and municipalities.
ltem 1-6	Question:	We wanted to confirm that we would be eligible to be awarded more than one contract?
	Answer:	Yes, it is possible.
Item 1-7	<u>Question</u> :	On page 002213-1, in paragraph 3.3, it states that "Offeror is encouraged to develop a plan that, at a minimum, will award 15% of the total contract value to subconsultants and/or vendors that are minority businesses". As a large MEP engineering firm, this is a requirement we are very familiar with, however have seen that for task order services work, where future project scope is not totally defined, Universities will often satisfy this requirement by issuing contracts to a mix of MBE and non-MBE firms.
		Can you please confirm whether it is Montgomery College's preference for us, as a non- MBE firm, to propose a subcontractor relationship, or rather what I have described above?
	<u>Answer</u> :	It is the intent of this RFP to select a single firm for each service category. The College is not seeking a joint ventured firm, or temporary partnership formed just for this solicitation. We also do not require any subconsultant information including minority subconsultant in the proposal submission.
		Offerors are encouraged to include their MBE participation goal in the RFP submission, and make a good faith effort to achieve its goal as practical as possible when task orders are assigned and team is to be formed, if awarded the contract.
Itom 1 0	Question	If colocted for a contract under the If colocted for a contract under the discipling of

Item 1-8 <u>Question</u>: If selected for a contract under the If selected for a contract under the discipline of Architecture, would we be bound to work with the selected consultants by the College

held under the other IDIQ contracts (i.e. civil engineering, MEP engineering, etc.) on issued task orders, or would it be the College's intent that we select our own consultant teams?

- <u>Answer:</u> Depending on the size and complicity of the project, the College *may* require the prime to work with other Task Order holders in various disciplines.
- Item 1-9 <u>Question:</u> Regarding the Qualification Questionnaire, some of the fields do not allow a detailed response, would it be acceptable to attach additional pages to the form to allow for a more detailed response? If not, can we direct you to other places in the proposal where we included the info (ie Section F projects)?
 - <u>Answer:</u> It is acceptable to attach additional pages to the Qualification Questionnaire, or to reproduce the Qualifications Questionnaire in Microsoft Word or other editable format, so that answers could be inserted between the questions.
- Item 1-10 <u>Question</u>: Can the college provide an anticipated number of task orders per service category it expects to issue during the first year of the new contract?
 - Answer: It is the intent of this RFP to established an contract for A/E services on as needed basis. We do have any anticipated number of task orders, nor guarantee of the number of task order contracts.
- Item 1-11 <u>Question</u>: The solicitation requires the submission of five (5) project examples. Please confirm if a blanket purchase agreement, IDIQ, on-call, or task order contract qualifies as a project.
 - Answer: Five (5) project examples required in the RFP should include detailed discussions to highlight firm's capabilities to perform services for that service category. Please reference RFP document requirements.
- Item 1-12 <u>Question</u>: I have a question related to insurance requirements. We are interested in pursuing several Categories outlined in the subject RFP, however, our limits of liability do not align with what the RFP is requesting. Is Montgomery College open to allowing us to perform services under the following policy limits, shown below?

The per claim requirement of \$2M is fine, but, since this RFP could involve dormitories, our Carrier will not provide a Client specific limit endorsement to get to the required \$5M aggregate (which is \$1M more than what our firm has). It would require us to change the limits for our entire practice. The RFP also requires the max. deductible to be \$50,000 where ours is currently \$100,000.

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE - OFFICE OF PROCUREMENT RFP NO.: 620-003 ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING TASK ORDER SERVICES FOR THREE CAMPUSES AND LEASED FACILITIES RFP CLOSING DATE AND TIME: APRIL 30, 2020 @ 3:00 PM ADDENDUM #1 **ISSUED: MARCH 30, 2020** Answer: Montgomery College does not have any dormitories. Our insurance requirements are mandatory requirements, and they are not negotiable. Item 1-13 Question: Can you provide a list of the incumbents for each category? See attached award list. Answer: Item 1-14 Question: Section 002113-5, 7.8.3.c, a list of projects completed by the assigned manager related to the category and in the same capacity within the past five (5) years, which are similar in the scope to the College needs. At least one (1) Project example must be within the Washington, D.C./Baltimore metropolitan area. Please confirm that the reference to Washington, D.C. refers to the greater Washington, DC metropolitan area? Yes. Confirmed. Answer: Question: We would like to ask if Montgomery College would consider accepting electronic versions Item 1-15 of this submittal due to COVID-19 and the State of MD is on a Mandatory Lock-Down. See answer provided in Item 1-19. The RFP closing date and time has been extended. Answer: Due to heavy workload to assist remote teaching, learning and working, our IT Office is unable to take additional tasks at the moment. We will closely monitor COVID-19 situation and provide update if the a vendor proposal upload link could be set up at the Procurement Office website. Will there be any preference points for local, county based firms like other surrounding Item 1-16 Question: counties have? Given that the College currently does not have a MBE set-aside program in place, we are Answer: not authorized to award points based on minority vendor participation in bid opportunities. Item 1-17 Question: Are we required to submit an entire team or send qualifications only of our team for the categories we choose to pursue? For e.g. for architectural services are we to show qualifications only for Architectural services or should we add other possible anticipated services under that task order - Structural, MEP etc. Just for the qualifications for the prime tasks only. For example, if a multidisciplinary firm is Answer: interested in both service categories in architecture and landscape architecture, the firm shall submit qualifications in each of the two categories separately. We will review the competencies of architects and landscape architects separately in two distinctively different submissions. Item 1-18 <u>Question</u>: The instructions request 5 project examples, but the SF330 typically consists of 10 projects.

Are we limited to five or are we able to provide additional projects support the additional evaluation criteria?

<u>Answer:</u> SF330 project listings are general in nature, the five minimum projects that the College required should include more detailed discussions to highlight firm's capabilities.

The following items offer clarification that <u>do change</u> the requirements of the RFP documents. PLEASE MAKE CHANGES TO THE RFP DOCUMENTS ACCORDINGLY:

- Item 1-19 To extend the RFP closing date and time from 3:00 p.m. on April 15, 2020 to **3:00 p.m. on April 30**, **2020**.
- Item 1-20 To provide Mid-Atlantic Purchasing Team Rider form missing in the RFP documents. See attached.
- Item 1-21 To delete Part 17.v.c, Section 004513-4 Qualification Questionnaire in its entirety and replace with the following:
 - c. A list of projects completed by the assigned manager related to the category and in the same capacity within the past five (5) years, which are similar in the scope to the College needs. At least one (1) Project example must be within the Washington, D.C./Baltimore metropolitan area.

Index of Attachments to Addendum

Appendix A Mid-Atlantic Purchasing Team Rider Clause

Awardee List for RFP No. 614-003 Task Order A/E Design Services for Three Campuses & Leased Facilities (For Informational Purpose)

-TA.A.

Patrick Johnson, MBA Director of Procurement

Please **sign** below to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum and return with the **Technical Proposal submission.** Failure to return this Acknowledgement of Addendum may deem a proposal nonresponsive.

NOTE: ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF RFP ADDENDA WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED BY FACSIMILE OR E-MAIL.

Company Name

Authorized Signature

Date

Printed/Typed Signature

MID-ATLANTIC PURCHASING TEAM RIDER CLAUSE



Cooperative Rider Clause

The Mid-Atlantic Purchasing Team (MAPT) is the agreement between the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments ("MWCOG") and the Baltimore Metropolitan Council ("BMC") to aggregate the public entity and non-profit purchasing volumes in the Maryland, Virginia and Washington, D.C. region ("region").

Format

A lead agency format is used to accomplish this work. The Lead Agency in this procurement has included this MAPT Cooperative Rider Clause in this solicitation indicating its willingness to allow other public entities to participate pursuant to the following Terms and Conditions:

1. Terms

- 1.1 Participating entities, through their use of the Cooperative Rider Clause, agree to the terms and conditions of the resulting contract to the extent that they can be reasonably applied to the participating entity.
- **1.2** Participating entities may also negotiate additional terms and conditions specific to their local requirements upon mutual agreement between the parties.
- 2. Other Conditions Contract and Reporting
 - 2.1 The contract resulting from this solicitation shall be governed by and "construed in accordance with the laws of the State/jurisdiction in which the participating entity officially is located;
 - 2.2 To provide to MWCOG and/or BMC contract usage reporting information, including but not limited to quantity, unit pricing and total volume of sales by entity, as well reporting other participating entities added on the contract, on demand and without further approval of contract participants;
 - 2.3 Contract obligations rest solely with the participating entities only;
 - 2.4 Significant changes in total contract value may result in further negotiations of contract pricing with the lead agency and participating entities.

In pricing and other conditions, vendors are urged to consider the broad reach and appeal of MAPT with public and non-profit entities in this region. A list of the participating members of the Mid-Atlantic Purchasing Team can be found at the following web links:

www.mwcog.org/purchasing-and-bids/cooperative-purchasing/member-links/ and http://www.baltometro.org/our-work/cooperative-purchasing/brcpc-representatives

RFP NO.: 614-003 AWARDEE LIST

Category A – Civil Engineering Consultants

A. Morton Thomas & Associates, Inc. (Rockville, MD) Adtek, Inc (Fairfax, VA) (MBE) Stantec (Laurel, MD) Whitman, Requardt & Associates, LLP (Baltimore, MD)

Category B – Architecture and Interior Design Consultants

Cho Benn Holback + Associates (Baltimore, MD) (MBE) Clark-Nexsen (Washington, DC) Marshall Craft Associates (Baltimore, MD) Stantec (Laurel, MD)

Category C – Mechanical, Electrical & Plumbing Engineering Consultants

Burdette, Koehler, Murphy & Associates (Baltimore, MD) Greenman-Pederson, Inc. (Rockville, MD) James Posey Associates (Baltimore, MD) Mueller Associates, Inc. (Baltimore, MD)

Category D – Geotechnical Engineering Consultants

EBA Engineering, Inc. (Baltimore, MD) (MBE) Froehling & Robertson (Jessup, MD) (MBE) Geotech Engineers, Inc. (Beltsville, MD) (MBE) Schnabel Engineering (Rockville, MD)

Category E – Building Enclosure Consultants

Gale Associates, Inc. (Towson, MD) Simpson Gumperz & Heger (Washington, DC) Wiss, Janney, Eistner Associates, Inc. (Fairfax, VA)

Category F – Landscape Architectural Consultants

Core Studio Design (Baltimore, MD) (MBE) Floura Teeter Landscape Architects, Inc. (Baltimore, MD) (MBE) Hord, Coplan, Macht, Inc. (Baltimore, MD) Slater Associates, Inc. (Columbia, MD)

Category G – Building Commissioning Consultants

Facility Dynamics Engineering (Columbia, MD) Horizon Engineering Associates, LLP (Hauppauge, NY) Leach Wallace Associates, Inc. (Elkridge, MD) Setty & Associates International, PLLC (Baltimore, MD) (MBE)

Category H – Roof Consultants

Gale Associates, Inc. (Towson, MD) Simpson Gumpertz & Heger (Washington, DC) Wiss, Janney, Eistner Associates, Inc. (Fairfax, VA);