

October 12, 2022

TO: Potential Proposers

FROM: Michelle Compton

RE: On Call A/E Design Services for Academic Projects
RFP #91018 MC
Addendum #3 dated 10/12/2022

The following information is made available on the above referenced solicitation and is issued as Addendum #3 dated 10/12/2022

The due date and time for the Technical Proposal remains Friday, October 28, 2022 at or before 2:00 pm. Receipt of this addendum is to be acknowledged by completing the enclosed "Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addenda" form and including it within your Technical Proposal submission.

Clarifications:

1. The following language has been added to RFP Section 3.2.3.B

NOTE: University/Higher Education is defined as a 4-year or more degree awarding institution.

2. RFP Section 3.5.1.1 has been updated as follows:

It is the intent of the UMB that the Price Proposal will consist of fully loaded maximum hourly rates for onsite work as well as hourly rates for remote work for A/Es for the applicable staff positions for the RFP categories which the Proposer is offering to UMB. All costs and expenses are to be included in the quoted hourly rates as there are no reimbursables associated with this Contract. Hourly rates will be requested for each of the initial 12-months of the three (3) year initial Term. Since this is a multi-year contract that will be made available to all USM Institutions, thereby relieving vendors of the cost and effort of preparing extensive RFP responses to individual institutions/organizations solicitations, ~~it is UMB's expectation that Proposers will offer rates considerably discounted from normal educational rates.~~ ***As well, the quoted hourly rates will be considered by UMB to be the maximum hourly rates for a given staff position. UMB may negotiate a lower hourly rate, or a Master A/E may quote a lower hourly rate, for a specific Task Order.***

3. RFP Section 3.2.3.B.5 has been updated as follows:

Civil Engineering Firm: One (1) project is to be submitted from the Civil Engineering Firm which meets the criteria noted below with higher consideration if done in the higher education setting.

- One (1) project submitted **must** be Civil Engineering design project, institutional (i) in an urban setting (ii) in excess of \$100K for construction costs (iii) ~~in which the prime firm is the Civil Engineer of Record.~~ Provide

projects if within an urban project where a Site Grading, Sediment and Erosion **Control Plans, Developer's Agreement, Franchise Agreement, Minor Privileges, Right of Entry, or similar documentation was required, preferably with Baltimore City.**

4. RFP Section 3.2.3.B.3 has been updated as follows:

Plumbing Engineering Firm: One (1) project is to be submitted from the Mechanical/Electrical Engineer which meets the criteria noted below with projects done in the higher education setting preferred:

Project Status: Must be complete and occupied for at least six (6) months; and,

Project Dollar Size: Must be ~~new~~ **recent** and in excess of \$200K for construction costs;

Project Type: Must be performed in a university and/or occupied setting

Design Work: Must be designed by the proposed plumbing engineering firm.

5. RFP Section 3.2.3.B.4 has been updated as follows:

Structural Engineering Firm: One (1) project is to be submitted from the Structural Engineering Firm which meets the criteria noted below with projects done in the higher education setting preferred.

Project Status: Must be complete and occupied for at least six (6) months; and,

Project Dollar Size: Must be ~~new~~ **recent** and in excess of \$200K for construction costs;

Project Type: Must be complete and occupied for at least six (6) months; and

Design Work: Must be designed by the proposed structural engineering firm.

6. RFP Section 3.2.3.B NOTES has been updated as follows:

NOTES:-The **Higher consideration will be given to** projects submitted by the M/E, Plumbing, Structural, Civil, Multi-Media Consulting Firm and Cost Estimating firm ~~may **that** duplicate the projects submitted by~~ **demonstrate** a working relationship with the Prime A/E firm provided the A/Es have provided the required services for those projects. Be sure to describe each disciplines unique scope of service and contributions to the design. The University prefers the key person's role is the same for both this proposal and the submitted Key Personnel Resume/Firm Experience projects.

Question/Responses:

1. According to the typical task order scope on page 20 and 21 of the RFP work is anticipated to be renovation of interior office spaces. The Phase 2 Technical Proposal requests a proposed team include civil, building envelope, geotechnical,

and landscape disciplines among others. Is it anticipated that potential projects may include building exterior and site work? Can you give an example for what potential projects may be?

The information in the RFP which provides for the typical task order merely provides an example of what a typical, not all, task orders may encompass. Design projects will vary and may include building exterior and site work.

2. This RFP outlines a five (5) step process to procure firms for this master use contract. In the past at UMB and in recent and current procurements at UMCP and other municipalities in the State of Maryland who procure similar contracts, there is two (2) or three (3) step process. Working through five independent steps places a large burden on design firms to secure one of the contracts and will be very time consuming to UMB's Selection Committee to review at each step. Recognizing two of the steps are stated as being "at the University's sole discretion," is it UMB's intention to fully perform all five steps for this procurement?

Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.

3. Section II Scope of Work Requirements, 1. General Information, E. Use of Master Contracts by UMB, 2. states "It is anticipated that no task order will exceed \$1,000,000." Is this amount to be total A/E fees or construction cost? \$1M construction cost is more suitable to the sample project indicated in C. Project Type/Specifications.

The \$1,000,000 amount is for the total A/E fees.

4. Similar to question 1 above, item 7. mentions MBE participation for "any task order over \$50,000 and subgoals may be set for any task order over \$200,000." Are those amounts total A/E fees or construction costs?

MBE goals will be determined based on the value of the A/E fees.

5. Section II Scope of Work Requirements, 2. Scope of Work, C. Project Type/Specifications, 4. Typical Task Order scope for Academic Projects describes the renovation of a small suite of offices, under 4,000 SF in size. Is this the project that is subsequently referred to as the "University's project?"

Examples of projects that have been issued off of the current On Call A/E Academic project include, but are not limited to:

**Roof Replacements
Building Façade Renovations
Office Space Renovations
Lecture Hall Renovations
Assessments**

With project fees ranging from approximately \$10,000 up to \$550,000.

6. Section II Scope of Work Requirements, 2. Scope of Work, C. Project Type/Specifications, 4. Typical Task Order scope for Academic Projects describes the renovation of a small suite of offices, under 4,000 SF in size. We agree that this a typical project for a master use contract, but it is out of character with other requirements to the response to this RFP. Section III Procurement Phases and Evaluation Process, Article 1: Portfolio Requirements, describes the portfolio for the A/E to submit. This appears to be from the architect, no consultants, and requests three (3) projects for various team members, including Lead Architect. It describes a lengthy project description and graphics with a 5 page maximum limit. The level of detail requested is out of character with the Typical Task Order scope described in Section II. We have seen this portfolio requirement for large capital projects at UMCP, but not for task order or master use contracts. Is it UMB's expectation that all architects respond in this manner? We believe this portfolio is overly onerous for this type of master use contract.
Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.
7. Section III Procurement Phases and Evaluation Process, Article 1: Portfolio Requirements, Portfolio Contents, 3.1.1.A. states that projects submitted under the portfolio must have been "provided to the University System of Maryland and/or the State of Maryland." Can this be expanded to any college or university, including private colleges or those outside the State of Maryland, to expand the number of projects our firm can consider for submission?
Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.
8. Section III Procurement Phases and Evaluation Process, Article 1: Portfolio Requirements, Portfolio Contents, 3.1.1.B indicates the design firm should document up to three (3) projects that are "the most outstanding samples/evidence of similar and relevant design work to the University's project." Are all items under B.a. through B.d. required for such small projects?
Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.
9. Section III Procurement Phases and Evaluation Process, Article 1: Portfolio Requirements, Portfolio Contents, 3.1.4 Design Team Organization requests a general description of your proposed design team organization but says "prospective sub A/E firms for each discipline not needed at this time." Please advise how UMB would like this presented. Examples are an organizational chart with disciplines but no firm names, a written narrative or listing of disciplines but no firm names.
Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.
10. Article 2: Phase 2 Technical Proposal Requirements, B. Example Projects which Best Illustrate Proposed Team's Qualifications for this Contract, Section (1) Prime A/E

Firm Experience, second bullet mentions "feasibility or building evaluation study." As the university's sample project is a renovation, studies would not be "similar or relevant to the University's project" as required under "Project Experience." Would UMB like one of the example projects to be a Feasibility or Building Study?

Proposers should provide example projects that meet the requirements provided in RFP Section 3.2.3.B.

Per RFP Section 3.2.3.B.1 under the third bullet point -

One project must be a (i) feasibility or building evaluation Study (ii) in which the prime A/E is the author.

11. Article 3: Phase 3 Technical Proposal Requirements & Oral Presentations, 3.3.1 Phase 3 Technical Qualifications Criteria, could these Phase 3 requirements be rolled into the Phase 2 Technical Proposal Requirements for ease of review by Selection Committee and ease of preparation by A/E firms?

Any changes made to the RFP Evaluation criteria will be updated via Addendum – at this time, it is not UMBs intention to remove or change RFP Article 3 Section 3.

12. What is anticipated to be included in the price proposal due on January 11th?

A sample price proposal form has been included in the RFP as Attachment B.

13. On page 6, the RFP states *The On Call A/E contracts are anticipated to be used primarily at the University of Maryland institutions in the Baltimore region; however, they may be used at any University of Maryland institution.* Please clarify that if a firm submitted on recent UMCP IDIQ RFP, work at UMB could be included under that contract. Please clarify if it is necessary / desired to submit for task order contracts at both UMCP and UMB.

This RFP is being issued by the University of Maryland, Baltimore. USM institutions serviced by the University of Maryland, Baltimore in the Baltimore Region include the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC), Coppin State University (CSU), Towson University (TU) and the University of Baltimore (UBalt).

This solicitation is not being issued in conjunction with University of Maryland, College Park. Questions regarding any University of Maryland, College Park Solicitations or Contracts should be directed to the University of Maryland, College Park.

Task orders issued off of this contract will only be issued to those firms who have been awarded as a result of this RFP.

14. What factors are weighed to determine the 2-year renewal?

Per RFP Section 1. 5 Terms of the Contracts, and Section 2.1.C Contract Term the decision to renew a contract will be at the sole discretion of the University.

15. Have anticipated tasks for the contract duration been identified?
At this time, anticipated tasks for the contract duration have not been identified.
16. Please confirm the \$1M limit is per individual task order, not for the contract's duration.
The \$1M limit is per individual task order, not for the contract's duration.
17. What are the anticipated MBE goals for both task orders of \$50K and \$200K?
Please refer to RFP Section 2.1.7 – The MBE participation for this procurement will be set per task order.
18. How will the portfolio phase be scored?
Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.
19. Please clarify that preferred work to be shown throughout the Portfolio submission is renovations and studies under \$1M.
Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.
20. Please clarify the preferred work to be shown throughout the Technical submission is renovations and studies under \$1M.
Please refer to RFP Section 3.2.3.B for information on project submissions. Projects should be similar or relevant the Universities
21. Please clarify the scoring of the criteria in 3.2.3. IS each item weighted? What is the detailed scoring sub-criteria? What are the selection committees priorities in scoring?
Please refer to RFP Section III Article 4 for information on the Technical Evaluation.
22. Please confirm resumes in the SF330 for Key Personnel should highlight under \$1M renovations and studies.
Please refer to RFP Section 3.2.3.A.1.b for information on Key Personnel submissions.
23. Please confirm “higher education” includes community colleges and technical schools for the purpose of this RFP response.
Please refer to Clarification #1 of this Addendum #3.
24. Regarding Project Experience: what is the scoring difference for studies that have resulted in a constructed project vs those that have not?
Please refer to RFP Section 3.2.3.B for information on the Project Experience requirements.

25. Can the built (new or renovated) project example be a result of the study example? For example could project example 1 be John Doe University Building Z and example 2 be the Feasibility Study for John Doe University Building Z.
Please refer to RFP Section 3.2.3.B for information on the Project Experience requirements.
26. Please clarify how the Phase 3 Technical Qualification submission will be scored.
Please refer to RFP Section 3.4.3.
27. Please clarify how the Oral Presentation phase will be scored?
Please refer to RFP Section 3.4.3
28. Please clarify how the university would like proposers to demonstrate design excellence on under \$1M renovations and studies that likely did not result in award submissions, press, or professional photography.
Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.
29. Will the Selection / Qualification Evaluation Committee remain the same throughout each phase?
It is the intention of UMB to maintain consistency within the Selection/Qualification Evaluation Committee through the evaluation process.
30. Who will be on the Selection / Qualification Evaluation Committee?
UMB will not be disclosing the members of the Selection/Qualification Evaluation Committee.
31. Page 41 notes it is *UMB's expectation that Proposers will offer rates considerably discounted from normal educational rates*. What is UMB's expected rate discount?
Please refer to Clarification #2 in this Addendum #3 – that language has been removed from RFP Section 3.5.1.1.
32. Please confirm that in the first phase – Portfolio Submission, you do not want a sub-consultant team included.
Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.
33. In Addendum 2 you referenced us acknowledging receipt of addenda and including it in our *portfolio* submission. Please clarify that you **do not** want us to submit a portfolio, and you want us to submit the items referenced in the previously stated Phase 2 Technical Proposal – now technical proposal.
Confirmed – proposers should NOT submit a Portfolio. Please refer to RFP 91018 MC Addendum #2 which was issued 10/3/2022 – the Phase 1 Portfolio Phase has been removed.

34. On page 20 Section 3.2.3.B, you reference under project experience that you want us to submit 11 projects. However, the SF 330 Form my life includes room for only 10 projects. Please clarify that want us to submit 10 projects rather than eleven.

Proposers are to submit 11 projects as requested in RFP Section 3.2.3.B.

35. Can we re-order the information submitted in our proposal so that the entire SF330 Part I (sections A-H) is presented together, followed by the Key Personnel Resume and Firm References and remaining requested information?

No, Proposers are to submit proposals in accordance with RFP Section 3 Article 2.

36. Can the University please provide the reference forms and other forms in MS Word format?

Word versions of the Key Personnel Reference Forms and Project Reference forms have been added to the UMB eBid Board.

37. Given the impact that COVID-19 had on many project schedules (slowing, stopping, or cancelling many) would the University please consider allowing submitted projects to be under construction?

Please refer to RFP Section 3.2.3.B Project Experience. The RFP requires:

All projects submitted under this category should be a maximum of five (5) years old based on the project completion date. The University prefers projects less than three (3) years old.

Proposers can provide projects that have been completed within the last five years (2017).

38. The Plumbing Engineering and Structural Engineering firm project requirements note that the project must be “new” but also that it should be performed in an occupied setting. Please clarify. Are renovation projects performed in occupied settings acceptable? Or is the preference for new buildings constructed within a campus or similar setting where the buildings surrounding the new construction were occupied?

Please refer to Clarification #4 and Clarification #5 of this Addendum #3.

“New” has been replaced by “recent”. Renovation projects performed in an occupied setting are acceptable.

39. Please clarify the requirement for the Civil Engineering firm project to be one “in which the prime firm is the Civil Engineer of Record.” It is more typical for civil engineers to serve as a subconsultant for projects. Is a project where the civil engineer was a subconsultant acceptable?

Please refer to Clarification #3 of this Addendum #3.

40. The last sentence under the requirements for the Civil Engineering firm project which reads “Provide projects if within an urban project a where Site Grading, Sediment and Erosion” appears to be incomplete. Please clarify what is required.

Please refer to Clarification #3 of this Addendum #3.

41. Are there any completion requirements for the Mechanical/Electrical Engineering firm, Civil Engineering firm, or Multi-media Consulting firm projects?

Please refer to RFP Section 3.2.3.B:

All projects submitted under this category should be a maximum of five (5) years old based on the project completion date. The University prefers projects less than three (3) years old.

42. Is it acceptable to send a link that opens a PDF of the submission, if necessary, rather than multiple attached files due to file size constraints?

No, proposers should submit proposals in accordance with the submission requirements provided in Section 1.3.2 and Attachment D. 2

43. RFP Pages 29-30, Example Projects: Project Experience, bullet 6 asks the Proposer to indicate whether the example projects were completed as a stand-alone request (Capital Project?) or if it was issued as a task order off of an On-call Contract. In evaluating the proposals, will preference be given to one contract source, or will projects be scored equally if they were solicited as either a stand-alone request or task order assignment?

Proposers should provide projects that meet the requirements provided in the RFP. Per the RFP Proposers are asked to submit projects which are similar or relevant to the University's projects.

44. RFP Page 31, Prime A/E Firm Experience: For the two built projects which must exceed \$400K for construction costs, is it UMB's preference for the A/E to present projects similar in scope and construction value to the Typical Task Order project described on page 20-21 of the RFP, or would UMB prefer for at least one project to demonstrate our capability to complete a larger project that would be closer to the task order fee limit noted on page 14 of the RFP?

Please refer to the response for Question 5 in this Addendum #3 for a list of projects that have been issued of the current On Call A/E Academic Contract.

45. RFP Page 31, Mechanical/Electrical Firm Experience: For the two Mechanical/Electrical projects, the RFP states "The projects submitted by the mechanical/electrical engineering firm may duplicate the projects submitted by the Prime A/E firm." In evaluating the proposals, will any preference be given to duplicate or different projects, since one selection factor is demonstrating the successful completion of projects by the proposed team members working together?

Please refer to Clarification #6 of this Addendum #3.

46. RFP Page 32, Civil Firm Experience, bullet 1: Confirm if the second sentence is complete, or if additional criteria were omitted.

Please refer to Clarification #3 of this Addendum #3.

47. The original RFP and Addendum 1, under the Portfolio Submission article, included submission requirements for three projects completed by the A/E Project Manager and the Lead Architect. Addendum 2 deleted the Portfolio Submission phase. Confirm detailed documentation for three projects completed by the A/E Project Manager and the Lead Architect is not required as part of the Technical Proposal submission.

Confirmed.

48. Will the University grade a community college project the same as a university project as long as it meets all the requirements of the RFP?

Please refer to Clarification #1 of this Addendum #3 for the definition of what a “University/Higher Education” project refers to.

49. Under Project Dollar Size (page 31 of the RFP, Sections B.3 and B.4), it states that the projects for the Plumbing and Structural Engineering Firms “Must be new and in excess of \$200k for construction costs.” Since the Task Order Scope for Academic Projects (pages 20 – 21 of the RFP) states that UMB’s academic projects will be renovations, and the other projects required in Sections B.1 and B.2 are to be renovations, is it acceptable to submit renovation projects for the Plumbing and Structural Engineering Firms (Sections B.3 and B.4) in lieu of new construction?

Please refer to Clarification #4 and Clarification #5 of this Addendum #3. “New” has been replaced by “recent”. Renovation projects performed in an occupied setting are acceptable.

50. Is the request for resumes and 11 projects to be in the SF330 (Sections E and F) format and should the original RFP requirements from Portfolio Phase (now cancelled) be applied or not? In other words, do the requirements in 3.1.2, 3.1.2 and 3.1.2 apply to the SF330 forms for the Technical Phase?

No. the requirements in the Portfolio Sections in the RFP do not apply to the project information requested in RFP Section 3.2.3.B

END OF ADDENDUM #3 DATED 10/12/2022

Enclosed: Addenda Acknowledgment Form ; Firm Reference Form (Word Version) ; Key Personnel Reference Form (Word Version)

RFP NO.: 91018-MC

TORP FOR: On Call A/E Design Services for Academic Projects

DUE DATE: Friday, October 28, 2022, at or before 2:00 PM.

NAME OF PROPOSER: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDA

The undersigned, hereby acknowledges the receipt of the following addenda:

Addendum No. 1 dated 09/29/2022

Addendum No. 2 dated 10/03/2022

Addendum No. 3 dated 10/12/2022

Addendum No. _____ dated _____

Addendum No. _____ dated _____

Addendum No. _____ dated _____

Signature _____

Printed Name _____

Title _____

Date _____