

ARLINGTON COUNTY GOVERNMENT
Office of the Purchasing Agent

ADDENDUM TO SOLICITATION

Arlington County Government Department of Management and Finance Office of the Purchasing Agent Arlington, Virginia 22201 Telephone: 703-288-3451	1A. ADDENDUM TO SOLICITATION NO. 20-239-7-8	1B. DATED July 8, 2020
	2A. ADDENDUM NO. Three (003)	2B. EFFECTIVE DATE July 22, 2020

The Addendum to this solicitation identified in Block 1A is as set forth in Block 3. Hour and date specified for receipt of offers is extended, is not extended. Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: a) by completing Block 4 (a), (b) and returning copy of the Addendum with the Offerors proposal. **FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED IN THE SOLICITATION MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER.**

3. DESCRIPTION OF ADDENDUM

Addendum No. Three (003) to Arlington County Government Request for Proposal No. 20-239-7-8, CC2DCA, entitled, "Conceptual Design and Environmental/NEPA Documentation Consultant Services", provides the following:

1. Attached responses to questions submitted on or before July 20, 2020, 3:00 P.M., Eastern Daylight Savings Time;
2. **EXECUTED FORMS** – Attached Firm Data Sheet as referenced in Attachment A;
3. Section IV-**PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS** – Item 4-Proposal Standards
 - e) Project Team Qualifications page limit is changed from Ten (10) pages to **Fourteen (14) pages:**

All other terms and conditions of the Request for Proposal remain unchanged.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Block 1A, as heretofore changed, remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

4A. NAME AND TITLE OF OFFEROR	4B. SIGNATURE	4C. DATE

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 20-239-7-8

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN, ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION CONSULTANT SERVICES

QUESTION RESPONSES SUBMITTED -JULY 20, 2020, 2:00 P.M., EASTERN DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME

Question No. 1: Will you please provide clarification on your key personnel requirements? Do the two projects in 7 years have to have been done by the same person (Project Manager) or collectively from all key personnel? Does the NEPA decision document have to be completed or can the ROD be pending?

Response No. 2: The Key Personnel as a team should collectively have a minimum of two (2) EISs completed within the past Seven (7) years. The Two (2) EIS's do not have to be done by the same person, they could be separate projects under different project managers. If the ROD has not been received on a project that you are using in the proposal, please provide some detail on the status of the ROD and an explanation on why it hasn't been issued.

Question #2: We have concerns that the Contract Section 38 ATTORNEY'S FEES is too broad. We believe Section 38 ATTORNEY'S FEES should be consistent with Section 07, Standards of Care. We request your consideration of revisions to Contract Section 38, ATTORNEY'S FEES to be tied to the Offerors failure (or negligence) to perform services under Exhibit A – Scope of Work of the Contract Documents normally accepted by members of the same profession. Therefore, the WRA Team would like to request that Contract Section 38, “ATTORNEY'S FEES – In the event that the County prevails in any legal action or proceeding brought be the County to enforce any provision of the Contract, the Consultant will pay the County's reasonable attorney's fees and expenses.” Be modified to tie the Offerors obligation to pay attorney's fees to Offerors negligence in performing services under Exhibit A – Scope of Work of the Contract documents. Suggested Revision: “ATTORNEY'S FEES – In the event that the County prevails in any legal action or proceeding brought by the County to enforce any provision of this Contract, the County is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred due to Offerors negligence in performing services under Exhibit A – Scope of Work of the Contract Documents.”

Response No. 2: The language remains as written.

Question No. 3 Regarding statement that Key Personal shall have a minimum of Two (2) projects completed under the NEPA process via an EIS within the last Seven (7) years. Is the following project example acceptable when considering “completed under the NEPA process” – transportation project for which FHWA and the USACE were Joint-Lead federal agencies (project followed merged like process). A draft and final EIS were completed but only the USACE issued a ROD for permit due to funding constraints for FHWA?

Response No. 3: A project similar to the one described in the example is acceptable to use in the proposal. It is understood that funding constraints is one of many common reasons why a RTOD would not be received or delayed in being issued.

As stated in the response to Question No.1, please provide an explanation in the proposal submission for why the ROD hasn't been issued.

Question No. 4: Page 40-Attachment A requests to include the Firm Data Sheet enclosed with the RFP. With the document not included in the RFP can you please provide? Is written confirmation of the Prime commitment to the sub-consultants required for this RFP?

Response No. 4: The Firm Data Sheet has been uploaded to Vendor Registry. The Offeror is required to submit written documentation of the Prime consultant's commitment to use a DBE sub-consultant whose participation it submits to meet the Eleven Percent (11%) DBE contract goal. Written confirmation of the Prime's commitment to a sub-consultant is required and can be documented using Exhibit 5-INTENT TO PERFORM AS A DBE SUB-CONTRACTOR FOR CONTRACT AWARD.

Question No. 5:

- Page 22-Criterion No. 1- Does the request to describe a demonstrated ability to work with multi-disciplinary team and the approach to coordinating the external agencies apply directly to the 3 projects in this criterion or is it separate from the 3 projects?
- Page 19—Section 4- Proposal Standards-Offeror's Experience is listed as “d” and Project Team Qualifications is listed as “e”; however, in Section 6-Evaluation Criteria and Weights, Offeror's Experience, Offeror Experience is Criterion 3 and Project Qualifications is Criteria 1. Is the supporting documentation in the Appendix to be in the opposite or of the presentations?
- Page 22-Section 7 outlines the executed forms to be submitted. Please confirm that these should be in the Appendix?

Response No. 5: Please see the responses below:

- 1st bullet – The discussion of the Offeror’s demonstrated ability to work with multi-disciplinary team and their approach to coordinating with external agencies could either be incorporated into the descriptions of the Three (3) projects; or provided separately from the Three (3) projects.
- 2nd bullet – Section 6 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTS – The number sequencing of the criteria is provided in the order they appear on the proposal evaluation scoring sheet. Please organize the proposal in the order listed on pages 19-20 in Section 4 PROPOSAL STANDARDS.
- 3rd bullet – Please provide the executed forms listed on page 22, Section 7 in the Appendix. The visualizations provided in the Appendix can be in any order.

Question No. 6:

- Please confirm that the minimum 10 pt. font requirement applies solely to the resumes of Key Personnel, as described in the RFP on page 20 and the rest of the proposal can have font sizes in the Offeror’s normal brand style
- Please confirm that Attachments F and G are not required as part of the submission.
- Do section divider-tabs count against each section’s page limit?
- What role, if any will VDOT and FHWA representatives play in the selection process.

Response No. 6: Please see the responses below:

- 1st bullet – The font of the text in the resumes of Key Personnel shall be no smaller than 10 pt. This font size requirement does not apply to anything else in the proposal.
- 2nd bullet – Attachments F and G are not required as part of the proposal submission. The Offeror would fill out and sign the non-disclosure and data security forms after they are selected, prior to contract execution.
- 3rd bullet – Section divider-tabs do not count against each section’s page limit.
- 4th bullet – The FHWA will not play any role in the selection process. At least one (1) of the Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) members will be a VDOT representative.

Question No. 7: How can we register for the Pre-Bid Meeting on 7-14-20?

Response #7: Registration for the pre-proposal meeting held on July 14, 2020 was done via filling out the form at the link below, which was provided in Addendum No. 1.

<https://forms.microsoft.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=BEg1gN8fjkKfX1CR6ZTPVH0ORFeYkZpKv1YaScdf7iJUODBG0VJURihBQks1WUtXMEtWMEpMWE1NRS4u>

Question No. 8: Is there an invitation to the Microsoft Teams meeting on the 14th of July? If so, could it be sent to my e-mail.

Response No. 8: The Microsoft Teams meeting link was emailed to the individuals who registered in advance for the pre-proposal meeting using the instructions posted in Addendum No. 1. A video recording of the pre-proposal meeting can be viewed at the link below:

<https://youtu.be/eMatYVqm4jw>

Question No. 9: The RFP states that "The Offeror must state whether it requests revisions to any of the remaining, non-mandatory terms and, if so, must explain the reason for the request(s) and propose alternative language. An Offeror who does not request a revision in its proposal may not object or request revisions to any contract terms during the negotiation process."

However, this requirement seems inconsistent with § 2.2-4302.2 of Virginia's procurement law, which states that "For architectural or engineering services, the public body shall not request or require offerors to list any exceptions to proposed contractual terms and conditions, unless such terms and conditions are required by statute, regulation, ordinance, or standards developed pursuant to § 2.2-1132, until after the qualified offerors are ranked for negotiations." Please provide direction regarding whether the County still expects Offerors to include expectations with their proposals.

Response No. 9: The RFP language in 14. EXCEPTIONS TO TERMS AND CONDITIONS- Paragraphs Two (2) and Three (3) are deleted from the Section in their entirety

PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL ELEMENTS-The "compliance sentence" is deleted in its entirety. Item No. 3 is deleted in its entirety.

§2.2-4302.4 of the Code of Virginia does not allow the County to ask A/E's to list their exceptions to non-mandatory terms until after they are ranked for negotiation.

Question No. 10: 1. Are offerors to include a 30% Preliminary Engineering staffing plan for the Optional task? Does the County anticipate that 30% plans will be advanced within the 3-year contract period? 2. Does the County anticipate the need for survey? 3. Would the County provide more clarification on the Key Personnel requirements/roles? Is the Project Manager required to have two completed EISs within the last 7 years, or does that apply primarily to the NEPA Task Manager? May the EISs within the last 7 years be ongoing if they are substantially complete (e.g., DEIS or further along)? 4. May a cover page be included as the first page of the PDF document (excluded from page count)? Are divider pages between the proposal sections allowed and excluded from the page count? 5. Are offerors limited to only three main project examples, including subconsultant qualifications?

Response No. 10: Please see the responses below:

1. Please include the staff that will work on the Optional 30% Preliminary Engineering Task in the one-page organizational chart requested in Project Team Qualifications Section of the proposal. The County anticipates the NTP for the Optional Task would be issued sometime between the Final EIS (FEIS) submittal and ROD. The Three (3)-year contract duration would be extended accordingly to account for the Optional Services depending on if/when NTP is issued for it.
2. The County has not collected any recent survey of the project area. The Offeror should anticipate that they will need to collect extensive base mapping and survey.
3. The Project Manager should have a minimum of Ten (10) years' experience in Project Management relating to the preparation of NEPA documentation, completion of NEPA studies with an emphasis on transportation projects. The Key Personnel as a team should collectively have a minimum of Two (2) EISs completed within the past Seven (7) years. The Two (2) EISs do not have to be done by the same person, they could be separate projects under different project managers. The completed EISs cited should have had at least their FEIS submittal. As stated in the response to Question No.1, if the ROD has not been received on a project that you are using in the proposal, please provide some detail on the status of the ROD and an explanation on why it hasn't been issued.
4. Please omit a Cover page. The first page of the proposal should be the cover letter. As previously stated in the response to Question #6, Section divider-tabs do not count against each section's page limit.
5. Please adhere to the three (3) example projects limit specified in the Offeror's Experience section of the proposal.

Question No. 11: Attachment paragraph 1 defines a DBE goal for the project of Eleven Percent (11%). The following paragraphs Two (2) through Five (5) mention DBE or SWaM requirements. Please confirm whether the requirements can be met by either DBE or SWaM (or both combined) participation or if only registered DBEs will count toward the goal for this contract.

Response No. 11: The Eleven Percent (11%) DBE goal shall be met by utilizing the DBE firms certified and found listed in the Small Business and Supplier Diversity Department (SBSD) only. The Offeror is encouraged to use SWaM firms, however, they will not count toward committing to or meeting the DBE goal established for the project.

Question No. 12: Section E-Project Team Qualifications is to be limited to 10 pages. That Section of the RFP response will include resumes, as well as narrative responses to "Team Experience-Conceptual Design and Team Experience Technical Studies and Analyses". Please confirm or clarify

that all of the above information is subject to the 10-page limit as this will significantly limit the number of resumes and require abbreviated narrative responses.

Response No. 12: The page limit for CRITERION NO. 2 – PROJECT TEAM QUALIFICATIONS, PERSONNEL was increased from 10 pages to 14 pages in this Addendum. Resumes should be included in the Appendix.

END OF QUESTION RESPONSES

FIRM DATA SHEET

Funding: F (S=State F=Federal)

Project No.: UPC 115562

Division: Transportation

Due Date: 8/3/2020

The prime consultant is responsible for submitting the information requested below on all firms on the project team, both prime and all subconsultants. All firms are to be reported on one combined sheet unless the number of firms requires the use of an additional sheet. Failure to submit all of the required data may result in the Proposal not being considered.

Firm's Name, Address and DBE and/or SWAM Certification Number	Firm's DBE or SWaM Status *	Firm's Age	Firm's Annual Gross Receipts

* YD = DBE Firm Certified by DMBE

N = DBE or SWaM Firm Not Certified by DMBE

NA = Firm Not Claiming DBE or SWaM Status

YS = SWaM Firm Certified by DMBE. Indicate whether small, woman-owned, or small business.

DMBE is the Virginia Department of Small Business and Supplier Diversity