



Keith Stewart

Director, Purchasing and Supply Services

EDUCATIONAL & FACILITIES CONDITION ASSESSMENTS

SOLICITATION NO. DCP006-24

ADDENDUM NO. THREE (03)

<u>ISSUED BY</u> DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND SUPPLY SERVICES CONSTRUCTION PROCUREMENT OFFICE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, UPPER MARLBORO, MARYLAND 20772	<u>ADDENDUM DATE</u> November 30, 2023 Number of Addendum Page(s) – Eleven (11)	<u>PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DATE</u> December 12, 2023 2:00 P.M., Eastern Standard Time
	<u>RFQ No.</u> DCP006-24	<u>RFQ ISSUANCE DATE:</u> October 12, 2023
	<u>PROJECT TITLE:</u> Educational & Facilities Condition Assessments	

TO PROSPECTIVE BIDDER OF SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS

This Addendum is hereby made a part of the Contract Document, which will be the basis of the Contract. This Addendum is issued to modify and/or correct the original Contract Documents issued on October 12, 2023. Prospective Bidder is requested to attach this Addendum to your Contract Documents. Receipt of this Addendum must be acknowledged on the Proposal. Failure to do so may subject the bidder to disqualification.

The following RFP Provision is hereby changed as follows:

Insert RFP Questions & Answers

- Listed below are answers to questions received from potential proposers.

	Questions	Responses
1.	Section 3.1 of the scope notes a total of 131 schools included and makes referenced to attached lists. The lists provided via the google drive total 163 schools. Could you please clarify the quantity of schools included for each Phase and provide a corresponding list?	There are a total of 163 schools - Cycle 2, Phase 1 = 63; Cycle 3, Phase 2 = 62 and Cycle 4, Phase 2 = 38. The lists on the google drive are correct.
2.	Is there an estimated budget or price range for DCP006-24?	No.
3.	Referencing the “Board of Education REQUESTED FY 2024 Annual Operating Budget / Prince George’s County Public Schools” (www.pgcps.org/globalassets/offices/budget-and-management-services/docs---budget/fy2024/fy-2024-board-of-education-requested-annual-operating-budget-book.pdf), it is unclear what budget has been allocated to support this activity. On page 182 of the Budget Request, the Budget and Management Services shows the following values for Technical Contracted Services, under the Contracted Services category – FY 2023 Approved = \$675,500 and FY 2024 Requested = \$654,000, totaling \$1,329,500. Is this the correct budget line item for this scope of services?	No.
4.	If the budget line item on page 182 is not correct, please advise which line item is the correct budget line.	There is no directly associated budget line for this task.
5.	Questions Due Time – RFP Page 1 states questions are due at 10am on 10/24, while PART II: INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS, section 2 on page 8 states questions are due at 10PM on 10/24. Which is correct, 10am or 10pm?	Questions are due on 10/24, 10:00 A.M.
6.	Questions Responses – Will all questions and responses be provided to all bidders?	Yes.
7.	Data Ownership – Please confirm all assessment data will remain the property of PGCPs and consultants are not allowed to use the data for any other purpose than to complete the scope of services.	Confirmed.
8.	RFP Section 10. Bonding – a bid and performance bond “may be” required but no construction or maintenance work is	No bonds are required.

	defined in the scope. Is Bonding required for this project?	
9.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.1 – For scheduling, can Phases 1 and Phases 2 be conducted at the same time, simultaneously?	Yes.
10.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.2 – For scheduling, how long is it anticipated for the pilot assessment to be discussed prior to the start of the comprehensive assessments?	There is no set time schedule for the pilot.
11.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.2 – Will a single pilot assessment apply to both Phase 1 and Phase 2, and if yes, should the deliverables for Phase 2 be revised to clarify sub tasks “a” and “b” under Phase 2 are not applicable (because they will be completed under Phase 1)?	No, only phase 1.
12.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.3 – Please confirm the cost for a web-accessible Facilities Condition and Educational Facility Assessment should be included in the Offerors price proposal.	SchoolDude was suggested but PGCPs is open to other capital planning database solutions that may be presented. First year subscription fees should be part of the proposal.
13.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.3 – Please provide a link or sample to the IAC standards, including the 9 weighted categories.	IAC evaluation data will be provided upon award. Public IAC facility assessment data can be found here: https://iac.mdschoolconstruction.org/?page_id=5983 .
14.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.5 – Please confirm enrollment projections will be provided by PGCPs.	Yes.
15.	Scope of Services, 3.6 – Please confirm other Microsoft Suite database programs include EXCEL.	Yes.
16.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.6 – Is the Offeror required to include School Dude subscription fees in its price proposal?	SchoolDude was suggested but PGCPs is open to other capital planning database solutions that may be presented. First year subscription fees should be part of the proposal.
17.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.7 – During the pre-proposal meeting, it was clearly stated that the Contractor will not be responsible for Master Planning. Please confirm the “FY 2027 Education Facilities Master Plan” will be the responsibility of others and is not included in the scope of services.	PGCPs will conduct the master planning with the guidance of recommendations from this study.
		PGCPs has scanned all as built documents into an online vault. They are scanned PDF files that are searchable. PGCPs will expect

18.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.8.1 – Please confirm as-built drawings will be provided by PGCPs and will be in electronic format.	a full analysis of each school against all sections of the current educational specifications.
19.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.8.2 – Please provide a copy of the “education program” referenced in 3.8.2.	Education programs can vary from school to school and there are no outlined documents available for each building.
20.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.8.3 – Will Building Services work orders be provided in an editable, electronic format (ex. MS Excel)?	Yes.
21.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.8.5 – Will energy usage information be provided by PGCPs?	Yes.
22.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.8.6 – Will enrollment projections be provided by PGCPs?	Yes.
23.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.8.7 – Will bus volumes be provided by PGCPs?	Yes.
24.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.8.8 – Will PGCPs provide “Capital Planning” software license or user rights to the consultant, or should costs be included price proposals?	SchoolDude was suggested but PGCPs is open to other capital planning database solutions that may be presented. First year subscription fees should be part of the proposal.
25.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.9.2 – Educational Sufficiency and Facility Adequacy are both capitalized throughout the document, implying they are defined terms, but no definition is provided. To better understand effort levels for pricing can an example PGCPs Educational Sufficiency and Facility Adequacy analysis be provided?	The previous Master Plan Support Project data is posted on the CIP planning page under pgcps.com
26.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.10.3 – Please confirm the Educational Facilities Master Plan is the responsibility of others and not included in the scope of services (per the pre-proposal meeting).	Confirmed.
27.	Part III – Scope of Services, 3.11.1 – A “pilot assessment program” should cover three (3) schools – an elementary, middle and high school – correct?	Correct.
28.	Part IV – Proposal Evaluation and Award, 3.2 – Please confirm PGCPs is only interested in understand a bidders “experience with long range Master Planning” and Master Planning is not included in the scope of services.	Part IV – Proposal Evaluation and Award, 3.2 – Please confirm PGCPs is only interested in understand a bidders “experience with long range Master Planning” and Master Planning is not included in the scope of services.
29.	Attachment A, Phase 1 Deliverable “a” and Phase 2 Deliverable “a” – A “pilot	Correct.

	assessment program” should cover three (3) schools – an elementary, middle and high school – correct?	
30.	Summary of Services - How many TEAMS will be selected for this award?	One contract will be awarded.
31.	Non-Exclusive - Is PGCPs looking for BEST Value or lowest price? - Is PGCPs looking at a time and materials contract or fixed prices, or cost plus?	The award will be based on best value. The firm that receive the highest combined score out of 130 points (100 points for technical and 30 points for cost proposal) will receive an award.
32.	Option to Extend Service - Is this contract firm fixed price or will there be additional services based on Time & Materials?	Fixed.
33.	Bid Bond - Is a Bond applicable to consulting professional services? If required, this will be an indirect services? If required, this will be an indirect reimburable cost charged to the project?	No bonds are required.
34.	Performance and Labor Bond - Is a Bond applicable to consulting professional services? If required, this will be an indirect reimburable cost charged to the project?	No bonds are required.
35.	Volume I – Technical Proposal - Please confirm that there is no specific format (SF330) that the Technical Proposal has to be in?	There is no specific format. Follow the instructions as mentioned.
36.	Tab C – Experience and Capabilities - How many references are required? What is the limitation of experience - past five years or longer?	Please review Technical Evaluation Criterion #'s 3 and 5.
37.	- If prime firm is certified MBE, can they meet all or just half of the MBE goal of 30%? - Is the MBE to be certified with MDOT or Prince George County?	A certified MBE can self perform at 100%
38.	Volume III – Cost Proposal #1 - Does PGCPs have a detailed cost proposal format for the backup so all TEAMS price the same way?	No.
39.	Scope of Work 1 Introduction - Does PGCPs have the KPI already established or will that be part of the project mobilization? - Can you confirm we are looking at a total of 131 schools to be assessed over two phases?	There are 163 schools to be assessed.
40.	Scope of Work 3.1 - Is the award going to be made to one firm or multiple awards? - Will the awarded firm(s) be responsible for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 assessments?	An award will be issued to one contractor for both phases.
41.	Scope of Work 3.2 - Can you define your expectations for a comprehensive building assessment?	Comprehensive building assessments would include overall assessments for each major building system including estimated remaining life.

42.	Scope of Work 3.3 - Are you expecting an Off the shelf software or just a web based solution to access files? - Can you confirm the 9 weighted IAC categories?	SchoolDude was suggested but PGCPs is open to other capital planning database solutions that may be presented. First year subscription fees should be part of the proposal. The IAC categories is a part of the IAC state inspections posted on their website at iac.mdschoolconstruction.org
43.	Scope of Work 3.6 - Can you provide the mapping tables expected for SchoolDude import? - Does PGCPs support Microsoft Office 365 products?	SchoolDude was suggested but PGCPs is open to other capital planning database solutions that may be presented. First year subscription fees should be part of the proposal. PGCPs also supports Microsoft Office 365 products.
44.	Scope of Work 3.7 - Can you provide a copy of the current Master Plan?	The current master plan is posted publically on the CIP planning page under pgcps.org
45.	Assessment 3.8.1 - Does PGCPs have complete as-builts for each of the schools? Are they in PDF format or just scanned images files? - Will PGCPs expect a full analysis of each school against all of the sections of the current Education specifications?	PGCPs has scanned all as built documents into an online vault. They are scanned PDF files that are searchable. PGCPs will expect a full analysis of each school against all sections of the current educational specifications.
46.	Assessment 3.8.3 - What format will the Building Services work order information be made available? Will it be a spreadsheet from SchoolDude?	Yes.
47.	Assessment 3.8.4 - How many interviews are you expecting per school?	One.
48.	Assessment 3.8.5 - What format will the Energy data be provided? - Will it be a spreadsheet from SchoolDude or PEPCO?	Data may be provided in the form of a spreadsheet with usage and billing amounts or in the form of scanned documents from the utility provider.
49.	Assessment 3.8.8 - Can you provide the data Schema for SchoolDude to allow for data mapping?	SchoolDude was suggested but PGCPs is open to other capital planning database solutions that may be presented. First year subscription fees should be part of the proposal.
50.	Analysis 3.9.1 - Can PGCPs provide a copy of an existing LifeCycle analysis currently in use as a baseline?	The existing life cycle analysis is part of the previously completed master plan support project on the CIP planning page under pgcps.org
51.	Analysis 3.9.3 - How many interviews are you expecting for each school?	One interview per school.
52.	Analysis 3.9.5 - Is PGCPs looking for design proposals to allow for cost estimates?	Yes.
53.	Analysis 3.9.6 - Is PGCPs looking for looking for overall project at a system level, such as roof replacement, window replacement or on a granular level, AHU replacement, boiler replacement etc.?	Overall replacement or renovation at a system level.
54.	Analysis 3.9.7 - Is PGCPs expecting to get LEED accreditation for each school or just meet LEED Standards?	LEED accreditation is not the expectation.
55.	Analysis 3.9.8 - Is PGCPs looking for the design team to develop designs for each of the schools to meet the projected demographic trends?	No. Only provide recommendations based on existing data (enrollment, building condition, proximity to adjacent schools, etc.)

56.	Evaluation Process - Does PGCPs propose to award to one team or to multiple, or will this be determined once proposals are submitted? - Should each offerer submit a cost proposal for delivering on all 131 schools?	One firm will be awarded a contract.
57.	Appendix B – Past Performance References - Does past performance with PGCPs count?	Yes.
58.	The notice of award is noted for December. There is no date for the Notice to Proceed. When does PGCPs intend to issue the Notice to Proceed? It would be best if several months of preparation are available to the winning team to conduct its pilot assessment prior to the summer of 2024, when the assessment teams can get better access to the school systems facilities.	The Notice-to-Proceed will be issued following execution of the notice of award - date to be determined.
59.	In sub-section 3.6 it reads: “Provide a report utilizing Microsoft Suite database such as Access, which allows future updates by Prince George’s County Public School staff. The data must be compiled, so that it can be easily formatted to be exported in standard Capital Planning Software to be determined by the Department of Capital Programs of Prince George’s County Schools under a separate contract. How the Capital Forecasting module in SchoolDude, a data-gathering platform the school system is already using should also be explored.” Please clarify the last sentence.	SchoolDude was suggested but PGCPs is open to other capital planning database solutions that may be presented. First year subscription fees should be part of the proposal.
60.	Can you characterize the nature and completeness of the as-built information that PGPCS has?	PGCPs has scanned all as built documents into an online vault. They are scanned PDF files that are searchable. PGCPs will expect a full analysis of each school against all sections of the current educational specifications.
61.	In section 3.8.1 It is noted that, “This condition assessment will identify any and all major code violations, or life safety issues (structural failure) which need immediate attention.” Code violations and life safety failures that require immediate action will need to be remedied. Does Capitol Programs have a procedure in place that assessors will be required to follow? Can you describe that procedure if so?	There is no procedure in place for this; visually observable violations should be included.
	In section 3.8.3 It is stated that the assessment team is to, “Compile outstanding Building Services work order information for each facility to incorporate	

62.	in final improvement recommendations.” Does PGCPs have a centralized database of outstanding work orders that the assessors can use for the compilation, or will the work orders be compiled at each school as part of the interview process?	Yes; data will be provided upon award.
63.	In section 3.8.4 It is stated that the assessment team is to, “Compile outstanding Building Services work order information for each facility to incorporate in final improvement recommendations.” Will the PGCPs project manager for this effort coordinate the interviews with the proposed schedule?	Yes.
64.	In section 3.8.5 It is stated that the assessment team is to, “Compile energy usage information for each facility comparing it with sustainability standards for LEED as it relates to a minimum Silver Rating.” Will this data be retrievable from the PGCPs maintenance department BAS central database?	Data will be provided from building services via spreadsheet or scanned utility bills.
65.	Will portable classrooms and other temporary facilities be part of the assessment?	Yes, but temporary classrooms are not a part of the state rated capacity.
66.	Will Prince George’s County Charter Schools be part of the assessment?	No, these facilities are independently owned and operated with exception of Imagine Foundations Morningside which is still owned by PGCPs.
67.	Page 5 of the RFP states that “The intent of this contract is to provide the Board with an expedited means of procuring supplies and/or services at the lowest cost.” Can you please confirm that the County is, in fact, looking for “best value” rather than “lowest cost” as per the evaluation criteria on pages 16-17? Can you also elaborate on how the 30 pricing points will be allocated (e.g., 30 points for the lowest bidder and 0 for the other bidders, or is it a sliding scale)?	A contract will be awarded based on best value. The firm that receive the highest total points out of 130 possible points, will receive an award. Points for the cost proposals will be allocated based on the firm's total cost proposal. Example - the firm that submits the lowest cost proposal will receive 30 points. Thereafter, each firm's cost proposal total will be divided into the firm with the lowest cost proposal total to establish points received.
68.	Can you clarify the requirements of the code review? Typically in an FCA, only observable deficiencies are identified. Measurements, code research, and calculations are not typically provided as this is usually included in a design project once projects and desired adaptations have been identified. Are you looking for observable safety issues and best practices or a detailed code review?	Observable deficiencies only.

69.	Item 3.8.7 states that “Bus volume for each site will be provided to determine site efficiencies for each facility.” Can you clarify the expected deliverable for this? Is the district providing the bus volume data to the consultant?	PGCPS will provide bus data upon award.
70.	Item 3.9.8 states that long-range master plan configurations will be based on projected demographic trends. Can you confirm whether demographic and enrollment projections are being provided by the district, or is the selected consultant expected to provide that data as part of the project deliverables?	PGCPS will provide data upon award.
71.	Appendix A (pg. 34 of the RFP) states that it should be used as a cover sheet for the proposal. Can you clarify whether this means that it should be used as a cover for Volume IV of the proposal, or should this be used as a cover for all four volumes?	Appendix A is to be used as a cover for all four volumes.
72.	Are requirements for bonding applicable to FCA/Education Adequacy scope work?	No bonds are required.
73.	Bonding – bid bonds and performance and labor bonds are not typically required for these types of consulting services – can these requirements be waived?	No bonds are required.
74.	46 schools are listed in the RFP for cycle 2 phase 1 however, the attachment “Cycle 2 Phase 1 Assessment” lists 63 schools – can the County please clarify which schools are to be assessed as part of this cycle/phase?	Cycle 2 Phase 1 are 63 schools, Cycle 3 Phase 2 are 62 schools; and Cycle 4 Phase 2 are 38 schools. The total schools are 163.
75.	47 schools are listed in the RFP for cycle 3 phase 2 however, the attachment “Cycle 3 Phase 2 Assessment” lists 62 schools – can the County please clarify which schools are to be assessed as part of this cycle/phase?	See the above comment.
76.	3.8.3 “Compile outstanding Building Services work order information for each facility to incorporate in final improvement recommendations.” Please clarify if the intent is to review work orders to identify components and systems that are in early failure mode or in need of priority replacement.	Yes. Data will be provided upon award.
77.	3.8.7 “Bus volume for each site will be provided to determine site efficiencies for each facility.” Please clarify if the intent is to estimate cost of bus lane upgrades or if more detailed traffic survey is anticipated.	This should be included in the full facility evaluation.
78.	3.9.8 “Recommend long range Master Plan configurations based on projected	

	demographic trends in conjunction with Educational Sufficiency and Facility Adequacy.” It was mentioned on the pre-bid call that this project does not include master planning – is the intent to identify gaps in space requirements that would be necessary to meet current or projected enrollment?	Yes.
79.	Part III – 3.3 Scope of Work references a deliverable that is web accessible. Does PGCPs have a Facilities Inventory software/ platform that the awarded team is to utilize, is the awarded team to develop a web based interface for the Assessment, or does the reference to web accessible mean that all documents shall be stored in a cloud type environment?	SchoolDude was suggested but PGCPs is open to other capital planning database solutions that may be presented. First year subscription fees should be part of the proposal.
80.	Should offers include a cost for attending training and obtaining user-licenses for the Capital Forecasting module of PGCPs’s data-gathering platform: SchoolDude referenced in Part III 3.6? If so, what are these costs?	SchoolDude was suggested but PGCPs is open to other capital planning database solutions that may be presented. First year subscription fees should be part of the proposal.
81.	Please provide clarification on the contract duration and extension terms. The final assessment is to be submitted to the Board of Education in July 2025, 18 months from a January 2024 NTP which aligns with the contract duration. Will services related to revisions and adjustments that are needed during the additional 12 months leading up to submission to the State in August 2026 be negotiated as an additional fixed fee as part of the reference contract extension or should hourly rates be included in this proposal for such work beyond the original contract duration?	Include provisions for any adjustments prior to state submission.
82.	Will the required walkthroughs of each facility be scheduled and coordinated through PGCPs to occur during normal business hours or should offers anticipate off-hour access to facilities?	Both can be accommodated.
83.	Should offers anticipate one in-person academic facility interview per facility to be scheduled and coordinated by PGCPs in which all required parties listed in Part III – 3.8.4 will attend or should offers anticipate a higher fixed quantity of interviews for various user groups from each facility?	One interview per facility should be anticipated.
84.	Please confirm only one cost estimate per facility during the contract duration prior to	Correct.

	submission to the Board of Education will be required per 3.9.5.	
85.	Technical Evaluation Criterion No. 5 requires references for five (5) similar projects of similar size. Will this criteria be loosened to include individual Facility Assessments or will past experience remain limited to similar Capital Improvement Master Planning scaled experience?	Capital improvement master planning is strongly preferred.
86.	Appendix B – Past Performance and References Form requires only three (3) references whereas Technical Evaluation Criterion No. 5 requires five (5) references. Further, Appendix B requires the past experience be completed within the last five years. Can the references provided on Appendix B differ from the requirements of Technical Evaluation Criterion No. 5 provided The Technical Criterion is included in Tab C of the proposal or will Appendix B be revised to align with Technical Criterion No. 5?	No.
87.	Will a revised Appendix G – Financial Proposal Terms be issued that removes the wording, ‘Paint and Paint Sundries’ from the terms of the agreement?	Yes.
88.	Will a preferred Excel document with cost proposal formatting be provided by PGCPs or is the offeror to format their own?	No. Offeror to format their own Excel document.

Correction(s)

- **PART II INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS – 6. BIDDER DELIVERY**
 - The bidder shall deliver their Proposal electronically via cp.submissions@pgcps.org or eMaryland Marketplace as noted.
- **APPENDIX G – FINANCIAL PROPOSAL TERMS**
 - Appendix G Financial Proposal Terms is replaced with “revised” Appendix G.

Note

- Included with addendum number three is the pre-proposal meeting participants list of names only.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. THREE (03)