

**Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
Infrastructure Division
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, Texas 78744**

ADDENDUM

Addendum Number:	Two (2)	Dated:	June 17, 2024
Solicitation Number:	1111827		
Solicitation Title:	Hueco Tanks State Park & Historic Site / Cultural Center and Park Headquarters		
Due Date/Deadline:	2:00 PM; June 21, 2024 - CHANGED, SEE BELOW		
Contract Manager:	JoAnn Hernandez, CTCD, CTCM		

PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM:

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced herein, remain unchanged and in full force and effect. The following are official revisions, specifications and/or clarifications to this solicitation. This Addendum shall be attached to and form a part of the referenced solicitation document and any resulting awarded contract and must be considered in your response.

Respondents are advised to check for updates, addenda issuance, and proposal opening date changes through the Comptroller's website under *Electronic State Business Daily (ESBD)* at <http://www.txsmartbuy.com/sp>

UPDATES

Due date has been changed from June 21, 2024, to **July 1, 2024 @ 2:00PM CST.**

A virtual public opening of responses will be conducted by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department via Microsoft Teams. To facilitate virtual openings, TPWD will host all openings **one (1) hour after the opening deadline.** Interested attendees must register in advance to obtain information regarding the virtual opening. Interested attendees will receive the invitation to attend the day of the opening. To sign up for the virtual opening, use the link below.

Bid Opening Registration Form:

https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=p_1keK1i7EeB7DlyZuOjX61WgEfLL99Ft5C-gSnEzjBUNFdKV0ZTODIHRktLOExTUjIMTzZBNVZSRS4u

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1. Are we permitted to reformat the information required in Exhibits A-G? Or would TPWD prefer we present the information in the format provided?

A1. Refer to the RFQ. Respondent should carefully review and conform with the specific requirements of each exhibit.

Q2. Attachment 2, Project Deliverables: \$2.6M is the listed construction budget. This scope of work appears to exceed the construction budget. Is there an opportunity for obtaining additional funding? or will you rely on the design professional to identify and prioritize needs that will fit within the current budget?

A2. For the design phases 1 and 2, we have budgeted approximately \$2.1M for AE professional fees, including their consultants and reimbursables. TPWD will rely on the selected firm to design to the construction budget. Future funding is not known at this time.

Q3. Attachment 2, Project Assumptions/constraints/[parameters/risks/other notes, Section Constraints: note 11 states "Interpexhibits will be conceptualized and curated by TPWD's Interpretive Services, and/or use current displays and exhibits". Then in the Parameters section regarding Exhibit Planning it states "TPWD will review the planning and design ... of interpretive exhibits for the Cultural Center." Will the design team incorporate museum planning and exhibit design professionals as part of the design team?

A3. Please refer to Section 4. Executive Summary, Section 4.9 Scope of Professional Services, which says: Exhibit planning, design, fabrication, and installation of interpretive exhibits. This would be closely monitored by TPWD's Interpretive Services.

Q4. Per the RFQ it states we must provide evidence of financial capability and stability and to attach a copy of our Dun & Bradstreet Report. We do not have a D&B account but can provide audited financial statements from the last few years and an independent accountant's report. Would that suffice? Or do we need to purchase the D&B report?

A4. TPWD requires and uses the respondent's Dun & Bradstreet Report as an indicator of financial stability. Please do not include audited, financial statement and/or independent accountant's report.

Q5. Will an audio/visual consultant be required on this project?

A5. It is unknown if an audio/visual consultant will be needed. It will depend on what is offered on the design professionals' submission.

Q6. Section 3.1 Is it possible to extend the dates for the site visit? possibly to the questions due date of June 7th?

A6. The dates for the site visit are set. You may attend outside of those dates, but it will not be an official visit and you will not be eligible for the 5 points for attending he site visit.

Q7. I see this statement on the Required Response checklist, "N/A Design Professional's Financial Capability (Dun & Bradstreet (D&B) Business Information Report)." Are we to supply a Dun & Bradstreet Business Information report with our proposal response?

A7. TPWD requires and uses the respondent's Dun & Bradstreet Report as an indicator of financial stability.

Q8. Pre-submittal Online Conference and Non-mandatory Site Visit. Will lists of those attending the Online Conference and Park site visit be made available?

A8. Attendees of the pre-submittal on-line conference and the attendees of the site visit are both posted to the TPWD website.

Q9. In Attachment 1 – Draft Professional Services Agreement, Article 7 – Project Construction Cost, page 24 of 36, paragraph 7.4, it states the following: "Construction Cost Limitation for this project shall not exceed the range of \$2M to \$2.6M". Would you please confirm if this range is accurate for this project? Our concern is that this construction budget does not seem to align with the scope of the project as described in the solicitation.

A9. For the design phases 1 and 2, we have budgeted approximately \$2.1M for AE professional fees, including their consultants and reimbursables. TPWD will rely on the selected firm to design to the construction budget. Future funding is not known at this time.

Q10. Page 26, Section 6-Required Response Content Checklist. The checklist and footnote state, "*** The Respondent must provide evidence of financial capability and stability. Respondent's financial capability must be appropriate to the size and scope of the project. Attach a copy of its Dun & Bradstreet (D&B) Business Information Report. If a D&B Report is submitted the report must include Respondent's Viability Score and the Portfolio Comparison Score or similar ratings."

GSBS Architects does not subscribe to Dun & Bradstreet. Would a letter of financial capability and stability from our bank satisfy this requirement? If not, what other kinds of financial documents would?

A10. TPWD requires and uses the respondent's Dun & Bradstreet Report as an indicator of financial stability.

Q11. Page 34-47, Exhibits C-F While Exhibits B and G either have no provided form or explicitly state that the form may be modified, Exhibits C through F do not explicitly state whether or not the provided forms can be modified. May these forms be modified as long as the required information is included?

A11. Refer to the RFQ. Respondent should carefully review and conform with the specific requirements of each exhibit.

Q12. For Exhibit B, do we need to select from consultants and subcontractors who are under a blanket contract with TPWD? If so, is there a document or web page that lists all firms currently under a blanket contract?

A12. Respondents are not required to select form consultants and subcontractors who are under a blanket contract with TPWD.

Q13. Questions about the type of wastewater management on site.

A13. Septic tank and leach fields. Each facility has their own.

Q14. Questions about the water source for park use and other related topics.

A14. Wells are our water source, one at ~450ft and one at ~600ft depth. A separate project for the park is being planned for utility improvements including well system and water distribution line upgrades. The water onsite is managed as a Public Water System according to Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) standards.

Q15. Expansion and reiteration on the project stakeholders mentioned in the RFQ.

A15. Project stakeholders may include the currently five affiliated federally recognized tribal partners: Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, Mescalero Apache Tribe, Isleta Pueblo, Kiowa Tribe, Comanche Nation, as well as local community organizations such as schools and universities and comments from the general public among others. The park was designated as a National Historic Landmark in 2021 and we are considering the possibility of applying for World Heritage Site designation.

Q16. Questions on uses for the Cultural Center and Park Headquarters, expansion on the description in the RFQ of all the needs this facility will fulfill.

A16. Answers: Staff office space and breakroom space, some supply storage, visitor orientation space for the mandatory orientation process, exhibit space which could potentially be the largest in any Texas State Park, indoor classroom/meeting/programming space, outdoor classroom/programming space including community grounds for performances and presentations, shaded pavilions, outdoor exhibits and landscaping. Design elements include incorporating the landscape view, sustainable design, design that blends into the landscape but is also a world class experience. The park has a Public Use Plan that dictates how many visitors can be in the Self-guided Area of North Mountain and the Guided Access areas at one time. We often experience a queue of visitors waiting to come into the park as visitors leave and open up more space, so having a facility that can provide a pleasant visitor experience while waiting is important. We are also looking for optimal accessible design which would provide a visitor experience even if the Cultural Center is the only experience in the park they are able or want to have due to time constraints or mobility/accessibility needs. We have many school groups and community partners that use this site for programming, meetings, activities and ceremonies. Having this facility will expand our capacity for more programming and park usage during the warmer and colder months.

Q17. Questions about if the department has done some internal planning for this project.

A17. Yes, we have done some assessments of areas of the park for this project, including some resource impact evaluations. The potential project area provided in the attached park map is one of those sites. The department has also gotten some stakeholder input on this project.

Q18. Questions about rock piles seen in the park in certain areas.

A18. Those are supplies for trail maintenance/building and erosion control projects. They are not collected from the park but purchased from nearby quarries to reduce impact to park resources and make it easier to differentiate between the rocks present in the park.

Q19. The HUB Subcontracting Plan, Exhibit H, requires that an expected percentage of the contract be assigned to each subcontractor and also requires that an approximate dollar amount be assigned to each of those percentages (HSP Good Faith Effort - Method A, Section A-2). Without knowing what the contract amount will be, are we to make an educated guess at these percentages and dollar amounts? Can TPWD give any estimate as to what the contract amount is expected to be? The construction estimate is listed at \$2.6M on the Notice to Respondents, and we presume the design fees negotiated with the winning respondent will be a percentage of \$2.6M.

A19. For the design phases 1 and 2, we have budgeted approximately \$2.1M for AE professional fees, including their consultants and reimbursables. TPWD will rely on the selected firm to design to the construction budget. Future funding is not known at this time.

Q20. Section 3, Paragraph 3.23 mentions a Build America Buy America form, but I don't see it attached. Is the signed BABA form required as part of the RFQ response?

A20. This is not a Federally Funded project, so a signed BABA form is not required.

Q21. For Exhibit F, if we plan to feature some of the same projects we featured in our RFQ response for the blanket contract, can we also reuse the owner reference letters for those projects, or do we need to obtain new letters?

A21. The solicitation does not require that the reference letters have current dates. As such, that is up to the discretion of the respondent.

Q22. May project images be included under Exhibit F?

A22. The RFQ, Exhibit F states that *Additional pages can be added to this exhibit if needed.*

Q23. Should staff members in our firm who are contracted hourly and will have involvement on this project be considered consultants and listed as such under Exhibits B and H, or can they be regarded as employees of our firm?

A23. The respondent's employees are not considered to be consultants (or sub-consultants)

Q24. Does the "Respondent's HUB Information" requested at the end of Exhibit B pertain to the prime consultant, subconsultants or both?

A24. You may contact HUB staff directly with questions pertaining to the HSP forms at 512-389-4784 or hub@tpwd.texas.gov

Q25. Under Exhibit C, should personnel profiles be included for staff of subconsultants who will be assigned to the project, or are profiles only needed for key staff of the lead firm?

A25. Refer to Exhibit C – Key Personnel Profiles – 1st paragraph. Per page 35, Exhibit C – Key Personnel Profiles, Key Personnel are licensed professionals that should be expected to handle the project on a day-to-day basis. They can be Project Principals, Project Managers, Project Professionals, etc., that have an established record of projects for the last 10 years. Per page 36, please list for each Key Personnel their three (3) comparable projects which they have completed in the last ten (10) years.

Q26. In Section F, Comparable Projects, if letters of reference are unavailable, can we provide CPARS, past performance questionnaires, or reference contact information instead?

A26. Respondents should use their best judgment for satisfying requirements of this Section. TPWD does not recommend simply providing contact information as evaluators will be reviewing the documents submitted by the respondents and will not be calling references during this phase of the RFQ.

Q27. Exhibit C – Key Personnel Profiles: Do we have to include the exact page listed in the RFQ plus our branded resumes? Or can we take the information requested on pages 35-36 and format the information into the branded resume we are providing?

A27. TPWD recommends that respondents refrain from re-formatting the exhibit forms.

Q28. Exhibit F – Comparable Projects: Same clarification as Exhibit C. Will you require that the exact pages be included in our submission or are we allowed to format that information into our branded template?

A28. TPWD recommends that respondents refrain from re-formatting the exhibit forms.

Q29. Does there happen to be a Program of Requirements available for the project?

A29. See Attachment 2, Draft Scope of Services, pages 98-105 for program scope.

Q30. Page 9, Section 7.3.1

7.3.1 **USB flash drive** shall include all the required documents of the Response. Provide each required submission in a separate PDF file.

Exhibit	Description
A	Execution of Response
B	Firm Profile
N/A	Design Professional’s Financial Capability (Dun & Bradstreet (D&B) Business Information Report)
C	Key Personnel Profiles
D	Team Structure
E	Statement of Qualifications
F	Comparable Projects & Corresponding Letters of References
G	Methodology, Quality Assurance / Quality Control & Cost Estimating
H	HUB Subcontracting Plan
N/A	Submission of addenda signed by Respondent

Please confirm that individual sections called out in the table above are to be printed and bound in one document, but provided as separate .PDF documents on the USB flash drive. Is one combined .PDF also to be included on the USB flash drive?

A30. TPWD confirms that individual sections called out in the table above are to be printed and bound in one document and provided as separate .PDF documents on the USB flash drive. It is not a requirement of this RFQ to provide one combined .PDF on the USB flash drive.

Respondents are to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum. Return a signed copy of this notice with your response submission.

I acknowledge receipt of this addendum.

Respondent Company Name

Respondent’s Authorized Signature

Date