



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
Department of Parks and Recreation
6600 Kenilworth Avenue Riverdale, Maryland 20737

June 3, 2019

For The Attention of all Offerors:

Project: Preparation of A Master Plan for Cosca Regional Park

RFP No: P39-133

Subject: Addendum Number Four (4)

The following information related to the above project is provided to all prospective offerors:

1. The date for receipt of sealed proposals has been changed to June 20, 2019 @ 3:00 p.m.
2. Provide and attach a detailed spreadsheet that details: staff, hours, and hourly rates that will total the lump sum for each task to the proposal fee form.
3. **Part II, Section I: Introduction, Discussion and Background, B. Discussion, on page 15, ADD the following bullet points:**

- Identify opportunities to incorporate innovative approaches to parks, recreation, and open space planning and environmental, operational, and financial sustainability. Innovation goes beyond trends and best practices and makes an attempt at finding game-changing solutions to age-old challenges. The challenges identified through the planning process will exceed the typical site design, circulation, and conservation challenges to include maintenance, operations, budget, and lifecycle of the park.

Proposers should discuss innovative ways to gather information; i.e. user engagement outreach, public meetings and surveys.

4. **Part II Section 3: Introduction, Discussion and Background, F. Level of Service Standards on page 21, ADD the following:**

4. Identify opportunities to incorporate innovative approaches to parks, recreation, and open space planning and environmental, operational, and financial sustainability. Innovation goes beyond trends and best practices and makes an at-

tempt at finding game-changing solutions to age-old challenges. The challenges identified through the planning process will exceed the typical site design, circulation, and conservation challenges to include maintenance, operations, budget, and lifecycle of the park.

5. **Part II, Section 3 – Scope of Work, H. Preparation of Final Plan on page 22, ADD the following:**

6. The final plan shall identify opportunities of innovative approaches recommended to parks, recreation, and open space planning and environmental, operational, and financial sustainability.

6. **The site is open to the public daily. Therefore, offerors may visit the site without scheduling an appointment.**

7. **Part IV – Proposal Submission and Evaluation, B. Technical Proposal on page 30, Tab 2. Performance of Similar Projects is revised as follows:**

The Commission's desired level of experience by project references is three (3) projects of similar scope and size quality and similarity completed within the past 8 years within the past eight (8) years, including location, name of client/owner, telephone number and email address of contact and total project costs. Projects must show successful completion by the prime Offeror and team with experience in unique structures and in all aspects of public facilities; and developing projects in a rural or suburban context.

8. **Part IV – Proposal Submission and Evaluation, B. Technical Proposal on page 30, Tab 3. Tab 4 and Tab 5 is revised as follows:**

Tab 3. **Project Understanding, Approach and Methodology:** All proposals will include a Detailed methodology describing how the desired outcomes will be achieved. In all cases, information should be provided in sufficient detail to be able to effectively assess what the consultant proposes. Consultants should be prepared to present the findings and recommendations of the plan to the public, the Prince George's County Planning Board, and/or the Prince George's County Council. Consultants may suggest any additions to the scope of services they feel would be beneficial to DPR. Each of these tasks noted shall be outlined in the work involved, and it shall be the responsibility of each consultant replying to this RFP to identify, with specificity, the tasks, sub-tasks, and meeting time for public workshops, public presentations, and public input.

Tab 4. **Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel:** Provide resumes, qualifications and experience of all key personnel and any proposed subcontractors to perform work

on this project. Reference shall be made to projects of similar scope and related work performed by each team member for current and former clients that demonstrate the consultant's ability to provide the services stated herein, especially in Prince George's County. The proposal shall include an organizational chart for the project that lists all personnel and proposed subcontractors that will work on the project, delineating responsibilities and assignments, names of personnel to perform each assignment, and their position title. Consultant's team shall demonstrate substantial relevant experience with regional park master planning, funding, acquisition, design, construction, operation and maintenance; park needs assessments; parks and recreation operations and funding; public engagement strategies; and stakeholder meeting facilitation.

Tab 5. **Project Team Organization and Capacity:** Consultant shall provide a preliminary project schedule and timeline that specifies the deliverables, key task identification and description detail; name(s) of key personnel assigned to each deliverable/task; projected start and completion timeframes for each deliverable/task; and the interrelationship and sequencing of tasks, key milestones and benchmarks.

Ability of the consultant to meet the Schedule of Completion – DPR desires all work to be completed within eighteen (18) months of the Notice-to-Proceed.

- Final Draft – 1 year
- Presentations – 6 months
- Modifications to draft – 2 months
- Final Report

9. Part II, Section 3 – Scope of Work I. Add Alternate: Feasibility Study for the Dock and Boat House on page 23 is revised as follows:

Analyze the existing conditions of the site and any necessary improvements (building and structures). The feasibility is intended primarily to gain an understanding of the cost of rehabilitation the existing facility verses replacing it. The analysis may include assessing building condition and compliance with the Building Code; site analysis (environmental, road frontage, utilities, etc.) life cycle costs and determining the business case. The deliverables will include the analysis report and a “Rough Order of Magnitude” cost estimates. (Two estimates: Rehabilitation and Replacement.

10. The “highly visual” plan should include artistic renderings, graphic maps, images, etc.

11. The winning bidder will be provided with a list of the various divisions and the resource team members who they should contact for interviews. All of the divisions will be involved in the master planning effort at one point or another.

12. M-NCPPC has all of those GIS layers and more and will provide them to the winning firm.

13. Firms shall describe how they will substantiate the public outreach survey results as part of their proposal.

14. A Cosca Maintenance Yard Improvement Plan is underway.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:

15. The following are responses to questions received:

Q1. 1. The add alternate for the feasibility study of the dock and boat house mentions analyzing the existing conditions and noting necessary improvements. At this point, we can definitely put a fee to that amount of work.

The add alternate item also mentions we should also provide full construction documents, permit documents, construction administration services, etc.

We can provide those services as well, but at this time, until we perform the first part (the analysis and master plan recommendations for what should happen there), we won't yet know how much work is required for the construction document/permitting/construction phase.

Would it be possible for us to provide pricing for the first part (analysis, recommendations as part of the master plan), but wait on providing a fee for the construction documents/permitting/construction phase, until we get through the analysis/recommendations phase of the master plan? It could be a negotiated fee at a later time, using the same hourly rates we're providing now.

A1: See Item #9

Q2: For the Cosca Regional Park Master Plan, we're trying to determine to what level of natural resource inventory and analysis you need as part of this master plan, without driving up the fees too far with a more detailed effort.

For instance, to do a full official Natural Resource Inventory, here are some steps needed:

Cosca Regional Park covers 790 acres so that task will be a large undertaking assuming MNCPPC wants their standard NRI (see attached checklist), which includes wetland/stream delineation (including GPS survey of delineated and flagged boundaries, detailed report/map, and USACE/MDE confirmation), T&E species evaluation, forest stand delineation, and then the resulting NRI plan showing natural resources (including wetlands/streams, floodplain, potential T&S species critical habitat, soils, steep slopes), forest stands, and specimen trees.

While that amount of effort is a good thing to have performed if the project concerned only Natural Resources Inventorying, we're not sure if that's too much effort in relation to the scope of the rest of the master plan, especially if the fees for that much NRI effort might equal that of the rest

of the master plan effort. Can you let us know if that much effort is what is desired, or if a lesser and more general review is what would be necessary for this master plan scope?

A2: The Assessment of Cultural and Natural Resources, starting on page 2-40 of the Watkins Regional Park Master Park Development Plan, is an example of the level of analysis we are seeking as part of this inventory effort. The analysis is intended to be used to understand development opportunities, areas of conservation, elements that enhance user experience, areas for consideration as future tree bank or permanent agriculture, etc. Refer to the following link for the Watkins Regional Park Master Park Development Plan
<http://www.pgparcs.com/279/Watkins-Regional-Park-Master-Park-Develo>

Q3: B. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL seems to ask for a proposed schedule in two places: under Tab 3. Project Understanding, Approach and Methodology (“a proposed timetable to perform and complete the work”) and under Tab 5. Project Team Organization and Capacity (“provide a preliminary project schedule and timeline.”) Is there a difference in the type of information requested under each tab or can this answer be combined to one location?

A3: See Item #8

Q4: The EMG study provided from 2011 seems quite thorough. Can you indicate what recommended elements from that list was implemented?

A4: The selected firm will be provided with a list of items from the EMG report that have been completed to date.

Q5: Compared to the EMG study, what level of assessment is required under Scope of Work A. Inventory of the Existing Conditions?

A5: The consultant will build upon the information provided in the EMG Report by conducting general field level observations, useful in the preparation of a master park development plan. The section of the Watkins Regional Park Master Park Development Plan, Assessment of Built Features Condition, Use, and Comparable Facilities Within the Region, which begins on page 2-8, is a good example of the level of assessment required.

Q6: Does winning the master plan bids exclude an offeror from bidding on future design work for the sites?

A6: Offeror awarded this contract will not be excluded from bidding/proposing on solicitations for performing additional work, except for work associated with Add Alternate 1: Feasibility Study for the Dock and Boat.

Q7: Do both the prime and subs need to submit a certificate of good standing for this proposal?

A7: Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulations certificate of good standing required only for Prime Proposer and shall be included in the proposal

Q8: Under Part 8- Technical Proposal - Tab 4 of the RFP, it states the consultant should reflect the ability to meet the schedule of completion. Should this be expressed as a signed statement by the Prime consultant?

A8: See Item #8.

Q9: Is it a requirement to submit MFD certifications along with the Non-discrimination subcontract bid form?

A9: MFD certifications are not a requirement of the Proposal contents.

Q10: If the Prime Consultant is a MFD, is it still a requirement to meet 10% Sub Consulting MFD?

A10: The recommended subconsultant participation applies to subconsultants only.

Q11: Will hazmat testing or sampling be required for the building or site analysis?

A11: No

Q12: Does M-NCPPC want full forest stand delineations and wetland delineations (including agency verification of boundaries) completed for all developable areas of the park or only the areas that are associated with the proposed park modifications per the new master plan?

A12: See A2. Developable areas will be determined after the detailed environmental resource evaluation and site analysis is updated.

Q13: Is the inventory of invasive species intended to cover the entirety of the developable areas or the entirety of the park?

A13: See A2. Developable areas will be determined after the detailed environmental resource evaluation and site analysis is updated. The goal of this task is to determine if there are any invasive species that will have an impact on habitat or user experience and not to inventory the location of all invasive species within the park.

Q14: Is the inventory of rare and endangered species limited to the undevelopable areas or the entirety of the park?

A14: See A12.

Q15: Is the detailed plan indicating the habitat, cover types, and other natural resources intended to be completed for the entirety of the park?

A15: See A2.

Q16: Are there previous studies/inventories that the proposers can build on or are all new inventories expected to be performed?

A16: The only previous study done for this park is the EMG Report.

Q17: Can the utility easement be eliminated from all investigations?

=A17: No, the utility easement shall not be eliminated from all investigations.

As part of a settlement agreement in conjunction with the Pepco/Exelon Power Company merger, the company identified the potential of piloting trail projects in both Montgomery and Prince George's County. Montgomery County is currently working with Pepco/Exelon on their pilot trail projects. The consultant should recommend potential connections to and within the park using the utility easement, with the expectation of a future partnership with the company.

Q18: Can M-NCPPC provide the bidders a copy of the permit application for the lake dredging to determine the estimated quantity of dredge material?

A18: The successful bidder will be provided with this information.

Q19: Do consultants need to register on the Commission's Online Vendor registration prior to submitting the proposal?

A19: All vendors, consultants and subconsultants should register on the Commission's Online Vendor portal - @ www.mncepc.org/register.html

Q20: If a consultant's office is located in another state, will they be required to submit proof of licensure in the proposal response? Or can they apply if they are selected? Do the subconsultants on a team need to submit the same information?

A20: Yes. See PART IV – PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION – B. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL, Tab 6 – Offerors must also submit documentation that demonstrates a status of “Good Standing” with the Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation.

The subconsultants on a team does not need to submit the information.

Q21: Does the sample contract need to be completed and submitted with the proposal response?

A21: The sample contract is for information purposes only. Do not need to be completed and submitted with the proposal response.

Q22: Is MNPPC requesting that the team make determinations based upon the condition assessment of the cost benefits of keeping vs. rebuilding facilities and is it expecting the master planner to develop new cost estimates for new construction?

A22: Yes, the consultant shall make recommendations regarding the renovation or disposal of facilities. The order of magnitude cost does need to be taken into consideration when making plan recommendations. See the examples in the Watkins Regional Park Master Park Development Plan Chapter 4 Moving Forward.

Q23: Can MNPPC please expand on what they mean by the terms financially sustainable and cost effective?

A23: Financially Sustainable generally means finding a way to use finite resources in a responsible manner. Cost effective means making recommendations that have good value where the benefits to the residents and the overall park system are worth the financial cost.

Q24: Can MNPPC clarify what they mean by “type” (e.g. snack bar, sit down, food trucks?)

A24: Yes, type means snack bar, sit down, food trucks, etc.

Q25: Does MNPPC mean understand current occupancy and how changes may change overall demand?

A25: This question is referring to the campground. Yes, the consultant will need to understand the current occupancy of the campground as well as the type of occupant if possible (i.e. long-term camping, weekend camping). The Watkins Regional Park Master Park Development Plan recommended eliminating the camp ground from that park. The consultant should evaluate how that decision may affect occupancy of the campground at Cosca and the enhancements required to meet that demand.

Q26: MNPPC has completed a comprehensive condition assessment on facilities. What additional assessment does MNPPC desire of the planners? Does it seek to qualitatively compare it to other MNCPPC regional parks from a positioning standpoint or other comparable parks?

A26: See A5

Q27: Does MNPPC desire us to evaluate the role from a demand and programming perspective (e.g. how many people is it serving, how does it compare to other centers, or how does it fit into overall positioning of space needs into the future?)

A27: Yes

Q28: Can MNPPC expand on what they mean by “evaluate”. Is this meant to be a qualitative or quantitative assessment?

A28: This question is referring to DPR’s staffing and operational capacities to maintain and improve the park. This question is meant to be quantitative as well as qualitative. The consultant should evaluate whether or not the Department has the resources to staff and maintain and new

amenities or programs that are recommended as part of the Master Plan progress. This evaluation may be conducted through interviews with the operations and maintenance staff.

Q29: Could you clarify the expectation for the price proposal for the I. Add Alternate: Feasibility Study for the Dock and Boat House?

A29: See Item #9.

Q30: Should we provide a price for the feasibility study, schematic options and costs estimates at this time and wait until there is a determination of scope to provide a price for full construction and permit drawings:

A30: See Item #9.

Q31: Compared to the EMG study, what level of assessment is required under Scope of Work I. Add Alternate: Feasibility Study for The Dock and Boat House?

A31: The findings of the EMG report indicated that the Dock and Boat House are at the end of their useful life. The feasibility study would verify this finding and identify the costs associated with rehabilitating the structures verses replacing them.

All other terms and conditions apply.

Proposers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment by:

1. Signing below and returning this letter with our proposal submittal; or
2. Indicating receipt of this Addendum by identifying Addendum Number and date.

**Receipt Acknowledged by
Authorized Company Official**

Pamela C. Graves
**Pamela C. Graves
Sr. Procurement Specialist**

END OF Addendum Four (4)