



JEFFERSON COUNTY, TEXAS

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT

1149 Pearl Street – First Floor
Beaumont, Texas 77701
409-835-8593 phone

ADDENDUM TO RFQ

RFQ Number: RFQ 20-041/YS

RFQ Title: Historic Preservation Professional Services for Historic Resources Survey Plan, Historic Resources and Historic Preservation Plan

RFQ Due: **Wednesday, November 4, 2020**

Addendum No.: 1 (one)

Issued (Date): October 14, 2020

TO RESPONDENT: This Addendum is an integral part of the RFQ package under consideration by you as a Respondent in connection with the subject matter herein identified. Jefferson County deems all sealed proposals to have been proffered in recognition and consideration of the entire RFQ package – **including all addenda**. For purposes of clarification, **receipt of this present Addendum by a Respondent should be evidenced by returning it (signed) as part of the Respondent's sealed proposal**. If the Proposal has already been received by the Jefferson County Purchasing Department, Respondent should return this addendum in a separate sealed envelope, clearly marked with the RFQ Title, RFQ Number, and Opening Date and Time, as stated above.

Reason for Issuance of this addendum: Responses to vendor questions.

The information included herein is hereby incorporated into the documents of this present Bid matter and supersedes any conflicting documents or portion thereof previously issued.

Receipt of this Addendum is hereby acknowledged by the undersigned Respondent:

ATTEST:

Witness

Witness

Approved by _____ Date: _____

Authorized Signature (Respondent)

Title of Person Signing Above

Typed Name of Business or Individual

Address

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Can you please clarify the assigned weighted values the Evaluation Committee will use to determine the best value? Would it be Page 14, Section 12, Rating Criteria or Page 34, Evaluation and Award, Criteria? **The criteria mentioned on Page 14, Section 12 is the county's usual criteria and will be the criteria used.**

Will the County be offering a pre-submittal review of HSPs (see Page 29)? If so, what is the deadline and is Darryl Gaona at 512-463-7748 / darryl.gaona@thc.texas.gov the contact (page 43)? **We don't plan to have any pre-submittal review. THC will not perform an HSP pre-review for the County.**

The RFQ indicates a map of the areas of the Jefferson County to be included in this project is included as Attachment 1. Can we have a copy of this map? **Copy of Map attached.**

The RFQ indicates a reference form is included on Page 19 of this package. Is that the same form as the Vendor References form on Page 17? **Yes, it's the same form.**

Can you please clarify the total number of hard copy submittals (original, copies, and flash drive) and what content should be included for the copies? (See Cover and Pages 15, 31, and 70 for discrepancies.) **Please submit one (1) original hard copy and five (5) copies. One (1) flashdrive should be sufficient.**

The first line of Page 15 includes a request to include "a completed copy of this specifications packet, in its entirety." Can you clarify if the specifications packet is the RFQ 20-041/YS packet or is there a separate packet to include? **Yes, the entire specification packet, completed, is what you will turn in.**

Can you clarify how many public outreach meetings would be required with the general public? "At least one (1) public outreach meeting must be held in each County Commissioner precinct." (Page 27) **As there are four (4) commissioner precincts, at least four (4) public meetings are required.**

Can you clarify if there is an Exhibit E to include with the response? "Respondents shall submit one (1) signed original Signature Page and one (1) signed original each of Exhibits A–E." The Exhibit E is not included on the checklist. The attached Exhibit E, Windshield Level... does not include a signature line.

The county does not need a signed Exhibit "E".

Can you clarify if the research design would be THC or TxDOT Standard? If TxDOT, can we clarify that the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Documentation Standard for Historical Studies Research Design (DS) would be limited to the Research Design? And that the rest of the documentation would be the THC standard? **Yes, it is appropriate to use the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Documentation Standard for Historical Studies Research Design (DS) limited to the Research Design and that the rest of the documentation would be the THC standard.**

Because the recipient of the grant is the THC (Page 21) from the HIM ESHPF, would we want to include review time in the schedule for the THC, in addition to the County review? (Page 29). **We plan to run the review concurrently with THC.**

Would Excel work as a Microsoft Access-compatible database (Page 26)? **The county will accept Excel. However, the two programs can at least talk to each other at a basic level, but the CRSurveyor Collector App has multiple related tables that may not work well in Excel.**

Under Task 5 Deliverables (page 27) – can you clarify the field survey forms required? Every resource would be inventoried and surveyed within the CRSurveyor Collector app, but would you want an individual hard copy form for every resource? If yes, would that be produced from the app itself? Or would that need to be produced separately from the Access-compatible database? **We are expecting that the CRSurveyor Collector can essentially output a survey form, with no need to duplicate information. The survey form would just be a formatted version of the data collected with the CRSurveyor Collector.**

Can we have a copy of Exhibit G Grant Agreement between the NPS and THC (Pages 29 and 74)? **The agreement is attached to this.**

Can we have a copy of the Exhibit F CRSurveyor Collector NAPC User Field Guide or a weblink to the preferred guide? **See attached.**

The submittal requirements state that one original and multiple copies must be mailed or hand delivered. On the first page in the RFQ it states that 5 copies should be submitted in addition to the original. On page 31 and the RFQ Submittal Checklist on page 70, the RFQ states that 3 copies in addition to the original are required in the submittal. Please clarify how many copies are required in addition to the original. **Please submit one (1) original and five (5) copies.**

Is there a page count limitation for each of the required sections (firm information/qualifications, scope, methodology, staff qualifications/resume/org chart, comparable project experience)? **No.**

Are there format restrictions, such as font, point size, margins, resume page totals, 8.5x11 vs 11x17 organizational chart, etc. for the each of the required sections (firm information/qualifications, scope, methodology, qualifications/resume/org chart, comparable project experience)? **No.**

Please confirm dates and time frames throughout the RFQ since they don't always match or correspond to one another. For example, the deadline for Task 4 is July 30, 2022 on page 5 versus December 1, 2022 on page 30. Similarly, the contract duration is listed as 30 months on page 21, but contract termination dates listed are less than 30 months from the projected start date of December 1, 2020 (February 13, 2023 on page 23 and January 31, 2023 on page 38).

The schedule of events on page 30 under Part III, Submittal Information, are the dates to be observed for this RFQ. Yes, our dates have already been pushed back a few months. We kept the intervals between the first few deliverables the same, pushing the dates back as needed, and then kept the date of the final deliverable the same so that we had time to close out the grant, and then we are shortening the time for the actual field survey work since that was by far the longest interval.

Page 30 of the RFQ discusses collective recordation of select property types. However, the "Windshield-Level Historic Resources Survey Report Standards" in Exhibit E do not include any allowances for collective property groupings. Please clarify if the survey methodology will or will not allow for collective groupings of properties. **We elected to use this collective grouping for types of properties that had very little or no potential to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register. Essentially it treats the post-war residential neighborhood**

(or other grouping) itself as the property being surveyed, rather than each and every house within the neighborhood, since we felt that provided the best value for the THC project. There is nothing in Exhibit E that would preclude grouping properties like that.

Page 25 of the RFQ states that the windshield survey inventory will either "field verify whether the historic-age resources are eligible for listing in the NRHP" or "make recommendations for further evaluation in the future to finalize such determination." Exhibit E states that all survey inventory entries must include "the recommended determination of eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP.)" Please clarify whether it will be acceptable to include a recommendation for further future evaluation in lieu of a NRHP-eligibility recommendation for some resources within the windshield-level survey inventory. **A recommendation for future further evaluation seems appropriate where further research and assessment would be required before making a full evaluation.**

The RFQ notes only that the County will review deliverables; the THC is never noted. Please clarify if the THC will review any deliverable(s). **Yes, THC will need to review and approve, and may require changes before we accept a deliverable. There will be a 30 day review period for a draft submittal and a 30 day review period for the proposed final deliverable.**

If the THC will review any deliverable(s), will their review be concurrent with the County's, or will County comments need to be addressed prior to submission to the THC for review? **THC's review will be concurrent with the County's review.**

Who at the County will be responsible for reviewing and providing comments on project deliverables? **The County's Historic Preservation Officer will be responsible for reviewing and providing comments on project deliverables.**

How will the deliverables be used by the County after project completion? **The deliverables will be used to identify historic properties that should be preserved, and to adopt a preservation plan that will give the county and other local governments guidance on how to preserve these historic properties and neighborhoods.**

Is there a page limit for the response? **There is not a page limit for the response.**

Are there formatting requirements for the response? **No, we don't have any required or standard formatting. Since we'll have a clean, searchable PDF copy, the binding won't matter as much since we won't have to scan it or anything. I believe that we requested 3 ring binders at least for the draft submissions just because they would be easier to take apart and review, but we did not have any standard for the final.**