

ADDENDUM # 2

MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

April 23, 2015

Address all questions to:
Paula Rickman, Senior Procurement Analyst
Multnomah County Purchasing
501 SE Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 125
Portland, OR 97214
503-988-7544
E-mail: paula.j.rickman@multco.us

RFP NO: 4000003514
TITLE: Architectural and Engineering Services for the Multnomah County Central Courthouse
CLOSING DATE: May 11, 2015 / NOT LATER THAN 4:00 PM

This Addendum is issued to the above referenced RFP to make the following changes, additions, deletions, and/or clarifications:

-
1. Delete RFP page 8, paragraph 1.21 "AFFIDAVIT OF COMPLIANCE AND PRE-AWARD RISK ASSESSMENT" is deleted in its entirety.
 2. Delete and Replace RFP Attachment 1, "Proposer Representations and Certifications" is deleted and replaced with **Revised Attachment 1**, attached to this addendum as "Attachment 1 to Addendum #2". Use this revised version for your proposal submittal. Note that the tax certification requirement in the former paragraph 1.21 has been incorporated as Certification item 7 of Revised Attachment 1 (top of 2nd page).
 3. Clarification Question: **Page 13:** Will design of spaces to be located outside of the Central Courthouse, such as the District Attorney's Office and High Volume Courts, be included in this contract?

Answer: That will be determined during final design.
 4. Clarification Question: **Page 18:** The RFP references that shortlisted firms will be furnished with a "problem to solve during the oral evaluation." Will this "problem" be issued prior to the oral evaluations, or during the oral evaluations?

Answer: It will be issued during the oral evaluations.
 5. Clarification Question A: **Page 20; 3.2.1.c:** We would like to confirm that the list of three recommended consultants for the disciplines listed on Page 20 of the RFP, plus additional sub-consultant information requested in 3.2.1.c. i-iv is all to be included in the Appendix. OR should the list be included in the 30-page Proposal Response, and the additional requested information in the Appendix?

Answer A: Provide all of the requested information in the Appendix.

Question B: Is it acceptable to recommend less than three firms for some specialized sub-consultant disciplines?

Answer B: Yes.

6. Clarification Question: **Page 20; 3.2.1.c:** Reference is made to Appendix B; can we assume we are to include only one Appendix with the requested information to be included in it?

Answer: Yes, one Appendix.

7. Clarification Question: **Page 21; 3.2.1.d.ii:** Should this be addressed by inclusion of MWESB firms in response to 3.2.1.c since the County wants to ultimately participate in selection of all sub-consultant team members?

Answer: Yes.

8. Clarification Question: **Page 21; 3.2.2.i-iii:** We would like to confirm that we are to propose a maximum of 8 key team members, and proposed replacements for 4 of those key team members (Principal-in-Charge, Project Manager, Courts Planner, and Lead Designer) for a total of 12 key team members (maximum).

Answer: Yes, that is correct.

9. Clarification Question: **Pages 21 and 22; 3.2.2:** Key Personnel is stated as 40 points maximum; however, the Evaluation Criteria total only 35 points; can you please identify how the other 5 points will be evaluated?

Answer: Please add 5 points to item b.

10. Clarification Question: **Page 22; 3.2.3:** Please describe the role the County anticipates playing in the public engagement / public involvement process.

Answer: The County is very interested in the teams' approach and how they would propose to include the County.

11. Clarification Question: **Page 27; Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters: Item 5:** How should we address any pending claims?

Answer: Please list any pending claims and provide a brief synopsis of each.

CONTRACTOR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ADDENDUM: _____

c: JD Deschamps, Mike Day
Paula Rickman, Tessa Steele
File