



**National Trust for
Historic Preservation**
Save the past. Enrich the future.

Addendum No. 1

PROJECT: PRESERVING BLACK CHURCHES ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES RFP 2023-25

DATE: JANUARY 12, 2024

RE: ADDENDUM NO. 1 TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

TO: ALL BIDDERS

This addendum forms a part of the Contract Documents and modifies the original Bidding Documents and shall be included in the relevant scopes of work and bids submitted. It is the bidder's responsibility to determine if their work is affected by this addendum. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum on bid submission may subject the Bidder to disqualification.

The Following is AMENDED:

GENERAL NOTES AND CLARIFICATIONS: None

1. First Set of Answers to Questions

DRAWINGS: None

SPECIFICATIONS: None

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1

Answers to Questions

1. Please confirm if NTHP intends to award the work on all six churches to a single prime firm.

ANSWER: Yes

2. Please clarify the effort required for the master plan document – referenced in the first paragraph after the three bullets on page 5. Is it a compilation of the various report deliverables or a separate document that summarizes those components? Also, is it the same document as the Stewardship Plan?

ANSWER: The master plan document is intended to be a separate document that summarizes the deliverable components and recommendations. The stewardship plan is a separate document which will combine the components of the master plan with the components of the business and strategic planning deliverables (to be developed by a separate consulting team) and that is the subject of a separate RFP.

3. The first paragraph after the three bullets on page 5 states “the selected firm(s) will be expected to collaborate with the Action Fund staff, preservation planning consultants, and project partners in the development of a holistic Stewardship Plan.” Will the Stewardship Plan be managed and produced by the Action Fund staff and its preservation planning consultants and project partners? Or will the selected bidder be expected to manage this additional document?

ANSWER: The Stewardship Plan will be managed and produced by the Action Fund in coordination with the consultants and project partners.

4. Please provide any available previous documentation for the 6 sites to facilitate our understanding of the work that has been previously completed at each site.

ANSWER: Documentation shall be provided after a contract is completed.

5. Developing fee estimates for producing a Developmental History is difficult without an understanding of the level of previous documentation on hand and the amount of archival research required by the scope of work. If the requested documents cannot be shared, please provide a brief summary of the documentation on hand and the level of archival research expected to be performed at each site.

ANSWER: Each of the selected sites are well documented due to their level of historic significance. This includes local designation, listing on the National Register of Historic Places, designation as a National Historic Landmark and a National Monument. Each site also has their own comprehensive archives as well. The Developmental History is expected to be compiled from these available materials and establish a context for preservation recommendations.

6. Provide the number of in-person meetings expected for each site, including at the NTHP offices in Washington, D. C.

ANSWER: A minimum of 4 sites visits to each site, as deemed necessary, should be expected. Virtual meetings are acceptable. No meetings at NTHP's Washington, DC headquarters are required.

7. Exhibit A, 5. a. reads: "NTHP shall pay Consultant for the performance of Work, subject to adjustments, additional services, and reimbursable expenses, as stated in Exhibit C." Exhibit C is the Execution of Offer and does not clarify the status of reimbursable expenses. Meanwhile, Exhibit A, 5. b. reads: "Expenses relating to lodging, meals, travel, and miscellaneous costs will be paid by the Consultant." It appears that these items are in direct conflict. Please clarify NTHP's preferred method for bidders to include the standard reimbursable expenses in our proposal. In addition, please provide the missing Exhibits A, B, and C to the Exhibit A Standard Services Agreement.

ANSWER: The Sample Standard Services Agreement is Exhibit A to the RFP. The Sample Agreement has three Exhibits listed, but not included, because they will be the final Scope of Work (A), Schedule (B) and the Payment for Services (C). Part 5 a of the Sample Agreement is referencing Sample Agreement Exhibit C.

8. Are any outside agency reviews such as NPS/SHPOs required as a part of the project?

ANSWER: No

9. On page 4 under Scope of Services it reads: "The scope of services, includes, but is not limited to, the following deliverables." Please provide clarification on what, if any, additional deliverables are required for each site to allow respondents to prepare fees to be included in the Project Budget.

ANSWER: Additional deliverables have not been determined for each site beyond those included in the scope of work. This stipulation is included to allow the consultant to recommend additional services it deems necessary based on the scope of work.

10. On page 5, the Project Team Composition lists “Historian (developmental history and context)”. The scope of work includes the history in the HSR, but it notes “a specific focus on the evolution of treatments to the current physical plant.” This suggests the history should be focused on the physical fabric in lieu of historic context. Please elaborate on the focus of the historical narrative portion of the HSR and whether a Historian or an Architectural Historian is the preferred team member.

ANSWER: The sites are well documented and historical context established. The consultant will be expected to reference the historic context for each site, but the architectural history and significance will take preference. As such an Architectural Historian would be preferred, though allowances can be made for both an Historian and Architectural Historian if deemed necessary.

11. For the Interpretation Strategy, is it expected that the selected firm will provide cost estimates for the implementation of the exhibitry or other interpretation efforts?

ANSWER: No, cost estimates are not required.

12. The Contribution to a Stewardship Planning Toolkit is noted to be an appendix to the HSR. Is this deliverable distinct for each site? Or is it a single document inserted into each of the 6 HSRs?

ANSWER: It is a single document inserted into each HSR.

13. Please indicate for which sites the additional list of professionals (Environmental, Public/contribution input, AV/Low Voltage, Elevator, Exhibit Designer, Materials Conservator) listed at the top of page 6 will be required. Shall bidders list these consultants as hourly (T&M) additional to the submitted Project Budget?

ANSWER: These professionals should be available for all sites. The consultants can be included on an hourly basis, as the amount of engagement for each site could vary.

14. Regarding pagination of the proposal: Item 3.K. states that all pages are to be numbered with the exception of the MWBE Plan. Item 3.C in this section lists a number of items that are not included in the overall limit of 20 pages. Should the items that are not included in the overall page count also be numbered?

ANSWER: As appropriate, yes, even if not included in the total 20 pages count.

15. The list of selection criteria jumps from Criterion 5 to Criterion 9 (see page 11), are there additional criteria that we should be aware of?

ANSWER: That is an editing oversight. No other criteria.

16. Are we required to include resumes for the full consultant team (civil, structural, MEP, HazMat, etc.)?

ANSWER: Either a resume or bio is required.

17. Are consultants required or expected to be local for each of the church locations (Alabama, Chicago, LA)

ANSWER: No

18. Should travel costs be specifically noted or broken out when listing fees?

ANSWER: Travel estimates should include all possible costs, airfare, etc. This should include fees – flat fees, hourly fees, etc.

19. Is there existing documentation in the form of floor plans (PDF, CAD, or other) for any of the 6 sites?

ANSWER: Yes. The level of detail and type of documentation varies by site.

20. Should laser scanning and subsequent Revit models be produced to LOD200 or LOD300 level? Will MEP be required to be modeled?

ANSWER: Laser scan should document the exterior and interior (all rooms, attic, basement/crawlspace) of the subject structure(s) in color except where light levels will not accommodate color. For low-light conditions and spaces, black and white is acceptable. For this level of documentation LOD100 or LOD200 is acceptable. Scan documentation of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems is not necessary except for features visible to the scanning equipment when scanning exterior conditions and interior spaces as mentioned previously. The scans will be used to 1.) provide digital documentation of the building for the record and as information for and support to future construction-related design work, 2.) for use in preparing scaled plans, elevations, and sections for the HSR, and 3.) use as screen captures for use in communicating character, assessment, and recommendations when beneficial and appropriate.

21. Will project teams be selected for each individual site or will one (1) selected team be chosen to perform the scope of work on each of the 6 sites?

ANSWER: 1 selected team will be chosen to perform the scope of work at each of the 6 sites.