



County of El Paso Purchasing Department
800 E. Overland Room 300
El Paso, Texas 79901
(915) 546-2048 / Fax: (915) 546-8180
www.epcounty.com

ADDENDUM 3

To: All Interested Proposers
From: Lucy Balderama, Procurement Data Analyst
Date: December 1, 2016
Subject: RFP #16-069, Historical and Architectural Survey for the County of El Paso

This addendum has been issued to notify vendors of the following:

- **The opening date has been extended to Thursday, December 8, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.**
 - **The deadline to questions has not been extended.**
-

The Purchasing Department has received the following questions:

1. Page 1 has a paragraph stating that to remain active on the county vendor list, we must respond in some form. Is there a response page we are missing in the packet or does our asking questions and/or submitting a proposal count as the response?

Response: Signing the Signature Page and stating "No Response" will suffice.

2. In the "Required Information" section (starting on page 9), Number 4 "Time Schedule" (on page 10) references a "public participation" phase of the project that is to be included in the schedule with the other phases referenced. The other phases are also referenced (by description if not by name) in the scope, but this is the only place public participation is mentioned. Can you clarify this? Should public participation have been included in the scope? If so, is there a set number of public meetings or other type of public participation that is expected by El Paso County, or is it up to the vendor to determine the involvement?

Response: Yes, public participation is strongly recommended to get buy-in from the stakeholders. A contractor, in their response or later, can help the county establish the amount and scope of these meetings. There are two types of public participation that would be very beneficial. Having the county and the survey consultants meet with stakeholder groups and/or general public at the beginning, before surveyors are out walking around with tablets and cameras photographing buildings. That way at least some of the residents know in advance what is happening. This is especially critical in residential areas where people will be suspicious and protective of their privacy. With so much physical ground to cover, it is difficult to say definitively how many of these meetings would be feasible. This outreach might be able to be supplemented with other methods such as notices in churches, schools, or neighborhood bulletins. In the commercial areas there may be some business groups that can be met with. In these various meetings, we would expect the team to explain the purpose and goals, the techniques being used, and general things the surveyors are looking at to demystify the process for the public. This should all be geared towards members of the public and not too detailed or technical. Although for this type of survey it is not as pertinent, but sometimes the public can be encouraged to bring historic photographs to the meeting (before/after) and have them scanned right then and there so they never leave their possession. They can also potentially walk away with a digital copy etc. This can get the community engaged and it sometimes yields unexpected information. (Early on the survey team is also going to be seeking out archival information, maps, etc. to help them understand what to look for in the field and where to concentrate their efforts.) Given the demographics, language and translation could also be an important component of both the survey team and outreach.

The second time of public participation ought to be when the survey result is being finalized and any National Register nominations are being created. This isn't intended to sway or influence the results but to help everyone understand what was found and the next steps, including reiteration that National Register is honorary, creates access to certain financial incentives, and is separate from the creation of any local designated districts. For a district to move forward, there are notification requirements for all owners within the proposed district. So long as not more than 50% of the owners formally oppose the National Register nomination it can move forward. Explaining to owners and residents what the National Register is and isn't is critical. This stage also helps the public understand why their neighborhood is significant. The survey and nominations give the public, stakeholders, and policymakers the information and recognition.

Public participation probably should have been referenced in the scope descriptions as well as in the schedule requirements but most of respondents are likely going to propose some public participation regardless of the specifications. The County could probably further define and negotiate the specifics when negotiating with the selected contractor.

The County may want more outreach than the contractor proposes so it may increase the cost marginally. While the county could handle many aspects of the outreach, having the contractor as part of that planning and implementation is critical.

Items listed in #4 "Time Schedule" were for example and reference purposes, it was not intended to be an all exclusive list of these schedule of events required in this Request for Proposal.

3. Also related to the "Time Schedule" – the National Register component of the scope is not referenced as a phase of the project, but is outlined in the scope. We assume that we should include it in our schedule, correct?

Response: Yes, the National Register component should be included in the schedule. The survey leads to the process to nominate and create national districts by the National Register of Historic Places and is the ultimate goal of the survey.

Items listed in "Time Schedule" were for example and reference purposes, it was not intended to be an all exclusive list of these schedule of events required in this Request for Proposal.

Is there a page limit for responses to the solicitation?

Response: No. The main interest is vendors providing an adequate response that fully addresses the scope of the project.

4. How many copies of the response should be provided? The solicitation is contradicting.

Response: Please submit one **(1) original copy and six (6) electronic versions** of the complete proposal (CD/DVD/Flashdrive) in Word/PDF Format.

5. Should the El Paso County Signature Page (RFP pg. 5) be presented in a separate sealed envelope?

Response: No. Please submit the Signature Page with your proposal.

6. Should Section 6 - Proposed Fee (RFP pg. 10) be presented in a separate sealed envelope?

Response: This information was requested on the Signature Page (page 5).

7. Is the yellow line the proposed boundary for this RFP?

Response: Yes, the yellow line is the proposed boundary for survey area and thus the RFP.

8. Does the yellow line run down the center line of the street, or does it include both sides of the street?

Response: The yellow line is intended to run down the center line of the street and only includes properties within that boundary, not both sides of the street.

9. Will the red boundaries for National Register districts that lie outside the yellow boundary (e.g. the Magoffin Historic District, etc.) be incorporated into this project in any way (e.g. potential district amendment to include areas within the yellow boundary)?

Response: The red line boundaries are existing local historic district overlays. This RFP is intended to create a national district overlay. There are two red line, local districts within the proposed survey area (Chihuahuita Historic District and Downtown Historic District). Those two districts will be re-surveyed as part of this project and they will be incorporated into this project insofar as older surveys that created the existing local districts will be consulted to view the data that established them in the first place.

10. Should the Conflict of Interest Questionnaire (CIQ Form) (RFP pg. 20) be submitted prior to completing the proposal, or as part of the proposal? If prior, to whom should it be submitted?

Response: Please sign and date the Conflict of Interest form and submit it with your proposal.

11. What is the County's budget for the proposed project?

Response: The Commissioners Court earmarked \$140,000 in hotel occupancy tax (HOT) revenues to fund the project.

RECOMMENDATION OF RESPONSE: The project will be funded with hotel/motel funding and possible grant funding further down the road. An actual budget has not been finalized at this time.

12. How many parcels are located within the boundary of the proposed survey area?

Response: There are approximately 1,635 parcels within the Downtown/Segundo Barrio/Chihuahuita area.

13. The evaluation criteria includes experience with "design guidelines for rehabilitation and new construction in historic districts." However, this does not appear to be part of the scope of this project. Please clarify.

Response: The section referring to "design guidelines for rehabilitation and new construction in historic districts" is mostly related to private sector development within historic districts after a survey and national

historic district nomination. This was included as a means for responders to simply demonstrate that they have worked on similar scale projects.

14. Does Attachment B need to be completed and included in the written proposal submittal?

Response: From the perspective of the THC, it will not be necessary to fill out Attachment B as part of the written proposal. The document provides THC staff the contact information for the survey consultant, but they will have access to that information through the County.

15. Attachment B lists the Texas Historical Commission FY16 CLG Grant Report due dates, but several of those dates have already passed. Does the County anticipate the successful proposer will meet the 9/30/2017 overall project deadline? If not, are we to factor in a specific project completion date by developing a new schedule with the County upon selection? Can you clarify how we are to use this attachment in our planning for the proposal?

Response: This language is a remnant of when the project was intended to be a CLG-Funded grant project of the city. Now that it is independently funded by the County, the time schedule is entirely up to the County, with or without input from the contractor. The dates, deadlines and similar reporting requirements are irrelevant now. If the County wants this done over a longer period of time that is absolutely fine. The only real concerns are keeping it moving, the County's budget commitments for the funds, and whatever redevelopment or economic pressures could be on the neighborhoods before the survey is complete. Another consideration is that one benefit of the actual National Register nomination is making it easier for buildings to qualify for the state or federal tax incentives. The state incentives can't be claimed until the property is listed whereas the federal credits actually allow 30 months after project completion to get listed. Many of the tax credit steps can be taken simultaneously with the survey and nomination process so it's not likely to be holding up very much.

The quality and techniques of the actual survey and recommendations need to continue to adhere to THC requirements and THC needs time to review the survey work and coordinate the resulting nominations with the contractor, owners, and County. But, there are no specific overall deadlines. There are deadlines leading up to each of the State Board of Review meetings in order to get on the agenda but that doesn't directly impact our schedule and contracts. The County may want to make sure that the contractor is still under contract to make any necessary revisions that THC or the State Board of Review require near the end of the process.

16. On Page 8, one of the specified work products is for a Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF)/Multiple Property Submission (MPS). Typically, the MPDF/MPS serves as a "cover document" for follow-on historic district and/or individual property nominations which are completed on National Register

Registration Forms. Earlier on Pages 7 and 8, the RFP also references completion of a National Register of Historic Places historic district nomination. Is the County's intended work product an MPDF/MPS, historic districts (i.e. downtown, Chihuahuita, Segundo Barrio), or both?

Response: The contractor will conduct the survey and that data is going to lead to various recommendations:

- 1. Are there one or more eligible districts**
- 2. What properties are individually eligible for listing by themselves? If they are within a proposed district they can be nominated as part of the district and the end result is virtually the same. If they are not within a proposed district then consideration can be given for nominating them individually or if they are important sites they could still be nominated individually.**
- 3. If there are certain types of resources with similar characteristics scattered across the survey area, consideration might be given for a multiple property submission. For example, a dozen Trost designed structures not all within proposed districts could be nominated at once as a multiple property submission. This method cuts out duplication and streamlines the process versus 12 individual nominations. There might be other commonalities that fit this model. It is possible that we will end up with a few districts proposed and perhaps a few individual listings based on importance of the resource or it might fall outside a district. Even though there is likely a strong density of historic resources across the survey area, we may end up with a few districts based on concentrations of resources and commonalities. For example the areas that are primarily residential in nature historically don't have a lot in common with the commercial core of downtown. Their histories and characteristics are unique so it wouldn't make sense to lump them together into one huge district. In the end the survey results, in consultation with our historians, are going to inform the final nomination decisions. With such a large and varied survey area, it's not possible or necessary to accurately predict the final outcome. The number of individual nominations has the largest potential to impact the time and cost. The proposed research and survey process is going to cover most of the information necessary to nominate districts. In district situations, detailed information and analysis on each property is not too critical because we're focusing on "the big picture." There will be property by property survey information but limited in scope and each individual property can be a bit more marginal but they contribute to the overall district. Individual nominations require the property to stand on its own in regards to its historic significance and integrity. There is more work necessary for individual listing so if the end results require 20 individual listings plus districts, that could be much more work than multiple districts and only a couple of isolated**

individual properties. Districts are complicated but they do have some benefits.

There will be two distinct but related phases of products. First will be the survey results, all of the data and research, along with specific recommendations of which properties are eligible based on specific criteria. It will also recommend the number of eligible districts and the boundaries. Even if the County ended the project here, this is valuable information but its best to also proceed to formal nominations.

The second phase will be the actual preparation of district and/or individual National Register nominations (or possibly the multiple property nominations). The County may end up picking and choosing which potential nominations to focus the final efforts on. This could be based on budgetary, significance, development pressures both positive and negative, local sentiment within district boundaries, etc. These two phases could be contractually separated. It makes tremendous sense and efficiency to have the same researchers and consultants undertake both but the scope of the second, nomination phase, remains unclear until the survey is completed. A contractor might be able to provide an up-front cost estimate per individual nomination or per district nomination or they could assign an overall budget and time amount to the second phase with the actual number of nominations to be determined by negotiation after the survey results are in.