City of Montpelier, VT

ADDENDUM #1

RFP CITY HALL, FIRE DEPARTMENT, & POLICE STATION
FLOOD RECONSTRUCTION AND MITIGATION ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

October 9, 2026

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. The FEMA CEF spreadsheet includes approximately $1.119M under H.2 – A/E Design Contract Costs. Is this intended to represent the anticipated budget for the A/E contract, or is it only a FEMA estimating allowance? If not, does the City have an anticipated A/E budget or NTE range?

The ~$1.119 million identified under H.2 of the FEMA-approved Cost Estimating Format (CEF) represents the City's anticipated budget for A/E services. The City does not anticipate all soft costs were included in the CEF. The final contract amount will be negotiated with the selected consultant based on the agreed-upon scope of services, staffing, and hourly rates.

2. Is any portion of the FEMA CEF H.3 – Construction-Phase Project Management allowance intended for the selected A/E consultant?

Yes. The selected A/E consultant is expected to provide construction management services as outlined in Section C.5 of the RFP. The applicable portion of the H.3 allowance will be determined based on the final negotiated scope of services and the division of construction-phase responsibilities between the consultant and the City.

3. Please clarify the current status of the FEMA-approved project budget and whether the project cost estimate may be revised and additional funds be made available as the design advances.

The project has been obligated by FEMA based on the approved scope of work and cost estimate. The current FEMA funding is capped at the obligated amount and will not be adjusted as design advances. The selected consultant will be expected to develop the final design and construction cost estimates consistent with the FEMA-approved scope and available project funding. The consultant must update the construction cost estimates as design advances, but those updates do not increase the FEMA award.

4. The RFP references an existing FEMA-approved 30% design and estimate. Please clarify the overall level of design development across the project, whether maturity

varies by building or system, what prior design information will be made available to the selected consultant, and whether any additional materials can be made available during the procurement to help proposers better understand the remaining scope.

The project has an existing 30% design and associated cost estimate that were used to establish the FEMA-approved scope of work and project funding for City Hall, the Fire Station, and Police Department. The existing design documents and cost estimates will be provided to all prospective proposers as part of this Addendum 1. The selected consultant will be responsible for reviewing the previous design, verifying existing conditions, and completing the remaining design work required under the RFP. Minor revisions to the approach will be allowed with City approval, provided the intent of the work is maintained.

5. Please clarify whether there is an approved or pending Section 406 Hazard Mitigation Proposal, or whether the flood-mitigation measures are currently included within the repair/code-and-standards scope.

The City has been awarded additional funding (approximately $1M) through FEMA Section 406 Hazard Mitigation in addition to the funds outlined in the FEMA CEF repair estimate shared. The funding is focused on meeting the City's 2024 flood code, which exceeds the code that was in place at the time of the disaster. It includes flood-mitigation measures to take the baseline repairs to a higher flood elevation, including (but not limited to) higher flood barriers and higher elevations or additional protections of building systems. The selected consultant will be responsible for incorporating these measures into the final design in accordance with the FEMA-approved scope of work. It is possible that additional Hazard Mitigation will be proposed for the Clerk's office records vault outside of the current fixed cost offer, but this is still being evaluated.

6. By chance, do you have a list of document holders – we are looking to team with local partners for this pursuit.

Requestor Name	Email	Firm
Dom Ponsades	DPonsades@ThorntonTomasetti.com	Thornton Tomasetti
Kim Jones	primevendor123@gmail.com	Prime Vendor
James Coe	james@coeandcoearchitecture.com	Coe and Coe Architecture
Joel Wood	joelwood@aesnortheast.com	AES Northeast
Tricia Roy	tricia@sasarchitects.com	SAS Architects
Karyn Allen	kallen@dubois-king.com	DeWolfe/Dubois King
Michael Vitti	michaelv@blackriverdesign.com	Black River Design
David Hindinger	heritageengineering@tds.net	Heritage Engineering
Alex Davis	davis@utiledesign.com	Utile

Andrew LaRosa	andrewlarosavt@gmail.com	Andrew LaRosa VT
Melissa Stephen	mstephen@dubois-king.com	DuBois King
Chad Phillips	cphillips@mjinc.com	McFarland Johnson
David Roy	droy@wiemannlamphere.com	Wiemann Lamphere Architects
Philippe Trotin	ptrotin@lnconsulting.com	LN Consulting
Andrea Murray	andrea@vermontintegratedarchitecture.com	Vermont Integrated Architecture
Kim Kraus	kkraus@dubois-king.com	Dubois & King
Andre Berthier	aberthier@psindustries.com	PS Industries

7. Does the City have a preference for an architect-led vs. engineer-led prime?

The City does not have a preference for an architect-led or engineer-led prime consultant. Proposers should establish a team structure that demonstrates the qualifications, technical expertise, and capacity necessary to perform the full scope of services identified in the RFP.

8. MBE/WBE/WOSB Scoring: Since the final NTE is negotiated after selection, how should proposers calculate and document the "percentage of overall fee" committed to certified firms for scoring purposes?

For proposal evaluation purposes, proposers should identify the anticipated percentage of the total contract value to be performed by certified MBE/WBE/WOSB firms. The percentage may be based on the proposer's estimated allocation of services, anticipated labor hours, and/or proposed rates.

Proposers should identify each participating firm, describe its anticipated scope of services, provide the estimated percentage of total contract value allocated to that firm, and include documentation of applicable state or federal certification.

The final participation percentages will be confirmed during contract negotiations based on the agreed-upon scope of services and negotiated contract amount.

9. Page 5 outlines the deadline for proposals as 3:00 PM on October 16, 2026, while Page 1 lists the submission deadline as "no later than October 16, 2026" without a specific time. Please confirm that 3:00 PM EST on October 16, 2026 is the correct deadline for both electronic and hardcopy submissions.

The deadline for receipt of both electronic and hardcopy proposals has been **extended**. The deadline is now **3:00 PM** Eastern Time (ET) on Friday, **October 23, 2026.** The bid registry lists

12PM on October 16th but will be corrected to reflect the new deadline date of **3PM (ET) on October 23, 2026**.

10. Page 5 states that the proposal response is limited to 25 pages, excluding "required forms" and "resumes of proposed staff." Please clarify whether the cover letter, table of contents, and section dividers are included in the 25-page limit.

The 25-page limit applies to the substantive proposal components, including the cover letter and executive summary. The table of contents, section dividers, required forms and certifications, and resumes of proposed personnel are excluded from the page limit.

11. Is there a procedure for pre-bid site visit?

Prospective bidders can make a site visit to the facilities on Tuesday, October 13th. Please coordinate with Jasmine Powers JPowers@montpelier-vt.org