

JULY 19, 2017

ADDENDUM NO. 3

For

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

For

**PROFESSIONAL TASK ORDER SERVICES: A) FACILITIES ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING;
AND B) AIRPORT ENGINEERING (FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL)**

SPECIFICATION NO. 180580 AND 180660

For which Statements of Qualifications (“SOQ”) were due in the office of the Chief Procurement Officer, Department of Procurement Services, Room 103, City Hall, 121 N. LaSalle Street, Chicago, IL 60602 at **4:00 p.m., Central Time, on July 20, 2017.**

The following changes and/or revisions are incorporated into the above referenced RFQ Document as noted. All other provisions and requirements as originally set forth, except as amended by previous addenda, remain in force and are binding.

THE RESPONDENTS MUST ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THE ADDENDUM IN THE COVER LETTER SUBMITTED WITH THEIR PROPOSAL.

BID/PROPOSAL DUE DATE HAS BEEN EXTENDED TO AUGUST 10, 2017

1. Proposal Due Date has been extended to **August 10, 2017**. For which Statement of Qualifications are due in the Department of Procurement Services, Bid & Bond Room, Room 103, City Hall, 121 N. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60602, at 4:00 p.m., Central Time.
2. Cover page of the RFQ is hereby amended to read as follows:
“All responses must be received by 4:00 p.m., Central Time on August 10, 2017”
3. Section I.E.1, Deadline and Procedures for Submitting Proposals, change proposal due date to read as follows:
“4:00 p.m., Central Time, August 10, 2017”
4. Section I.F., Procurement Timetable, change the Proposal due date to read as follows:
Proposals Due: August 10, 2017
5. Section I.B of the RFQ has been revised to read as follows (changes in ***bold red italics***):

B. Term of Services
The City intends to award one (1) or more Agreement(s) for each Group pursuant to this RFQ solicitation for a base contract period of five (5) years ***plus two (2) optional one-year extensions.***
6. Section I.F., Conflicts of Interests, is revised to read as follows (changes are shown in ***bold red italics***):

F. Conflicts of Interests

For the purposes of this Section I.F only, the term "Respondent" shall mean the entities that submit Proposals in response to this RFQ. For the purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

- “CARE Plus” or “Chicago Airports Resources Enterprise Plus” means a joint venture, which serves as the Department’s Owner Representative and Construction Manager for Capital Improvement Program projects.
- “Master Civil Engineer” means BPC Airport Partners, a limited liability company, which serves as the OMP’s Master Civil Engineer.
- “PMO” means DMJM Aviation Partners, a joint venture, which serves as the OMP’s Program Management Office.

Respondents will be subject to the following conflicts of interest rules:

1. CARE Plus, the Master Civil Engineer, and the PMO (“Covered Entity #1”) are not eligible for consideration for award of an Agreement and may not participate on the Agreement as a subcontractor (“Ineligible Parties”).
2. If Respondent is a subcontractor of one or more of the Ineligible Parties (Covered Entity #2), Respondent will be ineligible for consideration for award of an Agreement as a Consultant unless the Respondent’s SOQ contains a letter stating the Respondent will terminate its role as a Covered Entity #2 if the Respondent is awarded a contract.
3. If Respondent proposes to use as one of its subcontractors any Covered Entity #2 as described above, Respondent must comply with the requirements set forth below to be eligible for consideration for award of an Agreement.
 - a. The Covered Entity #2 shall have no management role whatsoever in the Respondent; and
 - b. The Covered Entity shall have no beneficial interest whatsoever in the Respondent; and
 - c. Respondent’s SOQ shall propose to use Covered Entities #2 on no more than forty-nine percent (49%) of all Services under an Agreement; and
 - d. Respondent must provide an accurate and complete description of the conflict of interest and the measures the Respondent proposes to mitigate the effects of the conflict of interest.
4. Affiliated Relationship
 - a. If Respondent is an entity that has an Affiliated Relationship (as defined below), Respondent will be ineligible for consideration for award of an Agreement as a Consultant but may provide Services as a subcontractor in accordance with Section 3 above.

For purposes of this section, an "Affiliated Relationship" exists if the Respondent and any of the Ineligible Parties ~~or any joint venture partner of the Ineligible Parties or any subcontractor of the Ineligible Parties~~ (Covered Entity #3) have any common ownership, whether directly or indirectly (including, without limitation, if they are subsidiaries of the same parent company); however, if any institutional investor owns less than 10% of both the Respondent and the Covered Entity # 3, such ownership will not render the relationship between the Respondent and the Covered Entity #3 an Affiliated Relationship.

- b. If Respondent proposes to use any subcontractor that has an Affiliated Relationship with a Covered Entity #3 the Respondent must comply with the requirements set forth below to be eligible for consideration for award of an Agreement.

- The Covered Entity #3 shall have no management role whatsoever in the Respondent; and
- The Covered Entity #3 shall have no beneficial interest whatsoever in the Respondent; and
- Respondent's SOQ shall propose to use Covered Entities #3 on no more than forty-nine percent (49%) of all Services under an Agreement; and
- Respondent must provide an accurate and complete description of the conflict or apparent conflict and the measures that the Respondent proposes to mitigate the effects of the conflict.

The CPO will make the determination of eligibility in his/her sole judgment based upon the requirements set forth above. The CPO's determination adverse to the Respondent shall be final unless the Respondent's SOQ contains a letter from the Covered Entity #3 agreeing to withdraw from Respondent's team in the event of such an adverse determination.

The City reserves the right to evaluate potential conflicts of interests, if any, not set forth above that could present a conflict in the performance of the Services. With respect to the evaluation of potential conflicts of interest, the City also reserves the right to render a final decision on the eligibility of a particular Respondent to be considered for an award of an Agreement, all in a manner consistent with the best interests of the City. Furthermore, should a successful Respondent be awarded a contract and found to have a conflict of interest in regards to a specific Task Order Request, the City reserves the right to deem the respective successful Respondent ineligible for participation on that specific Task Order Request.

5. Additional Ineligible Parties

If a Respondent, subcontractor to Respondent or Respondent which has an entity with an Affiliated Relationship is awarded an Agreement under this RFQ for Architectural/Engineering Services, they will then become an Ineligible Party for consideration of award of any Agreements for any current or future Program Management Services or Construction Manager Services (including Construction Manager At-Risk Services), which would fall under the management role of the Program Manager or the Construction Manager.”

7. Section II.B.4 of the RFQ for Specification No. 180660 has been revised to read as follows (changes in ***bold red italics***):

“4. Project Understanding and Approach – limit of ~~ten (10)~~ *twenty (20)*** pages plus a Team Organizational Chart**

Respondent must describe its interest, understanding and approach to providing Services for the Project. Respondent must include an explanation of its approach to management. Also to be included are: a plan for implementing and monitoring the Services; organizational chart showing the relationship between all team-member firms; the roles and responsibilities of team-member firms; strategies, tools and safeguards for ensuring timely, quality performance of all required timely Services; equipment, software and hardware considerations; training and on-going support; and any additional factors for the City's consideration.

Any subcontractors who will be performing Services on this Project, including their designation as DBE, should be listed along with discussion of their roles and responsibilities. Describe the Respondent's approach to Quality Management (Quality Assurance Plan and Quality Control Procedures or QA/QC), specifically to this Project. The Respondent must address the following items in regards to QA/QC:

- a. Provide details on corporate management's QA/QC process.
- b. Provide the name of the Respondent's QA/QC Manager and their qualifications.
- c. Describe how costs are allocated to QA/QC as it relates to the overall budget.

The organizational chart may be printed on 11"x17" paper as long as the 11"x17" paper is not loose (must be bound to the rest of the volume) and is folded to fit within the confines of the volume (8-1/2" x 11")."

8. The following questions and requests for clarification were submitted in accordance with the instructions provided in Section I.A.1 (Communications between the City and Respondents) of the RFQ. The City's response (*in bold italics*) follows each question or request for clarification in the table below:

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATIONS

Question 1:	<p>Ghafari is a joint venture partner in CARE Plus. The contract between the City of Chicago and CARE Plus expires April 30, 2018. The instant RFQ is for an initial term of five (5) years – a period significantly beyond the termination date of the current CARE Plus contract.</p> <p>Ghafari wishes to confirm that the "Conflict of Interest" provision does not preclude Ghafari from submitting a Proposal in response to this RFQ and, further, that such Proposal will be duly considered by the City. Ghafari acknowledges that during the period it is a member of CARE Plus, Ghafari cannot perform services that may be awarded pursuant to this RFQ.</p>
Response:	<i>See Item #6 of this Addendum above.</i>
Question 2:	<p>DLZ is a Joint Venture Partner in the DMJM Aviation Partners Joint Venture providing Program Management (PMO) for the O'Hare Modernization Program (OMP). DLZ respectfully submits the following questions:</p> <p>a. Given that OMP is nearing completion and the A/E Task Order Contracts will likely be managed by a future Program Management Office (O'Hare 21) contract, will the Department of Procurement Services (DPS) consider releasing the Conflict of Interest provision related to DMJM Aviation Partners/OMP?</p> <p>b. Would the DPS consider a partial release of the Conflict of Interest – e.g. in the event a specific A/E Task Order request happens to be managed by OMP, could our team clearly disclose the conflict of interest, and refrain from bidding on that specific task?</p>
Response:	<p>a. No. b. Yes.</p>
Question 3:	<p>a. Could you please confirm that CDA will be issuing 4 separate contacts covering the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group A: Facilities Architecture • Group A: Engineering • Group B: Airport Engineering – Architecture • Group B: Airport Engineering – Engineering <p>b. Could you please provide further clarification concerning the division of work listed in Exhibit 1: Group A. If bidding on the Facilities Architecture work, should this team include Facilities Engineering disciplines (structural, mechanical, electrical, HVAC, etc.) or would those services be covered under the Group A Engineering contract? Similarly, with the Group A Engineering services, should the team include all of the engineering disciplines or only a few (i.e. civil, infrastructure, etc.)? These questions would also pertain to Group B: Airport Engineering contracts.</p>
Response:	<p>a. As stated in the RFQ, Contracts will be awarded for facilities architecture and engineering services ("Group A"); and airport engineering services ("Group B"). There will not be a separate division for architecture or engineering within each respective group.</p> <p>b. Group A will be comprised of facilities projects, while Group B will be comprised of airside (e.g. runways, taxiways, etc.) and landside (non-facility) projects. Based on this delineation, Group A will require both architecture and</p>

	engineering services on the majority of the projects.
Question 4:	The following questions are regarding the Insurance Requirements in Exhibit 5: 1. As we put together a team of consultants to meet the potential needs of this RFQ, do <u>each</u> of the consultants on the team need to maintain the Insurance Requirements of Exhibit 5. If so, for the response to this RFQ do each of the consultants on the team need to demonstrate their ability to meet the compliance with Insurance Requirements identified in Exhibit 5? 2. With specific reference to the required Professional Liability Insurance of not less than \$10,000,000, will the City pay for the increase from the Consultant's Standard Professional Liability Insurance to maintain this coverage?
Response:	1. As stated in the Exhibit 5 of the RFQ, Consultant must require all Subcontractors to provide the insurance required herein, or Consultant may provide the coverage for Subcontractors. All Subcontractors are subject to the same Insurance Requirements of Consultant unless otherwise specified in this Contract. 2. No.
Question 5:	The following questions are regarding the MBE & WBE Special Conditions for Task Order Services Contracts Exhibit 4: 1. We are a MBE firm that have done extensive consultant work at O'Hare, with that said, there could be instances where depending on the specifics of the work requested, the MBE & WBE goals will be difficult to maintain. An example would be if a project simply required the engineering service to re-stripe the tarmac due to plane size changes (this is a common change). To the best of our knowledge, there are only a couple firms that provide this service and neither are an MBE or WBE. In this instance how would we maintain compliancy?
Response:	As stated in the RFQ, the Consultant is required to make Good Faith Efforts to expend at least the same percentages (unless otherwise specified by the City when requesting a particular Task Order Proposal) of the total Task Order Price (inclusive of any and all modifications and amendments), if awarded, for participation by MBEs and WBEs on each individual Task Order.
Question 6:	RFQs Spec #286644 and Spec #180580 B) Airport Engineering (non-Federal) look to be very similar, if not the same. Please clarify any difference that I should be aware of to help differentiate the SOQs.
Response:	Only MBE and WBE firms are eligible to submit qualifications in response to the RFQ for Target Market Multi-Discipline Engineering Services (Specification No. 286644).
Question 7:	If a firm is submitting proposals for both Group A and Group B, would the City like one proposal that contains information for both Groups, or separate proposals for Group A and Group B?
Response:	If a firm wishes to respond to both Group A and Group B, they must submit <u>separate</u> qualifications for each respective group (i.e. Volume 1 and Volume 2 for Group A; Volume 1 and Volume 2 for Group B).
Question 8:	In relation to section I.F Conflicts of Interest, will the City provide a list of the firms that fit in the category of "Covered Entity #2" as defined in the RFQ?
Response:	No.
Question 9:	Will the profit component for compensation be negotiated on a task by task basis, or will it be stipulated for the entire TOSR contract?
Response:	See Exhibit 2, Section F of the RFQ.
Question 10:	Will CDA or the consultant establish the maximum hourly rates by category for Exhibit 2A, which is not included in the RFP? Reference in Exhibit 2 Section F Cost Plus Percentage Fee Methodology (RFQ page B-1).
Response:	Once vendors are selected, rates will be established.
Question 11:	Pursuant to section I.F.5.a. of the RFQ, will a subcontractor to a successful Respondent be ineligible to serve as a subcontractor for future Program Management Services or

	Construction Manager Services (including Risk Services), including in connection with the RFQ associated with Specification Numbers 348988 and 376113?
Response:	Yes.
Question 12:	Please confirm the City would like 10 pages for the Spec180660 Federal proposal Project Understanding and Approach and 20 pages for the Spec180580 Non Federal proposal Project Understanding and Approach section per RFQ section II.B.4 (page 8).
Response:	<i>There is a limit of twenty (20) pages plus a Team Organization Chart for Section II.B.4 of the RFQ for Professional Task Order Services for the Chicago Airport System (Federal).</i>
Question 13:	For Spec180660 Federal, is the 150% overhead limit referenced in Exhibit 2 Section F.2 Multiplier (page B-2) consistent with federal requirements?
Response:	Yes.
Question 14:	<p>The questions below are regarding RFQ for Professional Task Order Services: A) Facilities Architecture and Engineering; and B) Airport Engineering (Non-Federal), Specification No 180580.</p> <p>a. "Section VI. – Legal Actions" is a form requesting different information than what is required per "Section II – Required Information", "C – Volume II – Representations and Verification – Required Content", "3 Legal Actions". Does the Legal Actions Form from Section VI need to be included in the submittal and if so, where in the submittal is it to go?</p> <p>b. "Section II. – Required Information", B Volume I-Statement of Qualification-Required Content", 3, 4 and 5 all request an Organizational Chart. Please clarify if the City would like the organization chart submitted in each of the 3 sections. Does the City want a unique version of the org charts for each section or, can a single version of the org chart showing the relationships of firms and key personnel be used in all locations of the response submittal?</p> <p>c. "Section VIII. Project Response Form". The instructions state "The Respondent must be able to demonstrate completion of the project identified" Please clarify if "completion" is defined as completion of the project design, if the Respondent was involved in the design, or if "completion" is defined as completion of the project construction, even is the Respondent is not involved in the construction of the project.</p> <p>d. "Section II – Required Information", "B – Volume I – Statement of Qualification–Required Content", 6. Professional Qualifications. What are the type of "appropriate licenses and/or certifications" required for key personnel? Can the PE or SE license's number be submitted or is an actual physical cope of the license required?</p>
Response:	<p><i>a. The form found in Section VI – Legal Actions is to be included as part of Volume II, Section 3. This form is in addition to the required information that is to be provided under Section II.C.3 – Legal Actions of the RFQ.</i></p> <p><i>b. The organizational chart that is referenced in Section II.B.4 needs to show the roles and responsibilities as well as the relationship (hierarchy) between the members of the team, including subcontractors. The organizational chart that is referenced in Section II.B.6 needs to identify the key personnel and their roles on the team.</i></p> <p><i>c. For Section VIII only, "completion" is defined as completion of the project construction.</i></p> <p><i>d. A copy of each license is to be included with the resumes from each of the respective key personnel.</i></p>
Question 15:	<p>a. As a MBE member of the Master Civil Engineer (MCE) Joint Venture, are we in conflict for participating as an MBE/DBE sub on any of the design task orders?</p> <p>b. Further, if we were to leave the JV will the remaining JV members be allowed to substitute with a different certified MBE/DBE firm?</p>
Response:	<p><i>a. No.</i></p> <p><i>b. Yes. See Exhibit 4, MBE & WBE Special Conditions for Task Order Services Contracts, Section 1.8, Changes to Compliance Plan of the RFQ.</i></p>
Question 16:	With the understanding that MCE may end when the PMO is selected, would we be eligible for selection as a prime consultant on any of these RFQs if we provide a letter

	stating we will withdraw from the MCE Joint Venture team upon selection?
Response:	Yes.
Question 17:	We noticed that in both the Federal and Non-Federal RFQ that Section 4, Project Understanding and Approach, and Section 6, Professional Qualifications, Specialized Experience and Local Availability of Key Personnel, both ask for an organization chart. Would you like this repeated in both sections? Or, could it only be included in the Key Personnel section?
Response:	See response to Question #14 b above.
Question 18:	The Non-Federal RFQ indicates that the project understanding and approach is limited to 20 pages, while the Federal RFQ indicates that the project understanding and approach is limited to 10 pages. Would 20 pages be acceptable for both responses?
Response:	See response to Question #12 above.
Question 19:	Please clarify as to how the conflict of interest (COI) language in RFQ, page 4, Section I.F., applies to BPC Airport Partners (Master Civil Engineer) or any of its entities? In addition, specifically is BPC Airport Partners included as (“Covered Entity #1”)?
Response:	The Master Civil Engineer and its Joint Venture Partners would be considered an Ineligible Party since they would have intimate knowledge of the airport planning.
Question 20:	Are we permitted to use a smaller than 12-point font on exhibits, graphics, and tables as long as they are clearly legible?
Response:	Respondents are allowed to use a font that is no smaller than an 8-point font on graphics and tables only. If a section is illegible, it may not be considered as part of the evaluation of a Respondent’s qualifications.
Question 21:	The RFQ states that we are not required to provide an insurance certificate; however, we are required to provide “evidence of insurability...indicating that if awarded an Agreement the Respondent will provide evidence of insurance in the amounts specified in Exhibit 5 to the Agreement.” Other than a statement that we will be able to provide insurance in the required amounts once selected, what would you require as “evidence of insurability?”
Response:	A letter from your insurance carrier will suffice.
Question 22:	On Page 4 of 21 Section F “Conflicts of Interest” in the City of Chicago’s “Requests for Qualifications (RFQ) for Professional Task Order Services for Chicago Airport System, Specification No. 180580”, CARE Plus and any Joint Venture Partner of CARE Plus have specifically been conflicted out from submitting their Qualifications on this Solicitation. a. The current CARE Plus Contract will expire in April 2018, which is well before the expiration of the above referenced RFQ. As such, we respectfully ask the City of Chicago to consider removing this Conflict of interest from the RFQ for Specification No. 180580. b. We also understand the Chicago Department of Aviation recently issued a separate RFQ for Program Management Services (Specification No. 348988) that is pending selection and includes taking over the management of both O’Hare and Midway Airports Capital Improvement Programs which are currently being managed by the CARE Plus team. Would the future selected program management services team (Specification No. 348988) be conflicted from winning this RFQ for Professional Task Order Services for Chicago Airport System, Specification No. 180580? Understanding there is no guarantee that any of the current CARE Plus JV members will be part of the successful Program Management Services team and our understanding that the current CARE+ contract ends April 2018, we believe that a conflict of interest for the CARE+ JV members specific to Specification No. 180580 to be unnecessary.
Response:	a. See Item #6 of this Addendum above. b. Yes.
Question 23:	It seems that personal/individual licenses of staff are requested to be included in both Volumes I and II (per RFQ page 9 section II.B.6 Professional Qualifications item d and RFQ page 10 section II.C.4 Business License/Authority to do Business in Illinois). Would the City like copies of personal licenses (e.g. Professional Engineering) in both Volumes,

	or may we include them solely in Volume II?
Response:	<i>For Volume I, the licenses and certifications to be included are for individual staff members (e.g. State of Illinois – Professional Engineer License). For Volume II, the license and certifications to be included are for the responding firm (e.g. State of Illinois – Professional Design Firm License).</i>
Question 24:	In the RFQ (page 8 section II.B.4 Project Understanding and Approach item C), you ask us to: “Describe how costs are allocated to QA/QC as it relates to the overall budget.” In order to properly respond, we’d like to understand what CDA would like to learn from this question. Are you looking for a percentage of our overall fee? What specific information would help the City understand our approach with regard to QA/QC costs?
Response:	<i>Provide your QA/QC costs as a percentage of the overall budget.</i>
Question 25:	Regarding MBE status, will the Department of Aviation accept a firm’s status at the CMS level and/or National Minority Supplier Development Council certificate?
Response:	<i>No.</i>
Question 26:	Is it a conflict of interest to include a team member who is also submitting on the Program Management Services contract Specification No. 348988?
Response:	<i>A firm that has been awarded a contract for the Program Management Services would be considered an Ineligible Party for the respective Architecture/Engineering RFQs.</i>
Question 27:	Exhibit 2 Section F-2 notes that the maximum multiplier will not exceed 150% of labor costs. Will the CDA consider an increased multiplier for labor costs that align with the audited rates submitted?
Response:	<i>No.</i>
Question 28:	Will alternate multiplier strategies such as a 150% multiplier over the life of the task order, an average of 150% from all team members, or other arrangements, be considered?
Response:	<i>No.</i>
Question 29:	Exhibit 2, Section F.2 notes that another governmental authority recognized by the city will be recognized as proof of audited rates. Please clarify which federal or state agencies will be accepted (such as GSA or Metra).
Response:	<i>Audited rates from a governmental authority other than those specifically listed in Exhibit 2, Section F.2 would be evaluated on a case by case basis.</i>
Question 30:	Will Exhibit 2A, Maximum Hourly Rates for Contractors (referenced in Exhibit 2, Section F-1 of both RFQ specifications) be shared?
Response:	<i>Once Contracts are awarded, they will be posted on line.</i>
Question 31:	We understand that the CDA’s future design and construction plans include renovation and new construction for Terminal 2/3. a. Does the CDA intend to solicit this work as part of the Task Orders or as an independent RFQ/RFP? b. If not part of the Task Orders, will there be a conflict of interest if a Task Order firm (prime or team member) wants to pursue the Terminal 2/3 project?
Response:	<i>a. It will not be part of the task orders. b. No.</i>
Question 32:	The RFQ does not cite specific projects that may be generated as part of the Task Order. Can a team member be added to a task order team at a later date to address the needs of a specific task order RFP?
Response:	<i>Yes.</i>
Question 33:	In both proposals, Exhibit 1 outlines the general scope of projects, but does not detail specific projects. Can you provide more specific design and construction projects associated with these task orders?
Response:	<i>Specific project information is not available at this time.</i>
Question 34:	Will respondents awarded eligibility for the Task Order Services be excluded or otherwise penalized in evaluation for Terminal 2 planning and architecture work should that work be released under a separate procurement process?

Response:	No.
Question 35:	Will the TOR submittals be made public, if so, when, relative to the other current and future procurements of the O'Hare 21 Program?
Response:	<i>The Statements of Qualifications submitted by Respondents to these RFQs will not be made public. The Contracts that are awarded as a result of these RFQs will be posted on the City of Chicago website approximately the first quarter of 2018 at the earliest.</i>
Question 36:	On Page 6 of 21 of the RFQ, it states: "Hard copies of the SOQ responding to this RFQ should be prepared using a font no smaller than 12 point on 8 ½" X 11" letter size paper (preferably recycled), printed double-sided and bound on the long side." May be orient our submittal in a landscape format?
Response:	No.
Question 37:	In Exhibit 4: Special Condition Regarding DBE Participation, Page D-7, it states: "1.6.4. Schedule F: Report of Subcontractor Solicitations, All Bidders/Proposers must submit, together with their bid/proposal, a completed Schedule F report containing information on all subcontractors, DBEs and non-DBEs, solicited for participation in the contract. The Schedule F shall include the following subcontractor information: Contractor name; Address; Contact person; DBE status; Type of work solicited" We were unable to locate Schedule F in the RFQ nor on the website listed in the RFQ on which to find the forms. Can you please provide a copy or clarify if this was an error.
Response:	<i>Schedule F is not required to be included with the Statement of Qualifications.</i>
Question 38:	Should proposals be submitted in environmentally friendly 3-ring binders? If not, would a recyclable comb or spiral binding be OK to submit the two volumes requested?
Response:	<i>The use of environmentally friendly 3-ring binders is encouraged.</i>
Question 39:	Will the design for the new Terminal 2 development, planned as part of O'Hare 21, be awarded through this task order services contract or will the Terminal 2 development design be procured separately?
Response:	<i>See response to Question #31 above.</i>
Question 40:	Do separate EDS forms need to be completed for each submittal (i.e. Federal/Non-Federal/Architecture/Engineering)?
Response:	Yes.
Question 41:	Is it acceptable to submit the electronic copies of the SOQ on reusable flash drives in lieu of CD-ROMs?
Response:	Yes.
Question 42:	Will selection under this contract preclude the prime firm from services on future RFQs?
Response:	<i>See Item #6 of this Addendum above.</i>
Question 43:	Will selection under this contract preclude the sub consultants from services on future RFQs?
Response:	<i>See response to Question #42 above.</i>
Question 44:	Is there a true conflict of interest in pursuing this TOSR, or a potential conflict if a firm is awarded a PM or CM contract and are also on one of the successful TOSR teams?
Response:	Yes.
Question 45:	Due to the timing of the release of this RFQ, which overlaps the selections and awards for the Program Management and CMAR contracts, there potentially are many conflicts of interest that preclude firms from pursuing this Task Order Service Contract. Will the Department consider voiding the conflicts of interest to allow firms to pursue work in this TOSR?
Response:	No.
Question 46:	In the event that Covered Entity 1 is not selected for the Program Management contract currently under evaluation, are they available to pursue the TOSRs as a prime or sub consultant?

Response:	Yes.
Question 47:	Is the Master Civil Engineer considered to be a Covered Entity #1? It is listed in the same section of the RFQ as CARE Plus and PMO, implying that it is a Covered Entity, but is not specifically mentioned in I.F.1.
Response:	See Item #6 of this Addendum above.
Question 48:	Is the language in I.F.1 intended to read “the PMO, or any joint venture PARTNER in the PMO...”? (Emphasis added)
Response:	See Item #6 of this Addendum above.
Question 49:	There are multiple Exhibits in the RFQ, some of which appear to be out of order, others that appear to be placeholders: which are correct? For example, Exhibit 1. Scope of Services, includes scopes for Groups A and B. Further in the RFQ document inside the Sample Agreement is a page titled” Exhibit 1: Scope of Work, Placeholder.” This implies that there is additional documentation. However, the remainder of the page is blank, and there is no Scope of Work following this title page. Please clarify.
Response:	Exhibit 1: Scope of Services, Placeholder will be replaced by the Exhibit 1: Scope of Services found in the RFQ. Each of the other placeholders will be replaced similarly.
Question 50:	Is there a cap on total contract funding or contract duration?
Response:	There is a base contract duration of five (5) years plus two (2) 1-year options.
Question 51:	How many firms will be selected?
Response:	To be determined.
Question 52:	Do we have to include the project reference form or can we provide all required information in our own format?
Response:	The format that is shown in the project reference form must be used. Respondents are allowed to recreate the form, but it must include all information as shown on the project reference form included in the RFQ.
Question 53:	We anticipate submitting two (2) volume ones (one for facilities architecture and engineering, and one for airport engineering), and one (1) volume 2. Is this acceptable?
Response:	Yes.
Question 54:	The RFQ says to submit “fifteen (15) electronic copies of the SOQ on CD-ROM in PDF format”, is it acceptable to submit fifteen (15) electronic copies of the SOQ on USBs in PDF format?
Response:	Yes.
Question 55:	The Federal contract states that a Fixed Fee will be earned as profit for performance of services, but does not specify how the Fixed Fee will be determined or calculated. Please clarify.
Response:	As stated in the RFQ, Consultant will be compensated for its Services based on actual costs plus a fixed fee negotiated for each Task Order.
Question 56:	Exhibit 2 Compensation states that percentage fee or profit is to be calculated only on labor. Profit and fee are normally defined as being calculated on all costs, inclusive of labor and burden/overhead. Will the Department consider revising the profit and fee calculation? This calculation method negatively impacts small M/W/DBE firms in particular.
Response:	Yes, CDA would take this into consideration.
Question 57:	Could you please provide the sign-in sheet from the CDA TOSR Pre-Conference held on April 17, 2017?
Response:	The sign-in sheet has been posted on the City of Chicago website: https://www.cityofchicago.org/content/dam/city/depts/dps/PreBids/2017PreBids/PreProp180580_180660.pdf .
Question 58:	Please confirm Schedule C-3s and Schedule D-3s are not required to be submitted with the response. The RFQ says they do not need to be submitted, but the actual forms say they do need to be submitted.
Response:	Schedule C-3 and Schedule D-3 forms are <u>not</u> required to be submitted with the

	Statement of Qualifications.
Question 59:	Please confirm that Burns & McDonnell is not conflicted from serving as prime or sub for Group A services.
Response:	<i>We cannot make this determination at this time based on the information given in the question.</i>
Question 60:	Please confirm that Burns & McDonnell is not conflicted from serving as prime or sub for Group B services.
Response:	<i>We cannot make this determination at this time based on the information given in the question.</i>
Question 61:	Can CDA provide a copy of their FAA approved DBE plan so that we can make sure our team is structured properly?
Response:	<i>Please refer to page 10 of the AIP Sponsor Guide-400 Central Region Airports Division at the following web address: https://www.faa.gov/airports/central/aip/sponsor_guide/media/0400.pdf.</i>
Question 62:	RFQ II.B.5 (page 8). This section requires a Respondent to describe “similar experience at other airports or in managing similar programs.” The required Project Reference Form further states that “The Respondent must be able to demonstrate completion of the projects identified.” Please clarify the acceptable level of completion of a program that spans multiple years and is ongoing.
Response:	<i>Only projects that have completed construction are eligible (final completion, not substantially complete).</i>
Question 63:	RFQ II.B.5 (page 8). This section requires a Respondent to describe “similar experience at other airports or in managing similar programs.” The required Project Reference Form further states that “The Respondent must be able to demonstrate completion of the projects identified.” Please clarify the acceptable level of completion of a program that spans multiple years and is ongoing.
Response:	<i>See response to Question #62 above</i>
Question 64:	RFQ II.B.6.d (page 9). This section states that “Copies of appropriate licenses do not count against page restriction.” Are licenses and certifications required in the submittal?
Response:	<i>Yes.</i>
Question 65:	RFQ Page 6, notes that no text smaller than 12 point font can be used. Is it acceptable for text on callouts and graphics including the organizational charts to be smaller than 12 point font?
Response:	<i>No.</i>
Question 66:	RFQ Page 8, Item 5 and RFQ Page 9, Item 6 both note an “organizational structure” or “organization chart” that identifies key personnel. Can you please clarify the difference between these two items. Also is it acceptable for the organizational chart to be 11x17 similar to the Team Organizational Chart?
Response:	<i>See the response to Question #14b above. Both charts may be printed on 11”x17” paper as long as the 11”x17” paper is not loose (must be bound to the rest of the volume) and is folded to fit within the confines of the volume (8-1/2” x 11”).</i>
Question 67:	RFQ Page 9, Item 7 notes the respondent is required to make a statement of commitment to the Contract DBE participation goals but does not require completion of Schedule D-3 and C-3. Is a specific percentage commitment to DBE teaming partners required to be identified in the submission or does identifying the roles and responsibilities of the individual firms suffice with a commitment to the contract goal? It is difficult to assign specific percentages without knowledge of the tasks the respondent will be supporting.
Response:	<i>A specific percentage commitment to DBE firms is not required to be identified as part of the Statement of Qualifications.</i>
Question 68:	Exhibit 2, Page B-1, does not list a maximum compensation for the contract. Is there an anticipated maximum compensation for awarded contracts?
Response:	<i>Not at this time.</i>
Question 69:	Exhibit 2, Page B-1, mentions Exhibit 2A but it is not included in the RFP. Is it correct to

	assume that Exhibit 2A is not required to be completed as part of the SOQ and will be negotiated at the discretion of the CDA?
Response:	Yes.
Question 70:	Can a sub-consultant that is both an MBE and WBE fill different roles on different tasks (i.e. WBE on task one and MBE on task 2)?
Response:	<i>A Subconsultant that is both an MBE and WBE may fill different roles on separate Task Orders.</i>

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 3

**CITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES**

**JAMIE L. RHEE
CHIEF PROCUREMENT OFFICER**