



# ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CENTER  
580 TAYLOR AVENUE  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

Pamela Harris  
State Court Administrator 410-260-1295

## Questions/Answers #2 Capital Program and Facilities Master Plan Development

RFP #16-0036-25  
December 3, 2015

To our prospective Business Partners:

The following question for the above referenced RFP were received by email and answer will be posted for all prospective Offerors. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions are not binding on the Judiciary unless the RFP is expressly amended. Nothing in the Judiciary's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the Judiciary of any statement or interpretation on the part of the Offeror asking the question.

**Question: Please confirm the scope of work is to provide program updates for the departments listed in the 2005 and 2013 reports and to provide concept studies to consolidate all of the departments in a new building located at the Taylor Avenue site OR to relocate the Courts of Appeal building functions to the Taylor Avenue site and renovate existing buildings to facilitate desired consolidation outcomes.**

*Answer: The departments listed in the 2005 and 2013 reports may or may not be included in the program for the new Courts of Appeal Building. Similarly, other departments may need to be included and provided spaces in the new building (Security and Facilities Administration. The successful offeror will meet with the Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts at the start of the project to verify which departments will have input to the capital program for the new Courthouse.*

*The Long Range Space Plan will include relocating all of the Administrative Office of the Courts functions on the campus at the Taylor Avenue location.*

**Question: Please confirm if native word and excel files will be provided to the selected team of previous reports content.**

*Answer: The Judiciary does not have the word or excel files of the previous reports.*

**Question: Please confirm if .dwg or .pdf files are available for the existing building assets.**

*Answer: The Judiciary will provide .dwg files of existing spaces.*

**Question: Please confirm the anticipated contract duration and clarify if the Capital Program for the Courts of Appeal building update is anticipated to be completed for March 2016 or March 2017 funding appropriations.**

*Answer: The proposals submitted should include the offeror's anticipated timeline to complete the work. The proposed timelines will be part of the evaluation used to rate the **proposals**.*

**Question: Please clarify the Institutional Evaluation analysis required for the Facilities Master Plan. Confirm if the evaluation is for the entire asset or limited to the areas occupied by departments within this scope. Confirm if the evaluation is inclusive of all building systems or limited to operational efficiency and analysis within the space provided.**

*Answer: The evaluation is limited to the the areas occupied by the Administrative Office of the Courts departments in the Annapolis area and the Courts of Appeal/Law Library. The evaluation is inclusive of all building systems.*

**Question: Please clarify if Part 1 and 2 have been previously submitted for the Capital Program for the Courts of Appeal building. Please confirm that updates to the program through the masterplan process will not require additional approvals processes as outlined in the following except from the Facility Program Manual.**

**“D. Section 3-602(e) of the State Finance and Procurement Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland specifies that except with the approval of the Secretary of Budget and Management and the Secretary of General Services, no change may be made in any proposed capital project after the program for that project has been completed and approved. A program change is generally defined as a change which significantly alters the characteristics of the project and:**

- 1) involves work not addressed in the program;**
- 2) is inconsistent with the original language of the program; or**
- 3) adds significant cost to the project in a manner not foreseen when the program was first approved.**

**The addition or deletion of a room or space constitutes a program change as defined in items 1 and 2 above. The term “significant cost” in item 3 is defined as an increase or decrease in cost which equals or exceeds 5% of the construction cost.”**

*Answer: The Part 1 and Part 2 have been submitted to DBM and DGS for review, but have not been approved for funding.*

**Question: The PDF of the HDR LRSP update, dated June 2013, only includes 44 of 91 pages. Will the remaining pages be posted and made available for review?**

*Answer: There are a total of eight attachments available on the solicitation website that together include the entire Part 1 and Part 2 Capital Program and the Long Range Space Plan.*

**Question: Will the successful firm be provided with paper or electronic, or both, floor plans of all facilities occupied by AOC and the Court of Appeals as well as the main site plan encompassing the current site of Rowe Blvd and Taylor Road?**

*Answer: Electronic drawings in .dwg format will be made available to the successful firm.*

**Question: For state-owned facilities, are there any hazardous materials and if so, has an environmental abatement report been prepared that will be available to the selected consultant?**

*Answer: The Judiciary is not aware of any hazardous materials in the leased buildings. A request has been sent to the Department of General Services requesting any available information on hazardous materials in the Courts of Appeal Building and the Tawes Complex.*