



MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Architecture & Engineering Division

Greg Gianforte, Governor
Misty Ann Giles, Director

architecture.mt.gov
406.444.2460
DOAAEDivision@mt.gov

ADDENDUM #2 TO THE RFQ DOCUMENT FOR DESIGN BUILD SERVICES

MSU GALLATIN COLLEGE

A/E#2025-07-05

Date: June 22, 2025

Changes to the RFQ document and answers to questions asked to date by firms are as follows:

The last paragraph on page 13 states the “no other consultants or trade contractors should be included in the proposal; these team members will be selected in consultation with the Owner”. I wanted to clarify that this means that structural, civil, MEP, etc. consultants will be picked later after the D/B Team is selected and we are not to include them in our Team for this response. Is that correct?

The only additional consultants that should be named are the Lead Constructor, Lead Designer, and those entities that employ Key Team Members. The intent is for subconsultants to be picked after the DB Team is selected in consultation with the Owner.

Section 5.2 indicates an RFQ checklist. Under that checklist section 5.3 indicates the max page count of 180 pages. We are assuming that this is a typo? Please clarify.

Yes, 180 pages is a typo. In Section 3.4, we have 20 pages. It should be that.

Section 5.3.1 – There is no request for a Project Superintendent unless we provide in section viii – can the Project Scheduler also be the Project Superintendent and not count towards the additional 3 key team members?

Yes. Section 5.3.1a specifically notes that a single person can have multiple roles. If Proposers want to assign being a superintendent to their scheduler in their description of that person’s duties, then that appears to be consistent with the SOQ.

Section 5.3.1 – under section vii – Quality Control Manager – the paragraph abruptly ends. Please add additional comments.

5.3.1.a.vii should just have a period at the end of the sentence rather than a semi-colon. The semi-colon was intended to indicate that it is a list.

Section 5.6 – Corporate Structure Questionnaire says to submit for Design Builder and each Team Member. We are assuming that team members is not a reference to team

members listed in section 5.3.1. Team Members is in reference to Builders and Architects correct?

2.6.5 defines Design-Build Team Member (also referenced as a “Team Member) as an entity rather than a person.

I understand that proposers are not allowed to use their own form for Exhibit B. Can you provide Exhibit B (Projects Table Form) in excel or word format or should we just try to replicate it as closely as possible in a chart?

DB teams may convert to a Word or Excel form, but it must match the layout and format provided in Exhibit B.

Section 3.3.4 is the evaluation and scoring criteria. There is no reference section that correlates to the 30-point scored section (unless I missed it)? All other scoring sections have a direct reference to a section in the RFQ. See below for clarification:

Reference Section 5.3.1	Team Organization and Collaborative Process	10 points
No reference section for this scoring criteria?	Successful, Collaborative Progressive Design-Build Process	30 points
Reference Section 5.3.2	Innovative Facility Design	15 points
Reference Section 5.3.3	Transparent Pricing	10 points
Reference Section 5.3.4	Efficient Scheduling, Sequencing, and Construction Means and Methods	15points
Response to RFP		Total RFP Points: 100

The table in Section 3.3.4 is replaced with the following:

SOQ	Total SOQ Points: 80
Team Organization and Collaborative Process	20 points
Innovative Facility Design	25 points
Transparent Pricing	15 points
Efficient Scheduling, Sequencing, and Construction Means and Methods	20 points
Response to RFP	Total RFP Points: 100
Overall Management Approach	25 points
Innovative Facility Design	25 points
Transparent Pricing	25 points
Efficient Scheduling, Sequencing, and Construction Means and Methods	25 points
Price Proposal	Total Price Proposal Points : 20
TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL Points: 200

Is the intention for the Design-Builder and the Design Consultant to both provide insurance information? There is a max 1-page limit. Or should the Design-Builder provide information and verify with the design firm that they meet the Professional Liability Insurance requirements?

The intent is for the Design-Builder to acknowledge that they can meet the insurance requirements. The prime/principal D-B will be contractually bound to ensure that their subcontractors (design and construction) have insurance.

Can you share with proposers who will comprise the RFQ review committee?

Two members from State A&E and two from MSU.

In Section 5.3.1 – Paragraph a: Provides a description of Key Team Members. In review, this listing of personnel seems to be very “construction centric”. Is this by design, or is there any flexibility in the “Naming” of these roles. Still keeping “Key Team Members” to a maximum of ten, but possibly flexing their job description?

Yes, there is flexibility. Key Team Members can have multiple roles. In addition, Proposers may name up to 3 additional Key Team Members.

Where will the August 6th confidential meetings be held?

MSU campus with a virtual option. Meetings will occur at the Facilities Management Building on S 5th Ave. Room TBD.

Can you please share the tracked changes version of the DBIA 530 and DBIA 535 as part of the next addendum?

Yes

There was wording in the RFP 3.1.1 about only the Owner and no one else with Owner Employees, Rep, etc. Who is our point of contact?

Bob Warfle, bwarfle@mt.gov with a cc to DOAAEDivision@mt.gov . Connecting outside of this limitation is non-binding on the Owner.

Just to clarify on key team members: There is no request for a Project Superintendent unless we provide in section viii (3 additional key team members) - can the Project Scheduler also be the Project Superintendent and not count towards the additional 3 key team members?

7 key + 3 extras for a total of 10 maximum; team members can hold multiple roles, but primary role should be identified.

What will the agenda be for the confidential meetings in the RFP phase?

Owner will issue 2 or 3 items they want firm to address during the meetings. Firm will describe how they will approach the project.

How many firms will the Owner shortlist to receive the RFP?

Three (3) is goal with option to go up or down.

RFP 2.2.1 - Please clarify MSU's expectations regarding "student engagement" by Design Build team.

MSU has no set number of meetings or format and is looking for the selected DB Team to provide input/suggestions.

With this being MSU's first PDB, based off the list of programs in Exhibit D and the \$43M target, can you share how MSU may prioritize scope flexibility vs budget adherence if those come into conflict?

The project is not being managed by MSU; it is a State A&E project. \$43M is the current project budget with \$3M is set aside for owner related expenses . No additional funds are anticipated and the selected DB Team in collaboration with the State will be expected to manage the scope and schedule within this target upon contracting.

Will the Owner provide de-briefings to firms?

There will be no debriefings offered at the conclusion of either the RFQ or RFP phases.

Is MSU open to early work packages (site, utilities, structural systems) ahead of a full GMP?

Yes

What is the Owners' top priority?

State – Timing ;speed of delivery.

MSU – Time and maximizing funds to get the most space

See the Project Goals. For more clarity:

Section 2.1, second paragraph states the Design Build team will examine available spaces on the current MSU campus to determine whether there are spaces that could be used for the Gallatin Program. What is the owner's expectation of the DB Team?

Intent was for Firms to fully understand Gallatin Colleges operations. Bulk of this work will be after firm is selected to fully understand the needs.

The RFQ emphasizes developing adaptable spaces that can "flex" with changing statewide workforce needs. What specific fields or industries is Gallatin College anticipating expanding into next?

No new industries are on Gallatin College's radar right now. Firms should showcase any new ideas they think are relevant based on the State's workforce needs.

Please clarify if tab pages between sections and the TOC are included in the 20 page count, or is section 5.3 the only portion that counts towards the 20 pages.

Tab pages between sections do not count towards the 20 page limit provided that they contain no substantive content.

TOC is part of the 20 page count because it contains substantive content.

Is it acceptable if the org chart is 8.5 x 14 folded to fit in 8.5 x 11?

Larger paper size is acceptable if folded for items like an org chart.

Regarding RFQ Section 2.6.11, I would like to respectfully request that the requirement that “Projects of Similar Scope and Complexity” have substantial completion dates within the last seven years be eliminated or at least extended to 10-15 years. I know from experience that current design trends and best practices for collegiate trade education facilities aren’t limited to the last 7 years. We feel MSU and the State should also take into consideration the limited number of facilities like Gallatin College that were constructed over the last 7 years due to the pandemic and volatility of the construction market.

The Owner will leave section 2.6.11 as written in the RFQ.

[END OF ADDENDUM #2]