



Worcester County Administration Office  
 1 West Market Street, Room 1103  
 Snow Hill, MD 21863  
 Ph. 410-632-1194 Fax 410-632-3131  
 Email: [nrice@co.worcester.md.us](mailto:nrice@co.worcester.md.us)

## Addendum # 1 Comprehensive Plan Update

Date of Addendum: 11/8/2023

### NOTICE TO ALL BIDDERS AND PLANHOLDERS

The Proposal Documents for the above-referenced Project are modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original Proposal Documents and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the Proposal Documents. Vendors will take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting a Proposal and shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the space provided in the Proposal Documents.

### PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DEADLINE

The Proposal submittal time has been changed from 2:30pm on Tuesday, November 14, 2023 to 2:30pm on Tuesday, November 28, 2023.

The last day for questions has been changed to noon on Thursday, November 16, 2023.

### 1.0 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following questions and answers are provided as a matter of information to clarify issues raised about the Proposal Documents.

Item	Questions and Answers
1.1	<p>Q. Our experience on comprehensive plans is that the scope/work approach as written ends up being very different than the scope/work approach taken due to the nature of a public process that is often controversial, explores new issues as they arise, and requests for further analysis to support the plan. This makes submitting a fee proposal a very risky proposition, especially in the context of question #4 (below). Would the County consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. providing a budget range for the project, and/or</li> <li>2. using a qualifications-based selection process that yields a negotiated price once the County and consultant have a more thorough opportunity to discuss the scope of work with the highest rated consultant, or</li> <li>3. significantly reducing the weighting of the cost proposal from 30%</li> </ol> <p>A. <b>The maximum budget for the project is \$125,000. The weighted criteria listed in the proposal documents will remain unchanged.</b></p>
1.2	<p>Q. Will the County consider electronic submittals instead of hand-delivered proposals?</p> <p>A. <b>The County currently cannot accept electronic submissions.</b></p>
1.3	<p>Q. Section I – Payment. Is it the County’s intent to receive monthly invoices based on the percentage of work complete?</p> <p>A. <b>Yes, that would be the easiest way to remit payments.</b></p>
1.4	<p>Q. Is there a report available that discusses the outcomes of the community engagement process that has been occurring?</p> <p>A. <b>The report is currently in the process of being finalized. When the draft is available, it will be made public. We anticipate having it presented at the January 2024 Planning Commission meeting.</b></p>

1.5	<p>Q. Is the firm that led the Community Engagement process for the comprehensive precluded from bidding on the comprehensive plan development itself?</p> <p>A. <b>No, they are not precluded.</b></p>
1.6	<p>Q. As the municipalities have their own independent planning and zoning authority, are we correct to assume that other than including a general understanding of their local comp plans that no further work is required regarding the municipalities.</p> <p>A. <b>The municipalities will have some say in their desired location for Growth Areas, which will involve some discussion beyond simply understanding their plans. Several are in the process or gearing up to perform an update of their plans in conjunction with ours.</b></p>
1.7	<p>Q. It is non-standard to include the following contract clauses in a comprehensive plan process and we request that they be removed.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">L. Liquidated Damages</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">O. Performance and Payment Bonds</p> <p>A. <b>Per this addendum, Liquidated Damages and Performance and Payment Bonds have been removed.</b></p>
1.8	<p>Q. Task #1 calls for Proposers to include in their Proposal a project timetable for Development of a Detailed Scope of Work; this wording suggests that the scope of work/approach may be re-negotiated post-award.</p> <p>A. <b>The scope of work listed in the RFP is not intended to be re-negotiated post-award, however each consultant may tackle the project in differing ways or in different amounts of time. We would like a general understanding of the consultant’s availability to complete the work, and what their anticipated timetable is for completion of the tasks.</b></p>
1.9	<p>Q. Task #1(d)(2) calls for development capacity analysis. The Maryland Department of Planning has been performing a “first draft” of this task on request of several municipalities and rural jurisdictions. Has MDP offered or been asked to do a capacity analysis for the County? If so, is a copy of this document available?</p> <p>A. <b>Worcester County has been on MDP’s “wait list” for two years now as they have previously advised that they do not have the capacity to support this effort. We do have a copy of their 2015 analysis under the “old growth model” available in a GIS file, which needs to be updated. Worcester County staff can perform the necessary updates and is available to assist the consultant with the analysis.</b></p>
1.10	<p>Q. Considering the above, we request that the due date for bids be extended at least two weeks from the publication of answers to questions.</p> <p>A. <b>The bid deadline has been changed to 2:30pm on November 28, 2023.</b></p>

**END OF ADDENDUM**