SOLCITATION ADDENDUM

Issuing Agency:	NC Department of Environmental Quality: Division of Mitigation Services
Solicitation Number:	16-2214810333
Solicitation Description:	**Full Delivery Projects to Provide: Warm Stream, Riparian Wetland and Riparian Buffer Mitigation Credits within the Cataloguing Unit 03020201 of the Neuse River Basin; and Nutrient Offset-Phosphorus Mitigation Credits within the Neuse-Upper Falls Lake Watershed and Neuse-Lower Falls Lake Watershed Service Areas.**
Solicitation Opening Date and Time:	February 23, 2027 At 2:00 PM
Addendum Number:	1
Addendum Date:	
Purchasing Agent:	Tracie Harrell

FAILURE TO RETURN THIS ADDENDUM MAY SUBJECT YOUR RESPONSE TO REJECTION.

1. The following are questions received about the Solicitation and the State's response to those questions:

SOLICITATION NUMBER: Error! Reference source not found. 16-2214810333
ADDENDUM NUMBER: Error! Reference source not found.1

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
1	SECTION 2.9 IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND RESTRICTIONS	What criteria does DMS use in determining when to purchase credits through the IFB vs. issuing an RFP that allows for the submittal of credits from banks vs. a full delivery RFP? In this service area, Naturion has approved bank site[s] that could contribute to DMS's credit need with no project risk. With insight into this decision-making process by DMS, we can better position project sites for DMS's needs.	DMS evaluates the amount of mitigation needs, whether the permits are issued (a requirement for stream and wetland credit purchases), the amount of credits a bank is offered, the price of the credits, the impact on cash flow, the amount of remaining needs should a bank purchase be executed, the strategy and financial ramifications for pursuing the remaining mitigation credit needs, the opportunity costs of pursuing and not pursuing bank or full delivery credits, the additional workload of both options, the likelihood that the regulatory agencies would approve the case-by-case permit bank decision, and the best interests of the state.
2	Section 4.14 Subcontractors	The RFP states that vendors should provide the names, qualifications, and experience of proposed subcontractors with their proposal. Given the nature of these projects, where subcontractor selection is often influenced by project location, availability, scheduling, and budget at the time of assignment, would DMS consider allowing vendors to provide a qualified pool of potential subcontractors, along with their qualifications and experience, rather than committing to specific firms at the proposal stage? This approach would allow the selected consultant to identify the most appropriate subcontractor for each assignment while still providing DMS with confidence in the qualifications of the firms that may be utilized. The prime consultant would remain fully responsible for all subcontracted work.	The State RFP template addresses subcontractors in the following sections to promote consistency for all vendors and agencies to follow: Section 4.8 requires a Vendor to include proposed personnel to be assigned to the project for evaluation. Section 4.11 further describes that by submitting a proposal in response to this solicitation, an awarded Vendor agrees to not substitute key personnel without prior written approval by the State's Contract Lead (DMS Project Manager). Section 4.14 refers to the necessary steps to be taken if there is a need for the awarded Vendor to subcontract the work. The State requires information provided on the HUB Supplemental Vendor Information (RFP Attachment D) and Location of Workers Utilized by Vendor (RFP Attachment F) to be considered during the RFP evaluation. For these reasons, DMS will not consider allowing vendors to provide a qualified pool of potential subcontractors.

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
3	Section 2.8	requires the Vendor's proposal to comply with ADA/WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility standards. Does this requirement apply solely to content authored by the Vendor, or does it also extend to documents the Vendor is required to complete on a State-provided template (e.g., Attachments / Optional Scoresheet), where the form's formatting or form field tags do not meet WCAG 2.1 AA. If the Vendor completes a non-compliant State template as instructed, will that be scored against the Vendor's accessibility compliance?	The ADA/accessibility requirement extends to all documents including State provided templates. The State is actively updating all State templates to be accessibility compliant.
4		What evaluation criteria or software tools will be used to assess ADA/accessibility compliance for proposal submissions? Knowing this would help us verify that our submittal is fully accessible prior to submission.	The state uses a variety of software tools to check for ADA/accessibility compliance. There is not a single software tool in use and new and better tools are being created at a rapid pace. The state recommends that the vendor identify the tool they use to demonstrate ADA/accessibility compliance.

Check **ONLY ONE** of the following options and return one properly executed copy of this Addendum prior to the Solicitation opening time and date.

☐ A response was submitted prior to this Addendum. An updated response has been submitted to address the changes resulting from this Addendum.

☐ A response was submitted prior to this Addendum. **NO CHANGES have resulted** from this Addendum.

☐ A response was **not** submitted prior to this Addendum. **ANY CHANGES resulting** from this Addendum are included in our response.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME

_____ _____
Authorized Signature Date

_____ _____
Printed Name Title