

ADDENDUM NO.5



Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026

To: All Bidders

From: Siera Wigfield Senior Planner

RE: Request for Proposal #26-0429 Meadow Mountain Trail Enhancement Design & Permitting Service

Purpose of Addendum

This Addendum No. 5 provides final clarifications, consolidates key procurement information, and incorporates responses to questions received.

This Addendum supersedes any conflicting information contained in the original RFP or prior addenda.

The contents of this addendum are hereby incorporated into and made part of the Request for Proposals (RFP).

Acknowledgement of Receipt

Offerors shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 3 by initialing below and including a copy of this page with their proposal submission.

Addendum No. 5 Acknowledgement: Initials: _____

Addenda & Informational Links

- [Project Website](#)
- [Background Document SharePoint](#)
- [Pre Proposal Meeting Recording](#)
- [Pre Proposal Transcript \(AI\)](#)
- [Addendum 1 2026-03-20](#)
- [Addendum 2 2026-03-27](#)
- [Addendum 3 2026-04-09 Site Visit Notes](#)
- [Addendum 4 2026-04-13](#)

Key Project Information

Proposal Due Date	May 11, 2026 at 2:00 PM (Local Time) - updated
Submission Requirements	One (1) hard copy required <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clearly labeled: “RFP #26-0429 Meadow Mountain Trail Enhancements”Delivered to: Garrett County Commissioners Office 203 South Fourth Street, Room 207 Oakland, MD 21550Electronic copy: encouraged but not required
Price Proposal	Shall be submitted concurrently with the full proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none">The April 15, 2026 price submission date is hereby rescinded
Questions Deadline	Closed – No additional questions will be accepted

Questions & Answers

Q: Are additional connecting trails (e.g., Ranger Station access, Bittinger Road segment) included?

A: The project area includes the primary Meadow Mountain Trail corridor and associated segments identified in the RFP and supporting materials.

- The **1.4-mile segment from the overlook to Bittinger Road (MD 495)** referenced in prior materials is considered part of the broader system context and may be evaluated.
- Connections such as the Ranger Station access trail **may be evaluated**, but inclusion in final design shall be determined through the design process based on feasibility, cost, and agency coordination.

Q: Can the County provide construction history, maintenance logs, or design standards?

- A:**
- The trail was constructed in **multiple phases by different contractors**, resulting in varying conditions and limited consolidated documentation.
 - Formal maintenance logs (e.g., gravel placement history) are limited.
 - There is **no single adopted trail width standard** across the system.

Expectation:

The Consultant shall:

- Evaluate existing conditions in the field
- Recommend appropriate trail typologies and widths
- Balance recreation, safety, and **Forest Service operational access needs**

Q: Can crossings be evaluated during preliminary design with final design as an additional service?

A: Yes.

- Evaluation of crossings shall be included as part of **base scope (30% design)**
- Due to permitting complexity, **final design and permitting for specific crossings may be scoped as additional or refined services**, subject to feasibility and County direction

This approach is consistent with prior guidance regarding SHA coordination and potential constraints.

Q: Can existing structures and potential new structures be evaluated in preliminary design, with final design as additional?

A: Yes.

- Evaluation of:
 - Existing structures (rehabilitation potential)
 - Need for new structures shall be included in **base design services**
- Advancement to final design shall:
 - Be contingent upon feasibility
 - Require coordination with DNR and applicable agencies
 - May be refined during later phases or treated as additional scope elements

As noted previously, new structures may require additional permitting and coordination.

Legal Disclosure Requirement (Lawsuits)

Clarification:

Offerors shall disclose any lawsuits, claims, or legal actions filed within the past **three (3) years** related to professional services.

For each, provide:

- Nature of claim
- Jurisdiction
- Case number (if available)
- Status
- Outcome (if applicable)

If none, include a statement indicating such.

Evaluation Criteria Clarification

Proposals will be reviewed by an evaluation committee composed of Garrett County staff and technical advisors with relevant expertise in trail design, planning, engineering, and project delivery. Agency partners may participate in an advisory capacity as appropriate.

Each proposal will be evaluated independently by committee members and scored in accordance with the criteria outlined below.

1. Technical Proposal Evaluation (100 Points)

1. Demonstrated understanding of the Meadow Mountain Trail context; quality, creativity, and feasibility of the proposed approach; ability to improve user experience while achieving RTP construction readiness. **(35 points)**
2. Experience delivering similar trail projects, including mixed motorized and non-motorized use, forested terrain, drainage and erosion control, and RTP or comparable funding programs. **(25 points)**
3. Qualifications of key personnel; trail-specific credentials; experience with professional trail design and construction-ready documentation; appropriate use of subconsultants. **(15 points)**
4. Ability to deliver phased design services within anticipated timelines; demonstrated capacity to manage workload and coordinate with agencies. **(10 points)**
5. Reasonableness and clarity of the proposed fees for each phase; alignment with scope and anticipated funding constraints. **(15 points)**

2. Cost Proposal Evaluation (50 Points)

6. Cost proposal. **(50 points)**

Cost proposals will be evaluated separately from the technical proposal based on completeness, reasonableness, and alignment with the proposed scope of work. Lower cost proposals will generally receive higher scores; however, cost will be considered in relation to the level of effort and overall value provided.

3. Total Evaluation

Total Maximum Score: 150 Points

Final rankings will be based on the combined total of the technical proposal score and cost proposal score.

Once each member of the Selection Committee has rated each proposal, a composite rating is developed which indicates the committee's collective ranking of the highest rated proposals in a descending order.

At this point, the Selection Committee may request interviews of the top ranked Firms. Project managers are requested to attend these meetings. The Selection Committee will conduct all subsequent interviews as necessary and may use interviews to clarify proposals and inform final rankings.

The Selection Committee will make a recommendation for contract award to the Purchasing Agent. The Purchasing Agent will review the recommendation of the committee and present it to the Board of County Commissioners for their final approval during their weekly public session.

This procurement is a competitive proposal process and not a low-bid procurement. Award will be made to the proposer whose submission is determined to be most advantageous to the County.

Prepared by:

Siera Wigfield

Senior Planner, Planning & Land Management Division

Garrett County Government