Responses to RFIs for Elevator IDIQ

RFI #1

Q1: Please confirm that this will be a single-award contract (SATOC) and that multiple contractors will not be awarded.

Response: Yes. This solicitation is intended to result in a single-award IDIQ contract.

Q2: Please confirm that a qualified general contractor may submit a proposal as the prime Offeror under this solicitation while teamed with properly licensed and certified elevator subcontractor(s) who will self-perform the elevator-specific services described in the Statement of Work, and that the prime Offeror itself is not required to independently hold an elevator contractor license. This approach will be beneficial to the AOC for the following reasons:

a. A general contractor will be able to use a vetted bench of multiple qualified elevator subcontractors, rather than the AOC's reliance on a single specialty subcontractor, to satisfy the capacity and scalability requirements of Factor 1.

b. A general contractor prime can offer (1) surge capacity across a pool of vetted elevator subcontractors to support concurrent Task Orders under Sections C.3.1 and C.3.2, (2) continuity of operations through backup subcontractor resources if a key subcontractor's capacity is disrupted or unavailable, and (3) integrated general construction management for the design and non-elevator construction items of work associated with Modernization Task Orders.

Response: The Government will evaluate proposals in accordance with the requirements of the solicitation. Offerors, including any proposed teaming arrangements or subcontractors, must demonstrate that they satisfy all applicable requirements of the Statement of Work and the solicitation. Any determination regarding the acceptability of a prime contractor and certified elevator subcontractor arrangement will be made by the Contracting Officer during the evaluation process.

Q3: For Factor 3 – Key Personnel (Section L.3.6), please confirm whether the resumes submitted for the Account/Program Manager (SOW C.15.1) and Senior Field Engineer/Supervisor (SOW C.15.2), including their designated alternates, may be personnel employed by the Offeror's teamed elevator subcontractor rather than direct employees of the prime Offeror, provided each individual meets the required skills,

experience, and certifications (e.g., NAEC VTMP, QEI/NAESA, IUEC licensure) identified in SOW Section C.15.

Response: The proposed Account/Program Manager is required to be an employee of the prime Offeror. Other proposed key personnel may be provided through elevator subcontractor company, provided they meet all qualifications, certifications, and experience requirements identified in the Statement of Work Section C.15.

Q4: Please confirm whether any distinction will be made in the evaluation of Factors 1 and 3 where the qualifying personnel, licenses, and certifications are held by a subcontractor rather than the prime Offeror, and whether teaming agreement(s) must be submitted with the proposal to substantiate this arrangement.

Response: The Government will evaluate proposals in accordance with the stated evaluation criteria. Use of qualified subcontractor personnel is permissible; however, the Offeror should clearly demonstrate an established working relationship and the ability to successfully perform the contract as an integrated team. Offerors who propose doing all the work in-house as the prime will receive higher ratings, all else being equal.

Q5: For Factor 1 – Technical Approach, Section L.3.4(e), the RFP requires the Offeror to describe its ability to provide technical and price proposals within 1 to 2 weeks for Task Orders under Section C.3.2 (Modernization Services). For design-build elevator/escalator modernization projects, which require site verification, engineering, and OEM/vendor quotes, a 1- to 2-week turnaround is typically not sufficient to develop an accurate proposal. Will the Government consider extending this timeframe to 3 to 4 weeks for modernization proposals?

Response: The Government acknowledges the concern regarding proposal development time for modernization efforts and will consider allowing additional time, where appropriate, for modernization quotations, based on complexity. L.3.4(e) is amended to add the sentence “For more complex modernization efforts, additional time may be permitted.”

Q6: Regarding Attachment J.3, IDIQ Pricing Sheet, and Section L.3.8/Factor 5, please confirm that the hourly ceiling rates and fixed quantities in the Modernization (C.3.2)

section of J.3 are used solely for price evaluation purposes at the IDIQ level, and that individual Modernization task orders will instead be priced as firm-fixed-price proposals developed for the specific scope of each project. Given that modernization scopes vary significantly and typically include design, engineering, and non-elevator construction items of work (e.g., structural, electrical, HVAC, plumbing., finishes) that are not reflected in the J.3 labor categories or assumed quantities, please confirm the J.3 rates will not be used to price actual modernization task orders.

Response: The fixed quantities in Attachment J.3 are for price evaluation purposes. After IDIQ award, yes, the Task Orders will mainly be firm fixed price, and the Contractor shall not exceed the ceiling rates for each listed labor category, for the base and each option year. Other price elements not listed (e.g., other labor categories) can be included at the Task Order level, however, the labor categories listed are what the Government anticipates will make the majority of the labor costs. **This is a service contract, not a construction contract**. Items cited like structural and HVAC will not be included in these Task Orders and will be executed via separate efforts by the AOC. Even though the Task Orders are firm-fixed price, each Task Order proposal shall detail the breakout of the firm fixed price, showing how the price maps to the labor categories in the IDIQ, and that listed rates do not exceed the ceiling rates. The Government expects the proposed rates at the Task Order level to be lower than the ceiling rates, commensurate with the quantity of hours (e.g., the more hours, the more discount from the ceiling rates. For the purposes of price evaluation, the annual hours quantities are listed in the column titled "Quantity of Hours at Ceiling Rates for Price Evaluation Purposes".

Q7: Modernization Services (SOW C.3.2) require design and engineering work in addition to the elevator, escalator, and accessible lift labor categories identified in SOW Section C.15. Since no design-related key personnel category is identified in Section L.3.6/Factor 3 or SOW C.15, would the AOC like Offerors to submit the resumes and qualifications of the designers (e.g., licensed engineer or architect) who will support modernization design efforts as part of the proposal, and if so, under which factor should this information be submitted?

Response: Additional labor categories not listed in the SOW and J.3 Pricing Sheet will be allowed at the Task Order level. **This is a services contract**, not an Architect-Engineering contract. However, we anticipate that there may be incidental design/engineering efforts involved, which the contractor can price at the Task Order level, with labor categories not specifically listed in the IDIQ, which can be negotiated at the Task Order level between the AOC and the contractor.

Q8: Please consider extending the proposal due date 2 weeks from the date of the RFI responses to allow offerors adequate time and prepare technical and price proposals.

Yes, proposal due date is extended to August 31, 2026, at noon EST. Section L.2.2 is updated.

RFI #2

Q1: Elevator Maintenance - Is it the objective of the AOC to have one (1) single elevator company that will be responsible for the routine elevator/escalator maintenance activities for all 235 elevators and 46 escalators on the IDIQ?

Response: Yes.

Q2: Is there a scheduled virtual pre-bid meeting for this IDIQ solicitation?

Response: Yes, the site visit shall be held at a date to show several representative buildings. The details of the site visit date and time will be provided via a future amendment.

RFI# 3

Q1: Is the contractor responsible for all obsolete equipment?

Response: For the U.S. Botanic Garden (USBG), the Contractor shall provide comprehensive full-service maintenance and repair, including replacement of components as required by Appendix E. For all other AOC jurisdictions, maintenance and repair services will be performed on a Task Order basis in accordance with the Statement of Work.

Q2: Is the contractor responsible for covering third-party inspection fees?

Response: Third-party inspection and testing requirements shall be performed in accordance with the Statement of Work and Appendix E. The Contractor shall include this fee in their Task Order proposal so that the Government can reimburse for this fee, for Task Orders that require third-party inspection.

Q3: Will there be an opportunity for a site visit?

Response: Yes, details will be forthcoming in a subsequent amendment.

Q4: Are you able to provide a list of the unit types? (Hydraulic, traction, lift, and MRL)

Response: The types and quantities of elevators, escalators, and accessible lifts are provided in Appendix D of the Statement of Work.

Q5: Can you please provide a current deficiency list for all units?

Response: The Government is unable to provide a current system-wide deficiency list.

Q6: Can you please provide the most recent inspection reports?

Response: The Government is unable to provide complete inspection reports. However, limited historical condition information, where available, may be provided at the Government's discretion, at the Task Order level.

Q7: Can you please confirm that this is a full maintenance contract?

Response: The contract provides comprehensive full-service maintenance only for the U.S. Botanic Garden (USBG), **see Appendix E**. For all other AOC jurisdictions, work will be issued on a Task Order basis in accordance with the Statement of Work.