

QUESTION & ANSWER ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM

TALLAHASSEE STATE COLLEGE
444 Appleyard Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32304-2895
850.201.8520
www.tcc.fl.edu

Proposal No: RFQ 2026-04

Proposal Title: Annual Architectural Services

Proposal Due Date: October 14, 2026 @ 1:45 p.m. EDST

Proposal Opening: October 14, 2026 @ 2:00 p.m. EDST

Date: September 15, 2026

THIS FORM CONTAINS QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY PROSPECTIVE RESPONDENTS AND THE COLLEGE'S ANSWERS.

RESPONDENT: Dustin Frost/Don Herr

BY: September 15, 2026

ADDRESS: Tallahassee State College

PHONE: 850.201.8520

Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #1	Is the Proposal Evaluation Meeting on 10/15 open to the public?
Answer #1	Yes. The Proposal Evaluations Meeting scheduled for October 15, 2026, is a public meeting and will be open to the public. However, no public comment or questions will be allowed. Please refer to the Schedule of Events in the RFQ for the meeting date, time, and location.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #2	We understand the broad scope of projects that may occur under this type of project as well as what has been noted on Page 16 of the RFQ. That said: a. Have any specific projects been identified that will occur under this contract? If so, can you please clarify what they are so we can tailor our experience in the submittal. For example, a library HVAC project or a restroom upgrade in xyz building. b. Does the College have funding in hand for any specific projects under this contract? If so, can you share the values per project, along with project name?
Answer #2	a. No specific projects are guaranteed under this continuing services contract at this time. The selected firm(s) may be assigned projects involving new construction, renovation, remodeling, rehabilitation, repair, planning, studies, and other professional architectural/engineering services as described in the

	RFQ. Proposers should demonstrate experience applicable to the range of services identified in the RFQ rather than tailoring their response to a specific anticipated project. b. The RFQ does not guarantee a specific volume, value, or number of projects to be assigned under the continuing services contract. Projects will be authorized by the College as needs are identified and funding is available. Accordingly, the College is not identifying specific project funding amounts as part of this RFQ.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #3	How is current workload scored? Do you utilize a table with ranges that correlate with a specific assigned score or is it subjective per committee member. If there is a scoring table for current workload, may we have a copy?
Answer #3	Current and Projected Project Workload is worth a maximum of ten (10) points. Each Evaluation Committee member will independently evaluate and score the information provided in Section 5 based upon the suggested scoring matrix below. Scoring Guide – Maximum 10 Points Score 9–10 Excellent Capacity – Current and projected workload demonstrates ample capacity to accept TSC assignments. Firm clearly demonstrates availability of key personnel and resources and presents little or no apparent workload-related risk to timely performance. 7–8 Good Capacity – Current and projected workload demonstrates sufficient capacity to support TSC assignments. Existing commitments appear manageable, with only minor potential workload concerns. 5–6 Adequate Capacity – Firm appears capable of supporting TSC; however, current or projected commitments create some concern regarding availability, staffing, scheduling, or responsiveness. 3–4 Limited Capacity – Current/projected workload indicates significant existing commitments or limited available resources that may affect the firm's ability to timely support TSC assignments. 1–2 Minimal Capacity Demonstrated – Information provided indicates substantial workload/capacity concerns or provides insufficient evidence that adequate resources will be available for TSC assignments. 0 No Demonstrated Capacity – Firm fails to provide sufficient workload information to permit a meaningful evaluation of its capacity to perform TSC assignments.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #4	How is past performance scored for firms that have not worked at TSC in the past 10 years? Do those firms get maximum points or less points than firms that have worked at the College? If you have a scoring chart for this criterion, may we have a copy please?
Answer #4	Prior experience with TSC is not required and firms will not receive a lower score solely because they have not performed architectural services for TSC within the previous ten (10) years. Firms without prior TSC experience will be evaluated based upon their demonstrated past performance on comparable projects for other public agencies, colleges, universities, school districts, or similar institutional clients, as provided in Section 9 of the RFQ.

	All firms are eligible to receive the full ten (10) points available under Section 9 based upon the strength of the past-performance information provided. Prior TSC experience does not automatically result in additional or maximum points. The Evaluation Committee will independently evaluate Section 9 based upon the criteria identified in the RFQ. No separate scoring chart was included in the published RFQ.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #5	Section 4 requests that proposers identify key architectural and engineering personnel proposed to provide services to TSC. Should the architectural firm identify a designated team of engineering subconsultants as part of its RFQ response? If so, will those engineering consultants be considered the firm's team for the duration of the continuing contract, or may TSC and/or the selected architectural firm determine the appropriate engineering consultants on a project-by-project basis?
Answer #5	Yes. Proposers should identify the key engineering personnel and/or engineering subconsultants anticipated to support the firm in providing services to TSC, as applicable, and provide the information requested in Section 4 of the RFQ. The identification of engineering subconsultants in the RFQ response does not require the selected architectural firm to use the same engineering subconsultants for every project assigned during the continuing services contract. Because the scope and required disciplines may vary by individual assignment, the appropriate engineering consultants may be determined on a project-by-project basis, subject to TSC's review and approval. Proposers should identify their anticipated team in the RFQ response so the Evaluation Committee can evaluate the firm's proposed staffing, qualifications, experience, and ability to provide the required architectural and engineering services.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #6	Does TSC currently have separate continuing professional services contracts with MEP engineering firms that may be utilized in conjunction with the architectural continuing services contract? If so, please identify the firms.
Answer #6	No. TSC does not currently have separate continuing professional services contracts with MEP engineering firms that are intended to be utilized in conjunction with this architectural continuing services contract. Proposers should identify the engineering personnel and/or subconsultants anticipated to support their proposed team, as applicable, in accordance with Section 4 of the RFQ.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #7	Does TSC currently have separate continuing professional services contracts with Structural engineering firms that may be utilized in conjunction with the architectural continuing services contract? If so, please identify the firms.
Answer #7	No. TSC does not currently have separate continuing professional services contracts with structural engineering firms that are intended to be utilized in conjunction with this architectural continuing services contract. Proposers should identify the engineering personnel and/or subconsultants anticipated to support their proposed team, as applicable, in accordance with Section 4 of the RFQ.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	

Question #8	Does TSC currently have separate continuing professional services contracts with Civil engineering firms that may be utilized in conjunction with the architectural continuing services contract? If so, please identify the firms.
Answer #8	No. TSC does not currently have separate continuing professional services contracts with civil engineering firms that are intended to be utilized in conjunction with this architectural continuing services contract. Proposers should identify the engineering personnel and/or subconsultants anticipated to support their proposed team, as applicable, in accordance with Section 4 of the RFQ.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #9	Section 5 – Current and Projected Project Workload requests a “list of current and future contracts” and states that, if voluminous, at least ten contracts related to the scope of services should be listed. Please clarify the information TSC would like firms to provide in this section; if we have more than ten contracts does this need to be noted?
Answer #9	Section 5 is intended to provide the Evaluation Committee with sufficient information to evaluate the firm's current and projected workload and its capacity to provide timely services to TSC. Firms should provide a representative list of current and anticipated contracts/projects, with emphasis on work relevant to the scope of services contemplated by this RFQ. If a firm's current and future workload is voluminous, the firm may provide a minimum of ten (10) representative contracts/projects related to the scope of services. If the firm has more than ten (10) current or anticipated contracts/projects, it is not necessary to list every contract. The firm may indicate that the list provided is representative of a larger overall workload. Firms are encouraged to provide sufficient information regarding their overall workload and available capacity to allow the Evaluation Committee to evaluate the firm's ability to support TSC throughout the contract period.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #10	Section 10 – Written References: Please confirm that this section is intended to include a list of five professional references with the information requested in the RFQ, rather than written reference letters from past clients.
Answer #10	Confirmed. Section 10 requires proposers to provide a list of five (5) professional references for architectural projects completed within the previous ten (10) years that are comparable to the types of projects anticipated by TSC, along with the information requested in the RFQ for each reference. Written reference letters from past clients are not required.
Question from: Clemons-Rutherford & Architects, Inc	
Question #11	Regarding Anticipated Projects: Does TSC have any specific projects currently planned, budgeted, or anticipated to be assigned under this continuing architectural services contract? If so, please identify the anticipated projects and, if available, their general scope and estimated construction budgets.
Answer #11	At this time, TSC is not identifying specific projects that are guaranteed to be assigned under the continuing architectural services contract. Projects will be identified and authorized on an as-needed basis during the term of the contract, based upon the College's needs, priorities, and availability of funding. Proposers should demonstrate qualifications and experience applicable to the range of services identified in the RFQ. The College does not guarantee any minimum number, dollar value, or specific type of project under the resulting continuing services contract.
Question from: Pond & Company	
Question #12	Section 05 – Current and Projected Project Workload: Please clarify whether the requested list of current and future contracts should reflect the workload of the entire firm, the office that will have primary responsibility for TSC projects, the proposed Project Manager, or the individual key team members proposed for this contract.

Answer #12	The information provided in Section 5 should primarily reflect the current and projected workload of the office that will have primary responsibility for TSC projects and the personnel/resources proposed to support the College. For firms with multiple offices, proposers are not required to provide a comprehensive list of contracts for offices or personnel that are not anticipated to support TSC. The information provided should be sufficient for the Evaluation Committee to assess the firm's capacity, availability, and ability to timely perform assignments under the continuing services contract. Proposers may include additional information regarding the availability or workload of the proposed Project Manager and other key team members if they believe it will assist the Evaluation Committee in evaluating the firm's capacity.
Question from: Pond & Company	
Question #13	Section 09 – Past Performance and Prior Architectural Services for TSC: If a proposed team member has previously provided architectural services directly to TSC while employed by another architectural firm, may that team member's prior TSC experience be included in the firm's response to Section 09 and considered as part of the proposed team's demonstrated past performance, even though the proposing firm itself was not the contracted architectural firm for those services? If permitted, should such experience be identified separately as individual team-member experience?
Answer #13	Yes. Relevant prior TSC experience of a proposed key team member may be included in the response, even if that experience was obtained while the individual was employed by another architectural firm. Such experience should be clearly identified as individual team-member experience and should identify the architectural firm under which the services were performed, the individual's role and responsibilities on the project, and the applicable TSC project. Experience performed by an individual while employed by another firm should not be represented as prior contractual experience of the proposing firm. The Evaluation Committee may consider the individual's experience as part of its evaluation of the qualifications and demonstrated experience presented in the proposal, consistent with the applicable evaluation criteria.
Question from: Pond & Company	
Question #14	Proposal Format / Page Limits: Other than the two-page limit identified for the Section 01 Letter of Understanding, are there any page limits applicable to the overall proposal or to individual Sections? If so, please identify any exclusions from the page count, such as forms, licenses, organizational charts, resumes, or other required documentation.
Answer #14	Other than the two (2)-page limit specified for the Section 01 Letter of Understanding, the RFQ does not establish an overall proposal page limit or additional page limits for individual sections. Proposers should provide the information and documentation necessary to fully respond to each applicable section of the RFQ while keeping responses clear, concise, and relevant. Required forms, licenses, organizational charts, resumes/personnel information, and other required supporting

	documentation are not subject to a separate page-count limitation unless otherwise specifically stated in the RFQ.
Question from: Pond & Company	
Question #15	Required Forms / Subconsultants: Please confirm whether any proposed subconsultants are required to separately complete, execute, and submit any of the forms included in Sections 11–18. If separate subconsultant forms are required, please identify which forms must be completed by each subconsultant.
Answer #15	Proposed subconsultants are not required to separately complete and submit the forms contained in Sections 11–18 as part of the Proposer's RFQ response. The required forms should be completed and executed by the proposing architectural firm, as applicable. The selected firm will remain responsible for ensuring that its subconsultants comply with applicable contractual, statutory, insurance, E-Verify, and other requirements. Any documentation required from a subconsultant may be requested by TSC or required of the selected firm prior to or in connection with an individual project assignment.
Question from: Pond & Company	
Question #16	Section C, Statement of Qualifications: This section states that TSC intends to select the “top scoring companies” and assign work on a rotating basis. However, Section 1.C, Evaluation Process/Criteria, states that the Selection Committee will recommend “the firm” to provide architectural design services. Please clarify whether TSC intends to select multiple firms under separate or shared continuing services contracts, or select a single firm. If multiple firms will be selected, please identify the anticipated number of firms and explain how assignments will be distributed.
Answer #16	TSC intends to select multiple qualified architectural firms under this RFQ for continuing architectural and engineering services. Each selected firm will enter into a separate continuing services agreement with the College. The reference in the Evaluation Process/Criteria to recommending “the firm” is not intended to limit the College to the selection of a single firm and should be read as “firm(s).” TSC anticipates selecting multiple firms, subject to the qualifications, rankings, and results of the evaluation process. Work will generally be distributed among the selected firms on a rotating basis. However, rotation does not guarantee an equal number or dollar value of assignments to each firm. TSC may consider the nature and requirements of an individual project, the firm's qualifications and experience applicable to the assignment, availability and capacity, prior assignments, performance, and other relevant factors when determining the appropriate firm for a particular project.
Question from: HDR Inc	
Question #17	Would you be able to share the latest contract that TSC has for architectural providers?
Answer #17	The current architectural services solicitation and award information are publicly available through TSC's Purchasing website. Copies of additional contract records may be requested through TSC's public records process
Question from: Hammond Design Group LLC	

Question #18	Is TSC expecting a full consultant team to be prepared in this rfq? Or is this rfq for architectural services only?
Answer #18	This RFQ is for continuing architectural and engineering (A/E) services and is not limited solely to architectural services. Proposers should identify the key architectural, engineering, and other professional personnel and/or subconsultants anticipated to support TSC, as applicable, in accordance with Section 4 of the RFQ. TSC does not require proposers to identify every specialty consultant that could potentially be needed during the term of the continuing services contract. Because individual assignments may vary in scope and required disciplines, additional or specialized consultants may be identified on a project-by-project basis, subject to TSC's review and approval. The RFQ response should demonstrate that the proposing architectural firm has the qualifications, team structure, and resources necessary to coordinate and provide the architectural and engineering services reasonably anticipated under the continuing services contract.
Question from: Hammond Design Group LLC	
Question #19	Are letters of commitment, licenses, resumes and insurance documentation required for each proposed engineering subconsultant, or is identification within the organizational chart and personnel section sufficient?
Answer #19	Separate letters of commitment, copies of licenses, resumes, and insurance documentation are not required for each proposed engineering subconsultant as part of the RFQ response unless otherwise specifically required by the RFQ. Proposed engineering subconsultants and key engineering personnel should be identified within the organizational chart and Section 4 response, as applicable. Proposers should provide sufficient information regarding the proposed personnel's qualifications, professional licenses/certifications, relevant experience, roles, and other information requested in Section 4 to allow the Evaluation Committee to evaluate the proposed team. The selected architectural firm will be responsible for ensuring that any subconsultants utilized on TSC assignments possess all applicable professional licenses and maintain insurance appropriate to the services being performed. TSC may require supporting licensing, insurance, or other documentation prior to authorization of an individual project assignment.
Question from: Hammond Design Group LLC	
Question #20	Will firms be selected separately for the Main Campus/Leon County locations and the Gadsden and Wakulla County locations, or will every selected firm be eligible for assignments at all six sites?
Answer #20	TSC does not intend to establish separate pools of architectural firms for Main Campus/Leon County, Gadsden County, or Wakulla County locations. Each firm selected under this RFQ will be eligible to receive assignments at any of TSC's six sites. Work will generally be assigned among the selected firms on a rotating basis. Assignment of a particular project may also take into consideration the project's specific requirements, the firm's

	qualifications and experience, availability and capacity, location and ability to provide timely service, prior assignments, and other factors determined by TSC to be relevant to the needs of the project. Selection under this RFQ does not guarantee any firm a specific number, dollar value, geographic location, or equal distribution of assignments.
Question from: Hammond Design Group LLC	
Question #21	The RFQ states that work will be assigned on a rotating basis. How will the rotation operate?
Answer #21	TSC intends to utilize a general rotation among the firms selected under this RFQ when assigning projects. The rotation is intended to provide selected firms with opportunities to receive assignments; however, it will not operate as a strict numerical rotation and does not guarantee an equal number or dollar value of projects to each firm. In determining individual project assignments, TSC may consider factors including the nature, scope, complexity, and schedule of the project; the firm's qualifications and relevant experience; availability and capacity; ability to provide timely service; prior and current TSC assignments; and other project-specific considerations. TSC reserves the discretion to assign each project to the selected firm it determines is best suited to meet the College's needs
Question from: Dempsey Architecture x Interior Design	
Question #22	To encourage meaningful competition and participation by newly established architectural practices, may TSC consider relevant prior project experience of the proposer's Principal-in-Charge and other key personnel that was completed while employed by previous firms, provided the individual's role, responsibilities, and former firm are clearly identified? Newly established firms may bring substantial prior experience, direct principal involvement, current technologies, and highly responsive project delivery despite having a shorter history as a legal entity.
Answer #22	Yes. TSC may consider relevant project experience of the proposed Principal-in-Charge, Project Manager, and other key personnel that was obtained while employed by another firm. Such experience should be clearly identified as the individual's experience and should include, as applicable, the individual's role and responsibilities, the project, and the architectural firm under which the services were performed. Experience obtained while employed by another firm should not be represented as project experience or contractual past performance of the proposing firm itself. However, it may be considered in evaluating the qualifications and relevant experience of the proposed personnel and team under the applicable evaluation criteria. Newly established firms will be evaluated based upon the information submitted in response to the RFQ and the published evaluation criteria. TSC does not require a minimum number of years in business beyond the minimum professional and licensing requirements stated in the RFQ.
Question from: Dempsey Architecture x Interior Design	
Question #23	May relevant project experience of proposed engineering or specialty subconsultants be included in satisfying or supplementing the Section 6 minimum project experience requirement?

Answer #23	Relevant project experience of proposed engineering or specialty subconsultants may be included to supplement the Proposer's response and demonstrate the overall qualifications and experience of the proposed team. However, the minimum five (5) project requirement in Section 6 should be satisfied by projects for which the proposing architectural firm provided architectural and/or A/E services. Projects performed solely by a proposed engineering or specialty subconsultant should not be used to satisfy the Proposer's minimum five (5) project requirement. Any additional projects presented as subconsultant experience should be clearly identified as such, including the subconsultant's role and services performed.
Question from: Dempsey Architecture x Interior Design	
Question #24	How many firms does TSC anticipate selecting for continuing architectural services under RFQ 2026-04?
Answer #24	TSC anticipates selecting multiple qualified firms for continuing architectural services under RFQ 2026-04. The final number of firms selected has not been predetermined and will be based upon the qualifications, rankings, and results of the evaluation and selection process. Selection will be limited to firms determined by TSC to be in the best interest of the College.
Question from: Dempsey Architecture x Interior Design	
Question #25	Please clarify what is meant by “certified businesses.” Our firm is SBE-certified with Palm Beach County and the City of West Palm Beach, but does not qualify under the MyFloridaMarketPlace's Minority-, Women-, or Veteran-Owned categories. Would our existing SBE certifications satisfy this requirement, or is another certification required?
Answer #25	The term “certified businesses” in the Statement of Qualifications is not intended to require certification as a Small Business Enterprise (SBE), Minority Business Enterprise (MBE), Women Business Enterprise (WBE), Veteran-Owned Business, or other similar socioeconomic business certification. Proposers are not required to hold a MyFloridaMarketPlace Minority-, Women-, or Veteran-Owned Business certification, nor is a separate SBE certification required to submit a response to this RFQ. Proposers must meet the applicable professional licensing and business registration requirements identified in the RFQ, including the State of Florida architectural licensing requirements. Firms may identify any SBE, MBE, WBE, veteran-owned, or other business certifications they currently hold; however, such certification is not a mandatory qualification under this RFQ.
Question from: Dempsey Architecture x Interior Design	
Question #26	Is a permanent office within Leon, Gadsden, or Wakulla County required or preferred, or will firms located elsewhere in Florida receive full consideration based on their demonstrated ability to provide timely on-site service?
Answer #26	A permanent office located within Leon, Gadsden, or Wakulla County is not required. Firms located elsewhere in Florida will receive full consideration based upon the evaluation criteria established in the RFQ. Under Section 3, proposers should identify the office that will have primary responsibility for TSC projects and demonstrate their ability to provide timely and responsive on-site services. The Evaluation Committee will consider the firm's physical location, accessibility, anticipated response times, and

	demonstrated ability to attend meetings, conduct site visits, respond to emergencies, perform construction administration activities, and otherwise support TSC's on-campus needs. No preference or predetermined scoring advantage is provided solely for maintaining an office within Leon, Gadsden, or Wakulla County.
Question from: Dempsey Architecture x Interior Design	
Question #27	May comparable educational, institutional, governmental, or public-sector projects completed outside Florida or outside the United States be included in Sections 6 and 9, provided their relevance to TSC's anticipated work is clearly described?
Answer #27	Yes. Comparable educational, institutional, governmental, or other public-sector projects completed outside Florida or outside the United States may be included in Sections 6 and 9, provided the projects otherwise meet the applicable requirements of those sections and their relevance to the types of projects anticipated by TSC is clearly demonstrated. The Evaluation Committee will consider the relevance and comparability of the experience presented, including factors such as project type, size, scope, complexity, construction type, operating environment, and the firm's role and performance. Proposers should note that the inclusion of projects performed outside Florida or outside the United States does not replace the RFQ's separate requirement that the selected firm(s) demonstrate knowledge and experience with applicable federal, State of Florida, local, Florida Building Code, Florida Fire Prevention Code, accessibility, Florida Department of Education, and other requirements applicable to Florida College System facilities.