



PRESERVATION MARYLAND

SUBJECT: RFP Q&A
DATE ISSUED: March 17, 2026
RFP: Freedman's State Park: Master Plan
DATE OF RFP RELEASE: February 10, 2026

Q&A

1. Will there be an Addendum with responses to collected questions?

Yes. Preservation Maryland shares all questions received and responses given with all firms that have expressed interest, in addition to posting the Q&A addendum online here: preservationmaryland.org/request-for-proposals-freedmans-state-park-master-plan/

2. Will there be a pre-bid meeting?

Preservation Maryland and DNR elected not to hold a pre-bid site meeting, as the area is too expansive for a walk-through and the pertinent members of the DNR team are not available for a virtual meeting.

Respondents were invited to submit questions as they arose and will have access to answers for all questions received. Moreover, the area is set within a state park, so Respondents would be welcome to visit independently during park hours. A bit of hiking may be needed to access some of the historic sites.

3. Which firms have been invited by Preservation Maryland to review the RFP?

The RFP was shared with a wide array of firms, in addition to being posted on Preservation Maryland's website and social media to ensure a fair, public, and competitive procurement process.

4. Are the firms that worked on the HSR and CLR precluded from doing the Master Plan?

No, the firms are not precluded.

5. Would the selected firm for the Master Plan be precluded from doing the design to implement components of the Master Plan?

No.

6. Can Preservation Maryland provide a list of key staff that are anticipated for this pursuit? Will a cost estimator be needed?

At minimum, planning, architecture, engineering, landscape architecture, and cost estimating services are expected to be needed.

7. Are subconsultants limited to those described in the RFP?

No, subconsultants are not limited to those described in the RFP. If Respondents include additional subconsultants, the proposal should indicate the services they will provide and how it will enhance the product(s)/project.

8. Is there a communications consultant already involved, or should that expertise be included within the consultant team?

No, there is not a communications consultant already involved and one is not needed. Preservation Maryland's Director of Communications and DNR's communications team can provide guidance/input as needed.

9. Are subconsultant resumes required? If so, do resumes count towards the 25 pages?

Respondents are advised to demonstrate the experience and qualifications of proposed subconsultants or subconsultant leads to allow for informed evaluation. Such information will count towards the 25 pages.

10. Does the 25-page limit include the cover page, table of contents, dividers, cover letter, resumes, or project sheets?

The page limit applies to any materials/copy addressing items, requirements, goals, and/or objectives in the RFP, i.e. cover letter, resumes, company profiles, project examples, proposals, etc. Preservation Maryland will not count towards the page limit such elements as a cover page, table of contents, dividers, etc. that serve to format or organize the submittal.

Respondents may elect to provide a link to online/digital project examples to reduce page count but should still be selective in the projects that are included. While we want Respondents to be able to fully convey their qualifications and proposals, we also want to ensure all Respondents are adhering to similar conditions and the evaluation period can be of reasonable duration.

11. Will there be an interview process, and if so, what is the timeline for that? When will the project commence?

No, it is not anticipated that there will be an interview process. If questions arise during evaluation, Preservation Maryland may elect to contact the respective Respondent(s) for clarification.

The duration of the evaluation period will depend on the number of submittals received, any necessary follow-ups, and DNR/Preservation Maryland review of submittals and approval of the top scoring candidate. Respondents should not anticipate notice of a decision until at least late April, with contract negotiation/execution taking place immediately thereafter, and kick-off scheduled for May.

12. Can Preservation Maryland share the grant funding level, a target range, or a not-to exceed so Respondents can tailor responses to match the services to be performed for that fee level?

Preservation Maryland is requesting that Respondents provide a budget they feel is realistic for the requested scope and services. If budgets exceed the amount of funding available, Preservation Maryland will reevaluate the scope accordingly. This may entail requesting revisions from top scoring Respondents or working with the successful Respondent to revise and finalize a feasible scope of work that still meets priority objectives and stays within budgetary limits.

13. Can Preservation Maryland share which grant is funding the project?

This project is funded by a grant awarded through the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, made possible by the Great Maryland Outdoors Act.

14. Is the budget for the Master Plan supported entirely by the grant?

The expectation is that the grant will fully support the budget for this first stage of the Master Plan.

15. What percent over the funding available would not be a competitive budget?

Approximately 10-15%. Preservation Maryland and DNR will not only be taking into consideration the dollar figure, but what services and/or deliverables are provided for the cost proposed.

16. Will the lowest qualified bidder be the selected firm—i.e. if there are three teams that are nearly equally qualified, would the lowest bidder be selected?

Not necessarily. Preservation Maryland and DNR will be equally considering relevant experience, special expertise, total services provided, and total cost.

17. Is there a timeline by which this project is expected to be completed?

The present expectation is to allocate 18 months from project kick-off for this project. Please see section 2.3 *Timeline* of the RFP. This timeline may be adjusted depending upon consultant feedback.

18. Are Preservation Maryland and DNR open to schedule proposals that could fulfill the project scope in fewer than 18 months?

Yes, shorter than 18 months is acceptable.

19. Is there a similar Master Plan that DNR can provide as a precedent/example project?

No, DNR does not have a similar example to provide for reference.

20. Have any natural resources surveys been completed? If so, is GIS data available, e.g., hydrology, endangered species (flora or fauna), habitat, plant communities, heritage trees, etc.?

DNR is not in possession of field-delineated information regarding natural resources within the bounds of the park. Respondents can visit Maryland iMAP (imap.maryland.gov) to view available data.

21. How are the agriculture areas within Freedman's State Park currently farmed and managed?

The agricultural areas within Freedman's State Park are currently leased to private farmers. These are traditional, row-crop agricultural leases. Current farmers typically plant in a corn/soybean crop rotation, but this is not a lease requirement and may be subject to change as leases turnover.

Additionally, these fields are non-irrigated. DNR agricultural leases require no/low-till farming practices as well as an overwinter cover crop, typically a small grain such as winter wheat. The fields at Freedman's State Park contain ~35 foot grass field borders as well as grassed waterways in several locations.

DNR agricultural leases are for a maximum of five (5) years and are publicly rebid. Leases are awarded to the highest per acre bidder upon advertisement. All agricultural leases at Freedman's State Park have active Soil and Water Conservation Plans through the Montgomery County Soil Conservation District.

22. Can information regarding to what extent the fields are farmed through lease agreements be provided? Are there active leases of which Respondents should be aware?

At this time, all open and farmable land is currently leased through Spring of 2027. The boundaries of these leases are subject to change between leasing cycles. Maps and additional lease information can be provided to the selected team.

23. Would the existing PEPCO easement agreements be made available so the selected team can accurately map "no-build" zones and trail crossing restrictions within the corridor?

Any easement agreements or their boundaries within Freedman's State Park will be made available to the selected team.

24. Is it correct to assume that no public water and sewer are servicing the park itself? Are there any previous studies regarding utility availability for the site?

There are currently no public water and sewer services on site. There have been no previous studies regarding utility availability beyond the defunct private utilities that serviced the John Howard House and Farm area of the park.

25. Are there any existing traffic/access studies available that should be assumed as baseline information?

There are no existing traffic studies available for use as baseline information. The selected team will conduct preliminary access studies in partnership with DNR to determine which access points should be studied in depth as part of this Master Plan.

26. Will the successful Respondent have access to the native CAD/GIS files and as-built drawings from the John Howard House and CLR reports?

Yes. Preservation Maryland may be able to provide certain source files from the HSR and CLR.

27. Is there assessment documentation available for any other extant structures within the park boundaries?

DNR does not have assessment documentation for other extant structures. Field notes and limited elevation/as-built drawings may be available for the Greenbury Howard House. Otherwise, existing documentation for the historical resources is limited to their Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties files.

28. Has a preliminary development program been established for the site that is to be tested (with public meetings) and built upon?

DNR has identified basic needs for park operation. However, location, quantity, size, necessary sitework, etc. to realize these needs has not been developed. Such is the purpose of this master planning effort.

29. To what extent is architectural work expected for existing or new structure development? Is the expectation set at only programming and development of sizes for new buildings, programmatic use of existing buildings, concept level floor plans, a combination? Should Respondents include an architect on the team?

Inclusion of an architect on the team is encouraged. The expectation is to develop, at minimum, the building program for existing structures **and** new construction, as well as massing for new construction. Floor plans are not expected either for existing or new buildings; however, it may be desirable for areas of intervention on/within existing structures to be determined as part of this initiative and noted in final documentation.

30. Should the master plan assume the John Howard House will serve as a visitor center (as suggested in the HSR), or is that still to be evaluated through this planning effort?

DNR has identified the John Howard House as an option for a visitor center. However, this is still to be evaluated through this planning effort. Further exploration and understanding of access, infrastructure, new construction, etc. challenges/opportunities to facilitate use as a visitor center are needed.

31. Is this study intended to advance architectural concepts for a future visitor center, such as at the John Howard House?

The study should, at minimum, identify location and massing of a future visitor center. If use of the John Howard House as a visitor center is determined to be ill-advised or unfeasible, identifying a building program for the John Howard House and what work may be needed to facilitate that result is also desired as a part of this effort.

32. Are there specific recommendations within the CLR/HSR that DNR views as fixed parameters versus guidance to be tested through master planning?

Recommendations made in the reports may be considered as guidance to be tested and further discussed through this planning process. However, recommendations to avoid development within/near delineated archaeological/agricultural sites.

33. Does Preservation Maryland anticipate that the consultant team will perform additional condition assessments of built structures (e.g., structural, building envelope, systems), or should existing documentation be assumed sufficient for planning-level recommendations?

No additional condition assessments are anticipated at this time. If it is determined during the planning process that additional assessments may be advisable, these can be noted in the implementation plan.

34. Regarding "Review and synthesize existing documentation and information," please clarify if a product is desired from this element. If so, provide detail on the form and content of the submission.

A specific product is not expected of this work, per se. Rather, the desire is to have the selected team review all existing documentation with which they will be provided and determine if/how it best informs and/or can be captured in the final master plan deliverable.

35. What level of interpretive planning is being sought as part of this effort, e.g., development of narratives and associated text, curation of interpretive panels, complete design for such?

Full curation for and design of an interpretive plan is not anticipated. Rather, Respondents should anticipate identifying opportunities for selection and placement of different interpretive features, be they wayfinding signage, panels, kiosks, incorporation of natural and/or historic resources, path route/design, exhibit space within park facilities (new or existing), etc.

While fully developed narratives and texts are not expected, a thorough understanding of the cultural landscape and site history will be necessary to determine appropriate locations for and types of interpretive features that will produce the desired visitor experience.

36. Please confirm the archaeology scope required for the master plan. Is additional archaeological fieldwork expected during this phase of the master plan, or should Respondents assume the existing sensitivity mapping is sufficient for this scope?

Additional archaeological investigation is not anticipated for this stage; respondents may assume the existing mapping is sufficient. However, it may be appropriate to account for further archaeological investigation recommendations, either those already made in existing reports or developed through this planning process, in the implementation plan.

37. Is any further historical research expected to be completed as part of this phase of the master plan, i.e., archival research or oral histories/interviews to fill in any known gaps?

No. It is not anticipated that further historical research will be completed as part of this plan. It may be that implementation recommendations include additional research for the purpose of curating the interpretive elements of the park. But it is not the expectation that archival research or interviews will take place at this stage.

38. To what extent are environmental analyses (RTE species, floodplain, stormwater) expected to be desktop-level planning analysis versus field investigation?

It is anticipated that the majority of the analysis will be “desktop-level,” utilizing existing records and data. However, it may be necessary to conduct targeted field investigations to verify information/research.

39. Will acquisitions of additional land be considered during the planning process?

Discussion of land acquisition to facilitate park access, development, and/or operations may be a part of this planning process. The purpose of the discussion will be to determine cost/benefit of such a pursuit, i.e., if suitable park access, development, and/or operations can be reasonably achieved without acquisition or if acquisition may drastically improve such elements.

It is not expected for the selected team to seek land price or identify DNR pathways for acquisition. Rather, in consultation with DNR, the selected team may consider the impact of acquisition vs. no acquisition to park development cost, timeline, and strategy. If after discussion and analysis it is the selected team’s advice to DNR to consider pursuit of acquiring additional land, the desired acquisition boundaries and their position in the implementation strategy should be noted in final documentation.

PLEASE NOTE: The selected team should not rely on the possibility of land acquisition as a solution to potentially identified challenges. Preference is to plan within the existing boundary. And at no time should the selected team contact any property owners as part of the review.

40. What is Preservation Maryland’s anticipated role in the public engagement process? Will Preservation Maryland be identifying potential stakeholders, coordinating meeting announcements, booking venues?

Engagement is divided into two categories: *stakeholder* and *public*. The expectation is that the consultant team will lead coordination of stakeholder meetings, while Preservation Maryland will lead coordination of the public meeting.

It will be the responsibility of the consultant team to ensure engagement occurs at appropriate stages, in consultation with Preservation Maryland and DNR, and to prepare materials for and lead all engagement meetings.

Preservation Maryland and DNR will identify and provide contact information for the stakeholders to be included in the engagement, assist with scheduling and identifying suitable locations for any in-person gatherings, and provide announcement and meeting content guidance, approval, and support.

It will not be necessary for Respondents to account for cost of venue or supplies in their budgets.

41. The RFP references reviewing partnership opportunities and provides a preliminary list of potential collaborators. Should the selected team anticipate direct outreach and coordination with identified partner organizations as part of this scope, or is the intent to provide a planning-level framework outlining potential partnerships for DNR and Preservation Maryland to advance following adoption of the master plan?

The intent is for the selected team to provide a planning-level framework outlining not only potential partnerships for advancement after adoption of the master plan but how such partnerships may be incorporated into the use, interpretation, amenities, etc. of the park.

Some of the identified partnership opportunities (Attachment B) may be among the stakeholders engaged during this planning process. In such a case, the selected team should not initially anticipate direct outreach and coordination. DNR or Preservation Maryland may provide contact information and/or facilitate outreach to certain stakeholders.

42. What stakeholders and/or community members have been engaged in conversations around this project so far? Has the stakeholder advisory committee been formed yet?

Yes, the advisory committee has already been formed. Respondents may refer to 2022 Senate Bill 541, Chapter 39 regarding appointed members. Meeting attendees have included representatives from the:

- Heritage Montgomery
- Howard Family
- Maryland Department of Legislative Services
- Maryland Department of Natural Resources
- Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
- Montgomery County
- Sandy Spring Museum
- Sandy Spring Slave Museum

These are the stakeholders that have thus far been engaged.

43. Is descendant engagement part of this project? Are Howard family descendants included as stakeholders?

Members of the Howard family form part of the advisory committee and, as such, will inherently be involved. Additional Howard family descendants will also be extended an invitation to participate in the engagement for this project.

44. Are there expectations for additional/sub-group engagement sessions beyond the referenced stakeholder meetings?

It is not specifically expected that there will be additional or sub-group engagement sessions beyond what is stated in the RFP. However, the possibility should not be ruled out, as it may come to be after initial engagement that further sessions or focus groups are advisable.

45. Will MNCPPC be involved in coordination for this pursuit?

As a member of the advisory committee, it is anticipated that MNCPPC will be invited to participate as a stakeholder.

46. Is coordination with Port of Deposit Park as a partnership park expected?

No, coordination is not anticipated.

47. Regarding the public survey(s), how many are expected, who are the target audiences, and is this additional to the list of stakeholders to be provided?

Yes, the public survey(s) are additional to the stakeholder engagement. The intent is to develop a park vision and priorities informed not only by site conditions and development needs but by input and feedback from stakeholders who had, have, or may have connections to and/or be impacted by the park.

Once a preliminary priority or wish list is established, the public surveys will then help to further refine the list and concept for the park. Respondents can expect no more than three surveys to collect data on such items, for example, as desirable park amenities, likelihood of park use based upon certain offerings, rank of most to least important park elements, etc.

48. Are Preservation Maryland and DNR open to considering the integration of alternative engagement methods to the activities listed to strengthen accessible and inclusive participation, e.g., individual and small group conversations, in-person intercept interviews in lieu of digital surveys?

Yes, Preservation Maryland and DNR may be open to alternative engagement methods, provided they allow for inclusion that is fair, equitable, and, where appropriate, broad. Appropriateness of activities, cost and timeline impact, and complexity of logistics will be important factors.

49. Are the concepts referenced in Section 3.1, page 3 intended to be for individual sites, e.g., one concept for the John Howard House area, one for the Greenbury Howard House area, etc.? Are these more detailed concepts/plans than would be included in the conceptual Master Plan document?

The intent is for the selected team to prepare up to three (3) rough concepts for park development, with high-level costs/budget ranges associated with each option to assist DNR in evaluating preferred development direction and feasibility.

The team may elect to prepare concepts that are scaled according to different target budgets and/or that consider different solutions to identified challenges, uses for existing structures, locations/massing for new construction, etc. What these concepts entail will be guided by the selected team and discussion with DNR.

These should help DNR further refine park development priorities, understand cost implications of certain decisions, select final park features, and determine a final design concept.

50. For the "Rough Order of Magnitude" cost estimates, is there a preferred methodology or format (e.g., phased order-of-magnitude costs, comparative option costing, or unit-based planning assumptions)?

The ROM cost estimates are meant to accompany the final design concept and be more detailed than the high-level costs/budget ranges prepared for the three rough concepts. It will be most helpful to understand cost per "work item," e.g., rough cost to construct new park facility (assuming certain materials to be used), to build new trails, to run utility lines, etc.

Respondents may elect to propose what they deem as most practical and/or beneficial for this planning process. Preservation Maryland and DNR are open to consultant recommendations. It is accepted that the methodology or format may be led by the selected team and the information that is able to be gathered.

51. Will the master plan be used to support future capital funding requests or grant applications that should inform the level of documentation for the base-level implementation plan?

Yes, it is likely capital and grant funding will be pursued using information from the master plan. It may be DNR's desire to identify existing programs and avenues of funding support for which pieces of park development may be eligible.

Exploration of such programs need not be exhaustive and may be largely informed by DNR and Preservation Maryland. Information such as pertinent deadlines, scope applicability, and award amount may be relevant.

52. *Is DNR anticipating a short-term (5-year) action plan, or a longer-term phased framework (10–20+ years)?*

The preference is for a short-term, 5-7 year phased plan that identifies steps needed in order to establish the park. The plan should be feasible and realistic. It is understood that it may be necessary to modify preferred park elements to meet timeline goals and/or that site challenges discovered during this planning process may impact the preferred timeline. Should a longer term for certain development pieces be deemed advisable, DNR is open to considering a plan that provides more immediate action that can be taken, paired with long-term goals and relevant considerations necessary to realizing such goals.

53. *What is the projected user/visitor count for the site for the life of the concept plan?*

The estimated visitor count is approximately 100,000 until further park development takes place.

54. *Would the Master Plan be contracted through Preservation Maryland or the State of Maryland (MPS, DNR)? Which organization will serve as the client's project manager?*

The project will be contracted through Preservation Maryland, who will also serve as the project manager. Please refer to Section 2.2 of the RFP.

55. *How many printed physical copies will be sought for the final master plan document?*

Four (4).



PRESERVATION MARYLAND

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Freedman's State Park: Master Plan

Preservation Maryland, a nonprofit organization headquartered in Baltimore, Maryland, is soliciting proposals from qualified firms for the development of a concept-level Master Plan for the State of Maryland's inaugural Freedman's State Park, positioned within the Patuxent River State Park in Montgomery County.

To be considered as eligible, the firm providing a submission must be properly licensed in the State of Maryland to practice planning, architecture, engineering, and landscape architecture. Firms must demonstrate experience in master planning, and project teams should include planning, engineering, landscape architecture, and historical and cultural resource expertise.

Preservation Maryland requests that interested parties respond to the solicitation by **4:30 P.M. ET on Tuesday, March 24, 2026**.

1. CLIENT

Preservation Maryland is a statewide non-profit working to protect Maryland's unique and irreplaceable heritage while creating a more equitable and sustainable future. The organization harnesses the power of historic places to revitalize and reinvest in communities, advocate, and build the historic trades workforce for the benefit of all Marylanders. To learn more, visit www.preservationmaryland.org.

Preservation Maryland is working directly with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Maryland Park Service to accomplish capital and planning projects related to the Service's large inventory of historic sites and buildings. The Maryland Park Service and the Department of Natural Resources will be the official recipients of the work provided by the selected firm.

2. PROJECT OVERVIEW

2.1 Background

Owned by the State of Maryland and managed by the DNR Maryland Park Service, the future Freedman's State Park will be an approximately 1,000-acre park located within the existing boundaries of Patuxent River State Park. The new park will encompass land once owned and farmed by the Howard family.

[Enoch George Howard](#), the family's patriarch, was born into slavery in 1814. At 37, he purchased his own freedom, securing his wife Harriet's two years later and their four eldest children's freedom seven years after that. The Howards later bought the land and home from the family who had once enslaved Harriet. By the time of Enoch's death, the property had more than doubled in size and included a chapel that served as both a place of worship and a school for the local Black community. During his lifetime, Enoch was a highly respected figure, and many of his descendants went on to distinguish themselves through their achievements and service. Since that time, the land has remained largely undeveloped, continuing in agricultural use. Several historical, funerary, agricultural, and archaeological sites present today derive much of their significance from this period of Howard family stewardship and ownership.

In order to recognize this rich history and elevate the contributions of Black Americans in Maryland, the 2022 Great Maryland Outdoors Act (GMOA) directed the establishment of Freedman's State Park. The GMOA charged DNR with establishing the park—as a partnership park managed alongside a local government, a bi-county agency, or a nonprofit organization—to “educate the public about and preserve and interpret the lives and experiences of Black Americans, both before and after the abolition of slavery.”

To date, DNR has met with key stakeholder groups to discuss a stakeholder advisory committee for park planning. DNR also has performed preliminary mapping and planning and has commissioned a Cultural Landscape Report (CLR), Historic Structures Report (HSR), and archaeological investigations through Preservation Maryland. See **Attachment A – Completed Work and Documentation** for more information.

2.2 Description

Acting as project manager on behalf of DNR, Preservation Maryland is seeking consultant services to prepare a concept-level Master Plan to advance the development of Freedman’s State Park. The purpose of this project is to produce a planning document that establishes the foundation for future park development.

Project objectives include:

- Compile existing property information and studies.
- Conduct necessary analyses for site planning.
- Engage the public and key stakeholders to identify priorities, park needs, and opportunities that will shape the conceptual design of the park.
- Address the unique history of the park’s resources, highlight the layered stories of the Howard Family and site historical context, and promote connections to other historically significant sites and properties in the area.
- Provide a base-level implementation strategy outlining project phasing, key steps, and considerations to guide subsequent planning.
- Develop two options for site development and, through a public stakeholder process, select a preferred concept for Park development supported by illustrative graphics, maps, conceptual renderings, and preliminary cost estimates.

This project is being executed in partnership with DNR. Preservation Maryland and DNR staff will be involved throughout the entire project. Preservation Maryland will serve as the main point of contact, contract signatory, invoice recipient, and liaison between the hired project professionals and any relevant government agencies, which will include coordination of document submission. DNR will be involved in project meetings, documentation review, as applicable, and site visits and will serve as final authority on the content of the master plan.

2.3 Timeline

Work is expected to begin immediately upon execution of the contract and conclude within 18 months. Respondents should account for ample opportunity within this timeline for DNR discussion, review, and feedback of project progress, milestones, and deliverables, stakeholder and public engagement, and a limited period after the final Master Plan draft submittal to incorporate minor revisions as may be requested by DNR.

3. SERVICES AND SCOPE OF WORK

The consultant team will build upon existing documentation and planning efforts, as identified in **Attachment A**. Where applicable, work recommended shall adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, and local, state and federal laws and regulations. Anticipated work to be undertaken by the consultant team may include, but is not limited to, the following:

3.1 Services

- Coordinate with Preservation Maryland, DNR, and project stakeholders throughout the duration of the project.
- Establish a project work plan and timeline to be updated and referenced regularly.
- Prepare brief status memos on a quarterly basis.
- Review and synthesize existing documentation and information.

- Conduct an analysis to confirm existing conditions, assess infrastructure and environmental factors, and evaluate potential facility locations, e.g.:
 - Rare/threatened/endangered species
 - Floodplain
 - Drainage/stormwater management
 - Infrastructure evaluation, including utilities siting
 - Site accessibility and circulation review
 - Access feasibility study, including an evaluation of Montgomery County codes and regulations and road standards.
- Review partnership opportunities to set the park within a local and regional context (a preliminary list of partners is provided and will be further informed by discussion with DNR)
- Hold regular, monthly virtual meetings with DNR and Preservation Maryland for status updates, information-gathering, and deliverable feedback
- Prepare for and conduct stakeholder engagement meetings:
 - Expect at least three (3) in-person stakeholder meetings, including Montgomery County, for concept development input and feedback (a finalized list of stakeholders will be provided to the successful Respondent).
- Develop online surveys and solicit public input on site development.
- Prepare for and conduct one (1) public meeting to present preliminary concepts.
- Prepare concepts for park development based on stakeholder and public input. Concepts will consider new facilities and visitor amenities, utilization of historic sites and structures, and key park features, including interpretative, road/trail access, and incorporation of passive park experiences. DNR will evaluate concepts and cost/feasibility for implementation.
- Develop a concept-level master plan document with an overview of the planning process and “Rough Order of Magnitude” cost estimates. The draft plan shall be sufficiently complete with formatted text, concept renderings, maps, photographs, and graphics so that it may be digitally disseminated for feedback from DNR staff, stakeholders, project partners, and the public at large.

3.2 Deliverables

- Quarterly status memos.
- Site assessment reports.
- Stakeholder and public meeting agendas, presentations, handouts, and summaries.
- Public survey results.
- Park development concepts with cost estimates.
- Master plan document encompassing the following elements:
 - Executive summary
 - Site description and significance
 - Outline of planning process and public engagement efforts, establishing:
 - Vision and mission statements
 - Goals and Objectives
 - Constraints and opportunities that consider:
 - Regional/Local setting
 - Existing and Proposed Infrastructure
 - Historical and cultural resource preservation
 - Land restoration

- Partnership collaboration
- Visitor experience
- Site development impact(s)
- Site management
- Finalized preferred concept
- Implementation plan outlining park development phasing and recommendations, accompanied by cost estimates

4. PROJECT BUDGET

This project is supported by grant funding for all related expenses and will be contracted based on a lump sum in negotiation with the selected Respondent. In no event shall the selected Respondent be entitled to receive more than the contracted amount unless authorized in advance and in writing by Preservation Maryland and DNR. Competitiveness of the budget will be considered as part of the proposal review process.

5. INSTRUCTIONS TO RESPONDENTS

5.1 Where to Deliver Submittal

All submittals must be submitted as a single PDF, no more than 25 pages total, to the following email: LHouston@presmd.org.

5.2 Submittal Due Date

Submittals are due by **4:30 P.M. ET on Tuesday, March 24, 2026.**

5.3 Preparation of Submittal

Respondents must submit the following:

- Firm profile(s)
- Qualifications of key personnel, including names, titles, and relevant experience
- Examples of projects similar in scope and scale recently completed (i.e., within the last 7 years)
 - To reduce page count, Respondents may include hyperlinks to project examples.
- Proposed project approach
- Project timeline that indicates durations for key tasks and the overall project
- Itemized project budget
- Three (3) client references, including the full name, telephone number, and email address for the primary point of contact and a one-to-two sentence description of the nature of the project

5.4 Subcontracts

Respondents must identify all portions of the work intended to be performed through subcontractors. Acceptance of the submittal does not necessarily constitute approval of the subcontractors identified therein.

5.5 Minimum Qualifications

Demonstrated experience in planning, park development, and historic sites development is preferred. For purposes of this Qualification, “projects similar in scope and scale” shall be understood to include the multiple of the following elements: 1) engagement-driven planning, including stakeholder workshops, community engagement, and partner coordination; 2) park master planning or concept-level planning for state, regional, or local parks, cultural landscapes, or large public lands; 3) planning for sites with historic, cultural, or natural resource sensitivities, including work informed by Cultural Landscape Reports (CLR), Historic Structures Reports (HSR), or similar studies; 4) cost estimating at the concept or master-planning level, including comparative cost models for multiple alternatives.

5.6 Small Business Enterprise (SBE), Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) and/or Woman-Owned Business Enterprise (WBE)

Respondents are not required to be or have subcontractors who are certified SBE, MBE, and/or WBE companies. However, use of SBE, MBE, and/or WBE companies is encouraged.

5.7 Inquiries

Questions regarding this RFP must be received at least fourteen (14) days prior to the RFP due date. Questions may be submitted by e-mail to LHouston@presmd.org. Clarifying information and supplemental instructions will be communicated to all prospective Respondents no later than one week / seven (7) days prior to the RFP due date. Submission of a proposal constitutes acknowledgment of receipt of all information pertaining to this RFP.

5.8 Rejection of Submittal

Proposals must be delivered to the specified location and received by the proposal due date to be eligible for consideration. Preservation Maryland and DNR reserve the right to reject submittals not prepared and submitted in accordance with the provisions specified herein and reserves the right to waive any minor deviations or irregularities in an otherwise valid submittal.

6. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCEDURES

6.1 Evaluation Procedure

Each response will be evaluated by Preservation Maryland and DNR in accordance with the indicated criteria below.

1	<p>Background and Qualifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Relevant experience (i.e. past performance) regarding public outreach and coordination, park master planning, public lands planning, or historical and cultural resource planning. b) Demonstrated experience coordinating with multiple stakeholders and the public. c) Special expertise of personnel for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cultural landscape analysis and historic preservation planning – Environmental planning, conservation, and resource management – Access, circulation, and site infrastructure planning – Interpretation and visitor experience design
2	<p>Project Approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Names and functions of personnel assigned b) Demonstrated capacity to meet schedule requirements, including assessment of current workload c) Commitment to project completion within time constraints d) Competitive budget
3	<p>Technical Merit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Demonstrated comprehension of tasks to be completed b) Completeness, clarity, and organization of submittal c) Quality and relevance of previous work samples

6.2 Award

Acceptance of the successful Respondent’s proposal does not create a contractual relationship. Preservation Maryland and DNR reserve the right to award the agreement to the next available Respondent in the event the

successful Respondent fails to enter into the agreement, or the agreement with said Respondent is terminated within 30 days of the effective date.

7. EXECUTION OF AGREEMENT

Upon Preservation Maryland and DNR's acceptance of the proposal, the successful Respondent must provide:

- Contract for review
- Completed Form W9
- Satisfactory evidence of insurance coverage as required by the State of Maryland and Preservation Maryland including but not limited to:
 - General Liability coverage with minimum limits of no less than \$1,000,000.00 per claim
 - Automobile Liability coverage to include Owned, Non-Owned, and Hired Autos, with minimum combined single limits of no less than \$1,000,000.00 per claim
 - Workers' Compensation and Employer's Liability coverage with minimum limits of no less than that required by Maryland law
 - Professional Liability coverage, if applicable, with minimum limits of no less than \$1,000,000.00 per claim
- If ACH payment preferred: Name and email address of individual to whom a secured form can be sent to obtain necessary information

Preservation Maryland and DNR reserve the right to cancel the award of the agreement without liability at any time before the agreement has been fully executed by all parties.



PRESERVATION MARYLAND

Attachment A: Completed Work and Documentation

Respondents may access the files below via the following link: [Completed Work and Documentation](#). You will be prompted for a password, which may be obtained by emailing Laura Houston at LHouston@presmd.org.

- A. Park Boundary and Historic Sites Map
- B. Partnership Opportunities Map
- C. Freedman's State Historical Park Cultural Landscape Report
- D. John Howard House Historic Structure Report

The following documentation and information may be made available to the successful Respondent upon project kick-off:

I. Existing Site Documentation:

- a. Archeological reports, including Phase 1A Investigation and GPR fieldwork
- b. Determinations of Eligibility
- c. Scope(s) of work for Enoch Howard House restoration
- d. Scope(s) of work for funerary site conservation
- e. Road access map
- f. Topographical data
- g. Utility data
- h. Property line data
- i. GIS data
- j. Existing trail data
- k. Land Deed Research
- l. Howard Family Research
- m. Enslaver Research
- n. Historic photographs of structures and family members

II. Administrative/Operation Documentation:

- a. Preliminary park development plan
- b. Preliminary cost projections (2022)
- c. Relevant DNR manuals, documents, and/or criteria for park management
- d. Park visitor count—current and projection(s)
- e. Stakeholder list