

ADDENDUM No. 1 – (October 8, 2018)

ADDENDUM TO: Owner's Representative Services
RFQ NUMBER: 17-04
RFQ DUE DATE: Monday, October 22, 2018 not later than 2:00pm

TO BIDDER: This addendum is an integral part of the Bid file under consideration by you as a bidder in connection with the subject matter identified above. For the purpose of clarification the following additions, changes, modifications and replacements noted below have been made to the Bid and have been made to the Bid file which bears the above title.

Bids submitted shall conform to these additions and modifications noted herein and including all issued addendums.

Questions and Clarifications/Answers

Question: The RFQ due date is shown as Tuesday, October 22. October 22 is a Monday. Is it due on Monday, October 22 or Tuesday, October 23?

Response: This RFQ is due on Monday, October 22, 2018 not later than 2pm.

Question: Page 8, 3.1(a) This reads "to assist in ensuring that all elements of the work are financially justifiable...". Beyond verifying that all elements of the work are within the budget, is there any other intent associated with this clause?

Response: No

Question: Page 9, 3.1(b) Per the last sentence, at what stage of design development do you anticipate the drawings will be at the time of commencement of services?

Response: Unknown at this time

Question: Page 10, 3.2 In the third paragraph, there is reference to "local presence". Is it required that respondents have a local office at the time of submittal to qualify for selection?

Response: No, but local building code and construction knowledge is a consideration in the selection process

Question: Page 14 3.11 At the present time, is there an anticipation that other public entities will use the services of the Respondent?

Response: Unknown, but the RFQ requests respondents to allow this action.

Question: Page EB 4 Per section 3 of this form, does the Authority expect the Owner's Representative to identify consultants to provide independent engineering peer review services of construction documents?

Response: Yes

Question: Per section 3 of this form, is it the Authority's intent to require the Owner's Representative to identify the firms or individuals that can provide peer reviews of the construction documents? If not, please clarify.

Response: Yes

Question: Please clarify the required total percentage and each company total percentage for the DM/DWBE/SDV. On Page 12, Item 5 Disadvantaged Minority / Disadvantaged Women Business Enterprise indicates each firm must be 10% and in Exhibit B, page EB-1, indicates the total 10% can be allocated among multiple firms.

Response: To receive the bonus points, Respondent must demonstrate that 10% of the total participation is with DM/DWBE/SDV consultants

Question: Who is the developer referenced on page 8? If they have not been chosen, what is the timeline for this selection?

Response: Developer is still to be determined. Timeline is still to be determined.

Question: Can the 40 page count requirement be expanded so that the respondents can include other information such as resumes, project sheets, etc.?

Response: No, however, as indicated elsewhere in this addendum, certain required forms are excluded from the page count.

Question: Can we include an addendum section to provide full resumes or project information which was included in the proposal, but truncated due to the forms or page count limitation?

Response: No

Question: Form on EB-4, item 3. – The 'Services to be Provided' listed on EB-4 do not fully correlate to the requirements on Pages 7- 9, Paragraph 3.1 or traditionally part of an owner's representative scope of services. Are we able to add/delete from the list to show the services and corresponding team members/consultants that 1) are named in 3.1 and 2) additional services required to execute this project?

Response: Yes, Additional information to form list will be accepted

Question: Form EB-7, item 7b: Are the roles put forth prerequisite positions or can we redefine the roles to reflect those roles/personnel that better align with the scope of services defined in paragraph 3.1 on Pages 7-9?

Response: This list is not intended to be all inclusive and other provider/consulting services may be added.

Question: Cover states due date is Tuesday, October 22, 2018. Please confirm that it is due Monday, October 22.

Response: This RFQ is due on Monday, October 22, 2018 not later than 2pm.

Question: Please clarify how box/packaging should be labeled: Page 4 states box/packaging must be marked "SEALED RESPONSE FOR OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE SERVICES". Page 13 states Submittals must be sealed in an envelope or box, and reference RFQ #17-04 and the words "STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS" must be clearly indicated on the outside of all of the envelopes or boxes.

Response: Please mark your box "SEALED RFQ #17-04 (OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE SERVICES).

Question: Section 3.3 indicates that the Authority is seeking respondents with "extensive experience in the design and construction of MLB facilities..." Could this be expanded to include experience with NFL, MLB, NHL, NCAA and other large civic spaces?

Response: Yes, but MLB experience is preferred.

Question: Are resumes for key members and project sheets for related experience included in page count or can we include it as an appendix (outside of the 40 page count limit)?

Response: No, resumes should be included within the page count limit. Any attached appendix will also be included within the page count limit.

Question: Is the Consultant Related Experience requested in #6 Related Experience included in the page count?

Response: No

Question: Is the RFQ Checklist included in the page count?

Response: No

Question: Is the WMBE/DM/DWBE certifying Governmental Agency Certification Letter included in the page count?

Response: No. It's a certificate that you would receive from a government agency indicating you are a registered/approved WMBE/DM/DWBE company.

Question: Is the WMBE/DM/DWBE commitment on their company letterhead included in the page count?

Response: No.

Question: A Table of Contents is requested. Is this included in the page count?

Response: No

Question: Form EC-2: Item 4 – Request changing “occurrence” to “per claim” as the professional liability policy cannot be purchased as specified.

Response: TSA will review response with insurance consultant and Respondents proposal should identify this concern within the submittal.

Question: Section 2.12: It is stated respondents who currently, or may in the future, provide the Tampa Bay Rays or MLB, a competing mixed use development project or any services conflicting to those identified in this RFQ for the duration of the DP will be ineligible from applying or participating as a team member with another respondent. If a construction company intends to pursue the future construction work related to the DP and they or a subsidiary of that company intends to pursue the services under this RFQ, they are precluded from applying or participating in the future construction work related to the DP, correct?

Response: Yes, if Respondent is selected as Owners Representative they would be precluded from applying or participating in the future construction work related to the DP.

Note: To qualify your proposal, of which this addendum becomes a part, this form must be completed and returned to this office with the proposal.

Date: _____

Authorized Signature of Company Rep.

Printed Name of Company Rep.

Company: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____

Contact's Email: _____

End of Addendum #1