

March 14, 2023

RFQu 23-4106 GENERAL ENGINEERING AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

ADDENDUM #1
(Acknowledgment is Required)

The Respondent shall acknowledge its review and receipt of this Addendum by signing below and including a signed copy of this Addendum with its bid submittal. Failure to do so could result in disqualification of the bid.

Please note that underlined information (example) is added wording and stricken information (~~example~~) is deleted wording.

I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Question: Are the projects listed on pages 15 and 16 of the RFQ individual contracts or do they fall under the scope of a singular continuing services contract?

Answer: The projects listed on pages 15 and 16 of the RFQu will be issued as individual Task Work Assignments (TWA).

2. Questions: During the pre-proposal conference today, it was stated that a firm may not submit as a Prime Respondent while also being included on another team under the same Chapter but a firm may submit as a Prime Respondent on a Chapter while being included on any number of other teams as a subconsultant under other Chapters. Respectfully, would the District please re-consider and allow firms to submit as a Prime Respondent while also being included on one or more teams as a sub-consultant in that same Chapter? Please note the urgency with which a response is needed in order to adjust existing teaming relationships and meet the April 4 response submittal deadline.

Would you please clarify if a firm can respond to the RFQ as a prime consultant, and also as a subconsultant with another firm?

Can a consultant apply for a Chapter as both a prime firm (respondent) and as a sub-respondent on another team?

Is it acceptable to submit as a Prime and a Sub-respondent?

Answer: The District will allow firms to submit as Primary Respondents while being listed as a Sub-Respondent for another Prime Respondent under the same Chapter.

3. Question: What firms currently hold this contract?

Answer: The list of firms that currently are awarded under this contract is attached to the Addendum (Attachment A).

4. Questions: Can projects and references under 1.8.1.2.2 be from a team member's experience under a previous employer or can they only be from the respondent firm?

Are the projects and references used for the individual Chapters tied to the firms that were awarded the work or the individuals who performed the work on the project?

Are the reference projects required to be from the prime respondent? Or can the reference projects be from a sub-respondent?

Answer: Information requested in Section 1.8.1.2.2 Chapter Projects and References is related to the Respondent Firm. Section 1.8.2 Resumes and Licenses requests resumes of Key Personnel and Team Member's, experience can be supplied in this section.

5. Questions: Regarding proposal requirement 1.8.1.2.2, do reference letters count towards the six-page limit.

Are the three letters of reference and Consultant Performance Evaluations excluded from the six-page-limit set for the Chapter Projects and References Section (RFP Section 1.8.1.2.2)?

Section 1.8.1.2.2 – Chapter Projects and References has a six-page limit and requests letters of reference. Do the letters of reference count as part of the six-page limit? (At a minimum, 3 reference letters would occupy 3 whole pages).

Answer: Section 1.8.1.2.2 Chapter Projects and References requests at least three examples of past projects that are at substantial completion within the last three years from the posting of this RFQ not to exceed six pages in length. At least three references from these examples must be supplied and will not count toward the six-page limit.

6. Question: For proposal requirement 1.8.1.1.4 Respondent Overview and Organizational profile, are full organizational charts required for each subconsultant in addition to the prime, and if so will additional pages be allowed beyond the current 1 page limit? If not, will President/CEO and key personnel names suffice?

Answer: Section 1.8.1.1.4.1 Respondent Organizational Chart states that the chart will not exceed one 11" x 17" page and identify the corporate officers and Key Personnel for the Respondent and Sub-Respondents including names, titles and locations.

7. Question: Is there a specific timeframe in which reference letters should have been provided?

Answer: Section 1.8.1.2.2 Chapter Projects and References states that at least three examples of past projects that are at substantial completion within the last

three years from the posting of this RFQu.

8. Question: In review of the MFL services checklist, many of the services requested can be performed in an MFL environment or other regulatory-constrained environment. Is the District seeking MFL-specific experience for all the services, or are they open to similar experience in Florida specific resource constraint experience?

Answer: It is not required to have specific MFL experience to apply for these Chapters, similar experience is accepted. The RFQu Chapters will be awarded to the best qualified.

9. Question: Is it acceptable to duplicate reference letters across Chapters?

Answer: It is acceptable to duplicate reference letters across Chapters as long as the reference letters are applicable to those Chapters.

10. Question: Is it acceptable to submit resumes for only Key Personnel?

Answer: Section 1.8.2 Resumes and References requires submittal of resumes of Key Personnel and Team Members under each chapter for which the Respondent is seeking to be qualified.

11. Question: Florida no longer supplies copies of certifications for engineering firms. Would a Sunbiz.com screenshot of our firm's registry information (license number, firm information, and being current) an acceptable form of proof of firm license?

Answer: A screenshot of Sunbiz.com showing your firms information would be acceptable. The District will also be verifying the selected firm's licenses.

12. Question: Are we to include tabs between key sections in Unit 1?

Answer: Tabs are not required within the units.

13. Question: Do we need to submit a section for "1.8.3 Costs" since there are no fees being submitted as part of this proposal?

Answer: Section 1.8.3 Costs/Fees states that costs and fees will not be submitted with the response.

14. Question: Can a respondent include services not specifically outlined under the Chapter in their response? For example, for design and permitting projects that would normally require Survey and Cultural Resource services, can those services be included under issued the response and future TWAs?

Answer: Services that are not stated in this RFQu and/or considered ancillary should not be included in this RFQu.

15. Question: Have they developed an anticipated budget for Restoration Projects over the next 2 years?

Answer: The District has not developed a budget for restoration projects to be funded over the next two years.

16. Question: Is an electronic signature that has been created by the authorized signatory in a different software and inserted as a .jpg in the signature line acceptable to be deemed the same as a handwritten signature?

Answer: An electronic signature created by the authorized signatory and inserted as a .jpg in the signature line is acceptable and will be deemed the same as a handwritten signature.

17. Question: Are we permitted to use a font size larger than 12 pt for headings?

Answer: Section 1.8 RESPONSE FORMAT specifies the submittal format of the RFQu.

18. Question: When submitting the proposal, would the District prefer one document that includes Unit 1 and all the Unit 2 documents or separate documents for Unit 1 and each Unit 2?

Answer: Please submit one document consisting of Unit 1 and Unit 2.

19. Question: Do the licenses and resumes included in Unit 1 also need to be submitted for Unit 2?

Answer: All licenses and resumes must be included in the requested units.

20. Question: Regarding references, what format will you accept from a different water management district if district staff are not allowed to provide references on letterhead and/or have not issued a final performance evaluation form? We understand that if we provide a SWFWMD reference it is to be via a final Consultant Performance Evaluation.

Answer: A draft or final performance evaluation from other water management districts are acceptable. If the other water management district's do not have a performance evaluation form, request that they provide a performance evaluation using the District's format. The District's performance evaluation form is attached to this addendum for reference. (Attachment B).

21. Question: Section 1.8.1.2.2 Chapter Projects and References, says "provide at least three examples of past projects that are at substantial completion within the past three years". Will the District please define what substantial completion means? Would the District allow us to show projects that the design is completed, but the project is currently in the construction phase?

Answer: The District defines substantial completion as the following:

- Studies – draft report submitted
- Modeling – model calibration and verification completed
- Design – 90% design package

- Construction Project – substantial completion meeting has been held and punch list issued to the Contractor.

22. Questions: Who is on the selection committee for each Chapter?

Can you please provide a listing of the Selection committee members for Chapter C?

Answer: A list of Selection Committee Members has been drafted but has not been finalized at this time due to potential scheduling conflicts. The District does not feel that it would be fair to the Respondents to publish an incomplete or incorrect Selection Committee Member list.

23. Question: In the 23-4106 General Engineering and Professional Services.pdf document, under the Chapter D tasks, the sixth bullet point item from the top of page 21 of 70 states: “Planning program development and budgeting; expert witness and independent peer review”. Does the “expert witness and independent peer review” task belong in Chapter D as a separate bullet item or should it be moved to a task under Chapter A?

Answer: The following changes have been made to the Request for Qualifications document:

Page 17 – addition of bullet point task

A. Minimum Flows and Levels (MFLs)

Types of Chapter Tasks:

- Expert Witness and Independent Peer Review (addition)

Page 21 – separation of bullet point tasks

D. Minimum Flows and Levels (MFLs)

Types of Chapter Tasks:

- Planning program development and budgeting
- Expert witness and independent peer review

24. Question: What is the file size limit on DemandStar?

Answer: Each uploaded file is limited to 100 megabytes.

II. ATTACHMENTS

1. Firms currently awarded under RFQu-001-18
2. Task Work Assignment Performance Evaluation

[This space is intentionally left blank.]

Tonya Parker-Rimes
Procurement Manager
cc: Project Manager

3

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ADDENDUM #1

BY: _____ DATE

(TYPE/PRINT NAME AND TITLE)

COMPANY NAME

[This space is intentionally left blank.]

ATTACHMENT A
FIRMS CURRENTLY AWARDED UNDER RFQu 001-18

| |
|--|
| AECOM Technical Services, Inc. |
| AIM Engineering & Surveying, Inc. |
| AMEC Wood Env & Infra Solutions, Inc. WSP USA Environment & Infrastructure Inc. |
| Applied Sciences Consulting, Inc. |
| Applied Technology & Mgt. Geosyntec Consultants, Inc. |
| Atkins North America, Inc. |
| Barnes, Ferland and Assoc. |
| Black & Veatch Corporation |
| Brown and Caldwell |
| CDM Smith, Inc. |
| Collective Water Resources LLC |
| Dewberry Engineers Inc. |
| DRMP, Inc. |
| Environment Science Associates |
| Exp U.S. Services Inc. |
| George F. Young, Inc. |
| Geosyntec Consultants, Inc. |
| Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. |
| H.W. Lochner, Inc. |
| HDR Engineering, Inc. |
| HSW Engineering, Inc. Verdantas |
| Hyatt Survey Services, Inc. |
| INTERA Incorporated |
| Inwood Cons. Engineers, Inc. |
| Jacobs Engineering Group Inc. |
| Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson |
| Jones Edmunds & Assoc. |
| Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. |
| King Engineering Associates, Inc. Ardurra Group, Inc. |
| Kisinger Campo & Assoc. |
| NorthStar Contracting Group, Inc. |
| Pickett and Associates, Inc. |
| Progressive Water Resources |
| Quantum Spatial, Inc. |
| Singhofen & Associates, Inc. |
| Southeastern Surveying & Mapping Corp. |
| Stantec Consulting Services Inc. |
| SurvTech Solutions, Inc. |
| Taylor Engineering, Inc. |
| Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. |
| WSP USA Inc. |
| Wade Trim, Inc. |
| Wantman Group, Inc. WGI Group, Inc. |
| Water & Air Research, Inc. |
| Water Resource Assoc. dba WRA |

ATTACHMENT B

Southwest Florida Water Management District



TASK WORK ASSIGNMENT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Instructions: Invoice Performance Evaluations will be completed by the Project Manager for the final invoice of a Task Work Assignment (TWA), at major milestones/deliverables or annually throughout a multi-year TWA. At a minimum, the Project Manager will complete performance evaluations when a final deliverable is received and at the TWA completion. Copies of Performance Evaluations will be returned to the Consultant. In the event the average rating score is "marginal" or "unsatisfactory" even after reasonable efforts have been taken to improve performance, the Project Manager will coordinate with Management to determine what action needs to be taken under the circumstances.

Click on the rating scores in the appropriate boxes and provide any additional details on page 2, as deemed necessary, to support the ratings. You must comment on a Marginal, Unsatisfactory or Exceptional rating (see Legend for scoring).

The completed Task Work Assignment Performance Evaluation form will be filed with Procurement Services Office (PRO) and will be available as a record of current performance for use in the evaluation process of future TWA considerations. The completed evaluation will be returned to the consultant along with reimbursement and is available to the consultant upon a Public Records request pursuant to Chapter 119, F.S.

| |
|---------------------------|
| Task Work Assignment No.: |
| Project Manager: |

| |
|------------------------|
| Consultant: |
| Project Number & Name: |

| Performance Indicators | Rating | Legend |
|--|--------|--|
| | | 5 = <i>Exceptional</i> |
| Performance Schedule | | 4 = <i>Very Good</i> |
| 1 Timeliness | | 3 = <i>Satisfactory</i> |
| 2 Develop Schedules & Meet Deadlines | | 2 = <i>Marginal</i> |
| Communication: | | 1 = <i>Unsatisfactory</i> |
| 3 Consultant/District | | |
| 4 Represent District | | |
| Staff Assignments & Technical Quality | | Please select a score from the Legend above and type it in the Rating column. |
| 5 Data meets guidelines | | |
| 6 Technical Analysis | | |
| 7 Effective Analysis | | |
| 8 QA/QC of results | | |
| Project Management: | | Overall Average Score 5.00 - 3.75 = Top Performer; 3.75 - 3.00 = Solid Performer; 2.99 - 1.00 = Poor Performer; Maximum Score - 65 |
| 9 Responsiveness to Concerns | | |
| 10 Use of Effective Techniques | | |
| 11 Executed Management Level Project/ Office QA/QC Plan | | |
| 12 Budget | | |
| 13 Due Care Taken | | |
| Total Rating Score | | Overall Average Score |

Rev July 2021

Complete for additional detail of items 1-13 above

Please indicate any comments corresponding to Performance Indicators above (Items 1-13) on Page 1
(note marginal/unsatisfactory/exceptional performance as necessary)

Number

Remarks

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Currently recommend firm for future contracts/work orders of this type? Yes No Needs Improvement

Project Manager

Date

Section Manager

Date

Additional Comments/Recommendations

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

PRO Use Only

Please indicate any additional comments corresponding to the numbered question on Page 1 and/or Page 2.

PRO Comments/Recommendations

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

PRO Office Chief

Date

Rev.July2021