



Alachua County Budget and Fiscal Services Procurement

Larry M. Sapp, CPPB
Procurement Manager

Darryl R. Kight, CPPB
Procurement Supervisor

February 25, 2020

RE: Addendum #1
RFP 20-953 Technical Consultant for a County Administration Building

Dear Sir/Madam:

Please be aware of the following clarifications regarding the above referenced Bid:

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Q #1: The RFP will likely generate proposals from teams of companies composed by a prime and sub-consultant(s). Can you please indicate whether all the Exhibits required in the proposal should be completed by the prime and the sub-consultants? Specifically, which Exhibits should be completed by the prime and which by the sub-consultants?

A #1: ***The exhibits should be completed by the prime consultant. If you are utilizing Certified Alachua County Vendors as sub-consultants then option 3 of Exhibit B should be completed. If you are utilizing sub-consultants that are not Certified Alachua County Vendors, than you should list your good faith effort by filling out option 4 of Exhibit B and by also completing Exhibit F.***

Q #2: Although the RFP focuses on the County Administration Building as a main project, it also makes references to potential additional projects. Can the County provide an idea of what are the additional projects that may be considered under this contract?

A #2: ***The County does own additional properties in the heart of the downtown area of the City of Gainesville which could be the subject of future development. However, at this point the County's main focus is the Administration Building.***

Q #3: Is there a page limit or cap applicable for the proposals? Proponents can list a significant number of project qualifications; thus, it is important to consider whether the County would like to establish a maximum number of pages for the proposals?

A #3: ***The County has not established a maximum number of pages allowed in the proposals, however, Section 6.1 and 6.2 states that the Evaluation Committee will not be impressed with excessive amounts of boiler plate, excessive numbers or lengths of resumes, etc.***

Q #4: P3 procurements can require a significant amount of analysis during the planning and pre-procurement phase of the project. Can the County share the amount of budget allocated to this contract? This can help proposers' better refine the level of efforts and budget estimations for the purposes of the proposals.

A #4: ***At this point there is not a designated budget specifically for the consultant fees, however, funding will be available for the project as needed.***

Q #5: The RFP has a due date of March 4, 2020, which is just two weeks away. Given the fact that proposals will likely require teaming up with other consulting firms and a thorough preparation of proposals, can the County consider a two-week extension of the deadline?

A #5: ***The March 4, 2020 deadline will not be changed.***

Q #6: Can you share the level of advancement of the proposed project for the County Administration Building? Is there schematic design? Has there been a space and programming analysis for the new building?

A #6: ***The County is just starting the process, there is not a schematic design and no programming analysis has been completed.***

Q #7: Does Alachua County have regulation or ordinance related to public-private partnership procurements? If yes, can the County provide a link to the regulation or ordinance?

A #7: ***There is no County Ordinance other than the Procurement Code allows P3 as a method of source selection. A resolution may need to be adopted to allow the process and all Florida Statutes pertaining to P3 will need to be followed.***

Q #8: Are there any key milestones driving the process that the consultant should be aware of when developing a work plan? If so – what are they?

A #8: ***The County would like to have a developer on board by November or 2020.***

Q #9: Regarding the existing building - what related studies/assessments have been completed and when?

- a. Feasibility studies?
- b. Condition assessments?
- c. Environmental?
- d. Others?

A #9: ***No studies have been completed.***

Q #10: Regarding the planned consolidation across the mentioned 300,000 SF:

- e. Have any level of architectural programs or space needs been developed for the 300,000 SF?

A #10: ***No***

Q #11: Does the County have established work place design guidelines or standards? If so, when were they developed?

A #11: ***No***

Q #12: Sections 3.5.3.3 and 3.5.3.4 of the RFP, appear to indicate that the Consultant will be expected to provide services related to design review during the design phase and assessment of construction process to monitor the progress. Can you please clarify if these services are expected to be rendered after the Award Phase? More specifically, we would like to understand if we should consider providing Owner's Representative Services after the award of the contract? Including and pricing Owner's Representative Services after award can be challenging at this point in time.

A #12: ***The County anticipates the work completed by the consultant to be completed in Phases. At the end of each phase the County will either approve moving to the next phase or discontinue efforts. If the County elects to move into Phase Three then the services listed would be required.***

Q #13: Section 3.3 indicates that the current location of the County Administration Building is to be considered but other sites may be available for development. Can you please indicate if all sites that may be under consideration will be County-owned sites? Also, besides the current site, can you provide an estimated number of sites to be considered?

A #13: ***The County does own additional parcels that total an approximate 1.3+/- acres within 1000 feet of the city center intersection. Those sites as well as any other downtown parcels could be considered but the primary site for consideration is the current County owned site that the County Administration Building is on.***

Q #14: Section 3.1.4 indicates that the Consultant will be required to coordinate and work with other outside consultants that may be retained by the County such as outside legal and financial services providers. Can the County confirm if outside Counsel and a financial advisor has been selected for the project? If we are selected as Consultant, we expect that a significant amount of collaboration with legal and financial teams will be needed

A #14: ***Yes, both outside council and a financial advisor have been selected.***

Q #15: Does the SBE have to be located in Alachua County?

A #15: ***Yes, to have points awarded on the RFP evaluation process the SBE has to be an Alachua County Certified SBE. If not then you need to see answer #1.***

Q #16: Shall we include all the appendices in our proposal or those that require signature only?

A #16: ***Please include all appendices.***

Q #17: Has the Proposal deadline been maintained as stated in the RFP, March 4, 2020 (2PM EST)?

A #17: ***Yes***

NOTE: You should acknowledge receipt of this addendum on your Bid Form.

End of Addendum # 1

Sincerely,

Larry Sapp

Larry Sapp
Procurement Manager

LS/bf