

**ADDENDUM NO. THREE (3)**

TO  
THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS FOR

**DESIGN-BUILD OF LOCKHART WATER TREATMENT PLANT RFQ**

IN  
HERNANDO COUNTY, FLORIDA  
**SOLICITATION NO. 21-R00076/PH**

**PROPOSAL DUE DATE: ~~AUGUST 18, 2021~~ SEPTEMBER 15, 2021**

**NOTICE**

PROPOSERS ARE REQUIRED TO ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF  
THIS ADDENDUM BY SIGNATURE AT THE BOTTOM OF  
THIS ADDENDUM IN THE SPACE PROVIDED AND  
RETURNED AT THE TIME OF THE PROPOSAL DUE DATE.

TO ALL PLANHOLDERS:

The following changes, additions and/or deletions are hereby made a part of the Contract Documents for **DESIGN-BUILD OF LOCKHART WATER TREATMENT PLANT RFQ** located in Hernando County, as fully and completely as if the same were fully set forth therein:

**A. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

1. Question: There are duplicate and sometimes conflicting instructions in the RFQ on formatting and contents of the Offeror's SOQ response. Pages 9-13 of the RFQ lists the "SOQ Documentation Requirements" with further instructions provided on page 14. But the formatting and organization of SOQ information begins again with pages 43-55 DBIA Standard Form of Request For Qualifications. In comparing the instructions on previous pages of the RFQ with the DBIA Standard Form of Request for Qualifications beginning on page 43, there are some discrepancies between the two versions:
  - a) Slight difference in the package labeling instructions ("Sealed SOQ for..." on page 3 vs. "Sealed Proposals for..." on page 45.  
  
**Answer:** Either title is fine.
  - b) Nature of submission as defined by page 1 of the RFQ as: one Original, four Copies, and one PDF on CD or Flash drive. Page 45 instructions omits the required digital version on CD or Flash drive. It is assumed that the page 1 instructions are correct; please revise pages 1, 3 and 14 instructions if that is not accurate.  
  
**Answer:** One PDF on a CD or Flash Drive is required.
  - c) Section 4.2 SOQ Organization on pages 52-53 list the first two elements to address in the SOQ (Letter of Interest, and Minimum Qualifications). But 4.2.2 references three parts [ability to provide P&P Bond, ability to meet insurance requirements, and verification that Offeror's EMR is less than 1] and section 5 on page 53 lists only the first two, omitting the required verification of EMR. It is assumed that the EMR information is required; please clarify if that is not accurate.

Answer: The Experience Modification Rate (EMR) is required.

- d) Section 6.3 states that “emphasis will be placed on past performance and expertise in performing substantive work on projects that are of similar scope and complexity as described in the definitions above; but no specific definitions were provided in this section or in any RFQ attachments. Please see Question 2 below that also relates to this discrepancy.

Answer: Required information regarding Demonstrated History of Other Projects Similar in Scope and Complexity are provided in Section 6.5. Section 6.3 should read: “...as described in the definitions above Section 6.5.”

- e) What is required to follow Team Organization and Location in the SOQ response is unclear. Section 6.4 (page 12) specifies 10 items that are required in descriptions of projects in the SOQ response. This precedes the 6.5 “Demonstrated History of Other Projects Similar in Scope and Complexity” section. In addition, the organization of “Technical and Management Qualifications” in 5.2.3 (page 10) only lists the “Demonstrated History of...” to follow Team Organization and Location with no reference to what is described in section 6.4. It appears section 6.4 is a subsection of instructions related to what will be provided in response to 6.5 requirements; therefore, it is assumed that what is expressed in sections 6.4 and 6.5 are to be combined in one “Demonstrated History of Other Projects Similar in Scope and Complexity” section in the SOQ response. Please verify that this assumption is correct and the SOQ response to 6.4 and 6.5 is NOT to be provided as two sections of project experience examples.

Answer: Per Section 6.4, “The information required in this section can either be provided in a separate section of the SOQ, in the narrative for each of the evaluation criteria in Section 4.3, or the Offeror can provide a separate table for the identified Projects.” Combining the information requested in section 6.4 into section 6.5, or another applicable section of the SOQ is acceptable, as would be creating a separate table for this information, or creating a separate section altogether. Please note, should you create a separate section in your SOQ for the information required in Section 6.4, it would be subject to the two (2) pages per project limit described in Section 5.1.3.1.5 (and not count toward the maximum twenty (20) page limit of the SOQ). Should you choose to combine the information requested in Section 6.4 with another section of your SOQ, it will be subjected to the maximum twenty (20) page limit described in Section 5.1.3.

2. Question: Section 6.5.1 on page 13 of the RFQ requires at least three (3) but no more than five (5) “Projects of Similar Scope and Complexity” within the last 10 years; and section 2.6.8 on page 47 of the RFQ PDF document defines “Projects of Similar Scope and Complexity” states to provide five (5) projects completed by the Proposer within the last five (5) years using the form provided in Attachment B. The discrepancies noted are:

- a) No Attachment B form is provided for this purpose, and the details of what is meant by “Projects of Similar Scope and Complexity” is not specifically defined.

Answer: Disregard the conflicting information in the DBIA form as well as the requirement to use Attachment B. Required information regarding Demonstrated History of Other Projects Similar in Scope and Complexity are provided in Section 6.5. The number and time limit of past projects should be per Section 6.5.1.

- b) Section 3.1.5 on page 48 of the PDF notes Attachment B for listing protest procedures; but there is no Attachment B, and the Protest Procedures are not provided with the RFQ except for a link to the procedures listed on “Exhibit B Protest Procedures” on page 57 of the PDF (one of multiple Exhibit Bs).

Answer: The protest procedure is attached.

- c) Question: It is unclear from the contradictions between 6.5.1 on page 13 and 2.6.8 on page 47 of the PDF if the required descriptions of similar projects entails three to five projects within the last 10 years or exactly five projects within the last 5 years. Please clarify what is required, and provide a definition of similar scope and complexity to govern the Proposers’ selection of experience to include in the RFQ response.

Answer: Disregard the conflicting information in the DBIA form as well as the requirement to use Attachment B. Required information regarding Demonstrated History of Other Projects Similar in Scope and Complexity are provided in Section 6.5. The number and time limit of past projects should be per Section 6.5.1.

- d) As referenced in sections 5.2.4, 6.3.3 and 6.8.1, a completed Exhibit B “Corporate Structure Questionnaire” form is required to be submitted. There are two notable discrepancies regarding this requirement:

- On page 60 of the PDF an Exhibit E “Corporate Structure Questionnaire” is provided; however;
- On page 78 of the PDF the Questionnaire is again provided as Exhibit B; but there are actually three (3) Exhibit B documents in the PDF document:
  - Exhibit B “Protest Procedures” (pg 57)
    - Answer: This is the correct Exhibit B.
  - Exhibit B “Proposal, Performance, and Payment Bond Instructions” (pg. 58)
    - Answer: This should be Exhibit C of DBIA Document No. 405.
  - Exhibit B “Corporate Structure Questionnaire” (pg. 78)
    - Answer: Exhibit B “Corporate Structure Questionnaire” should be deleted in favor of Exhibit E “Corporate Structure Questionnaire”, and the document text that references Exhibit B Corporate Structure should be corrected to read Exhibit E.

3. Question: Since both Exhibit E and Exhibit B are exactly the same document (Corporate Structure Questionnaire), it is assumed that either form can be submitted for compliance with this requirement. Please consider assigning alternative labeling nomenclature for all associated Exhibits to avoid confusion.

Answer: See above. Either document can be submitted as Exhibit E.

4. Question: Sections 5.2.2.1 and 7.2.1 refer to a “Statement of Offeror’s Ability to Provide Proposal Bond and a Performance and Payment Bond (mandatory minimum requirement) as specified in Exhibit A. However the Exhibit A document included on page 56 of the PDF does not relate to this requirement; it is instead a “Project Scope of Work” document. The second Exhibit B document on page 58 does appear to be the needed instructions for the bonding requirements; and it is understood that the proposal bond shall be submitted on DBIA Form 610 within 14 days of being shortlisted for this project. However, but it is unclear when the corresponding DBIA Forms 620 and 625 are required to be submitted.

Answer: Forms 620 and 625 are not required at this time. They are referenced for informational purposes only.

5. Question: Please revise the Exhibit designation for the bonding requirement instructions, verify all that is required with the RFQ response is a “Statement of Offeror’s Ability to Provide Proposal Bond and a Performance and Payment Bond” and not completion of DBIA forms at this time, and provide instructions on when the Payment and Performance Bond on DBIA Forms 620 and 625 submission will be required.

Answer: Forms 620 and 625 are not required at this time.

6. Question: Access to the design documents referenced in sections 1.4 and 2.3 is desired. Section 1.4 refers to a McKim & Creed SharePoint site, and section 2.3 refers to an FTP site – both require a Username and Password to access.

Answer: See Addendum No. 1 for access information. All available documents are posted to the SharePoint site.

7. Question: Do these sites offer different drawings and are both accessed through the same Username and Password?

Answer: Use the SharePoint site listed in Section 1.4.

8. Question: Will the County please provide the necessary access information for both sites at this time?

Answer: This was addressed in Addendum No. 1.

9. Question: We understand that a more definitive scope of work to be included in DCP as part of Step 2, but can a rough outline of the Step 2 process be provided so that we can better grasp future requirements?

Answer: The DCP was added to the SharePoint site.

10. Question: Please verify the budget for this project. In the RFQ document, Section III, article 1.5 estimated budget is shown at \$4,650,000. In the DBIA Standard Form of Request for Qualifications, Section 2.4 estimated budget is shown at \$4,000,000.

Answer: The estimated budget is \$4,650,000.00.

11. Question: Sections 6.3.3 and 6.8 are both calling for the Exhibit B Corporate Structure Questionnaire, for the D-B and all team members. Does this info need to be included twice?

Answer: No, just one time.

12. Question: Are Sections 5.1.3.1.5 & 6.4 referring to the same information?

Answer: Yes. The information in section 6.4 can be included as a separate section in your SOQ, in which case it would be subject to the 2 pages per project limit described in section 5.1.3.1.5. Should you choose to combine the information requested in Section 6.4 with another section of your SOQ, it will be subjected to the maximum 20 page limit described in Section 5.1.3.

13. Question: We request that the bid date be pushed 30 calendar days beyond date of issuance of McKim & Creed documents in order to ensure bidders fully understand, and comply with, all issued documents.

Answer: See Addendum No. 2.

14. Question: Regarding 5.2.2.3 Statement verifying and documenting the Offeror's Experience Modification Rate (EMR) for safety is less than one (1), Is responding to this requirement excluded from the apply to the page count? The previous statements (5.2.2.1 and 5.2.2.2) are excluded from the page count.

Answer: Yes, it is excluded. We should have included it in Section 5.1.3.1.

15. Question: We see some inconsistencies in how 5. SOQ Documentation Requirements and 6. SOQ Evaluation Criteria and Submittal Information align.

- For example, 5.2.3.3 Design-Build Engineering and Permitting Past Performance and Ability aligns with Criteria 6.6 Design-Build Engineering and Permitting Past Performance and Ability, and 5.2.3.4 Design-Build Construction Past Performance and Ability aligns with 6.7 Design-Build Construction Past Performance.
  - Answer: They align with each other.
- Here are examples where 5 and 6 do not align: 5.2.3.2.1 and 5.2.3.2.2 do not have corresponding criteria in 6.5 Demonstrated History of Other Projects Similar in Scope and Complexity. How will they be evaluated?
  - Answer: These items should be discussed as part of Section 6.4.
- Please consider: 5.2.3.2.1 is the same as 5.2.3.4 and therefore 5.2.3.2.1 should be deleted.
  - Answer: No, they are not the same. The information n 5.2.3.2.1 is included in Section 6.4, and 5.2.3.4 is included in Section 6.7.
- Section 5.2.3.2.2 should be a standalone section with its own writer evaluation criteria.
  - Answer: It should be included in Section 6.4.

16. Question: Based on the response to our questions and the pending documentation mentioned at the Pre-Proposal conference (Reference Documents on Page 6 of the RFQ), we respectfully request additional time be added to the due date.

Answer: See Question No. 13 above.

17. Question: Will all SOQ's submitted in Step 1 remain confidential until after Step 2 Proposals are submitted and Notice of Intent to Award has been made?

Answer: This information is withheld until after award is made by the Board of County Commissioners.

18. Question: Is there an expected format of the SOQ? I ask this as there are five (5) scoring criteria, but Section 5.2 (SOQ Organization) lists four (4) sections (10 if sub-sections are counted), and Section 6 (SOQ Evaluation Criteria and Submittal Information) has even more sections. We just want to ensure that we provide to Hernando County our SOQ in the manner which will best suit County desires.


Answer: Section 5.2 is simply an overview of the SOQ requirements. Section 6 elaborates on the detailed requirements for each section. The SOQ should include everything listed in Section 6, and the formatting requirements of Section 5.1 should be applied (searchable pdf, page limits, etc.).

19. Question: Providing a project-specific bond this early in a design-build project is not typical. Can the Proposers instead provide a letter from their surety stating that the contractor is qualified to bond this project based upon the current proposed contract value?

Answer: Yes, this will be acceptable. See Section 5.2.2.1.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
HERNANDO COUNTY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Acknowledged

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Patty Hall  
Purchasing Coordinator

Issued: August 20, 2021

#### VII. BID PROTEST/CHALLENGE:

Any bid award recommendation may be challenged on the grounds of material irregularities in the bid procedure, or material irregularities in the evaluation of the bid. Such notice of intent of bid challenge shall be made in writing and delivered to the Chief Procurement Officer within 72 hours after posting of the intended recommendation of award or notice of award in the Administration/Purchasing Office (72 hours excludes Saturdays, Sundays, and County holidays). **Any bidder who protests the bid specifications or Award or Intent to Award , must file with the County a notice of protest and formal written protest in compliance with Chapter 28-110, Florida Administrative Code, and applicable provisions in Section 120.57, F.S. (2011). Failure to timely file such documents will constitute a wavier of proceedings under Chapter 120, F.S. (2011).** A formal written protest shall be filed within ten (10) working days in the Purchasing and Contracts Office after the date on which the notice of protest has been submitted. Failure to file a timely notice of protest or failure to file a timely formal written protest shall constitute a waiver of bid challenge proceedings. Bidders who do not submit a legitimate bid do not have standing to file a protest. Furthermore, bidders who would not be awarded the subject contract even if the protest were successful lack standing.

1. The notice of protest shall contain at a minimum: the name of the bidder, the bidder's address, fax number and phone number, the name of the bidder's representative to whom notices may be sent, the name and bid number of the solicitation, and a brief factual summary of the basis of the intended challenge.
2. The formal written protest shall: identify the protester and the solicitation involved, include a clear statement of the grounds on which the protest is based, refer to the statutes, laws, ordinances, or other legal authorities which the protester deems applicable to such grounds, and specifically request the relief to which the protester deems itself entitled by application of such authorities to such grounds. The protester shall mail a copy of the notice of protest and the formal written protest to the apparent best bidder. The County Administrator shall, within ten (10) working days of receipt of the formal written protest, cause the protest to be investigated. In the event the protest is not resolved, the Board shall, within a reasonable time, be presented with the written protest and the County Administrator's decision to the protest prior to award of the bid. The procurement, which is the subject of the protest, shall not proceed until a final decision has been made, unless the Board makes a determination that the contract must proceed without delay to protect substantial interest of the County.
3. Nothing herein relinquishes the County's rights to waive irregularities and formalities in accordance with its bid package and instructions. Further, nothing herein shall create any rights in the unsuccessful bidder. All decisions of the Board shall be final.