

**ADDENDUM 1**  
TO REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION  
WATERSIDE GENERAL ENGINEERING SERVICES  
FOR CONTINUING SERVICE CONTRACT  
PUR-RFQ-12-1  
FOR  
CANAVERAL PORT AUTHORITY  
January 31, 2012

This addendum is issued as part of the Contract Documents for the above described project. The changes incorporated in this addendum shall be considered as a part of the documents and shall supersede, amend, add to, clarify, or subtract from those conditions shown in the original documents. The Proposer shall take care to coordinate modifications herein with all trades and disciplines related to the work. The Proposer shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum on their proposal by addendum number and date. Failure to do so may subject Proposer to disqualification.

**SENT VIA U-SEND-IT – 4 PAGES TOTAL**

\_\_\_\_\_ (NAME OF YOUR COMPANY)

**NOTE:**

PLEASE SIGN \_\_\_\_\_ AND **RETURN THIS FIRST SHEET ONLY** VIA E-MAIL OR FAX to KAREN PAPPAS. [KPAPPAS@PORTCANAVERAL.COM](mailto:KPAPPAS@PORTCANAVERAL.COM) or (321) 783-3522 Fax

THIS VERIFIES THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THE ADDENDUM.

**GENERAL**

1. THE PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DATE REMAINS THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2012 at 2:00 PM (EDT).

**SPECIFICATIONS**

1. There are no specification changes at this time.

**DRAWINGS**

1. Not applicable.

**QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:**

1. **QUESTION 01:** Currently we hold a Continuing Contract with the Port. Can we rely on the renewal of our current contract or should we apply to the current RFP?

**RESPONSE:** The Canaveral Port Authority (CPA) has had a major change in staff, the way business is conducted and the way projects are delivered in the Infrastructure (Engineering) Department during the past year. The prior RFQ and subsequent awards on continuing service contracts did not take any of the current project delivery

methods into consideration. CM at Risk, Design/Build and other methods not previously used by CPA will continue to be the focus on project delivery. CPA also foresees adding projects not previously envisioned when the previous RFP was issued years ago.

CPA has reevaluated the professional service needs it will have over the upcoming five to ten years and has specifically worded this new RFQ so that the Port has access to the kinds of firms, talent and resources required. Current contracts allowed teams based on levels of sub consultants and while some possess the skills needed, others rely on their sub consultants for what should be prime contracts. CPA wants firm(s) that have the disciplines outlined as part of their own firm and not as part of an ad hoc team or as a sub consultant when embarking on certain projects. CPA is seeking innovative, problem solving, cutting edge and proactive project delivery firms who have performed way beyond anything previously built at the Port before and who can assist in bringing resources to Port Canaveral as it continues to grow into a world class multi use port.

Firms currently providing services for CPA under a continuing service contract will continue to be used when the project is right for those services desired or required. Firms holding a continuing services contract and have not been selected would not need to submit to these new RFP's unless the Firm has new talents, key designers and skills not included in the previous RFQ. CPA wants to stress that being selected as a continuous contract firm does not come with any guarantees of work nor does it mean that the Port will call upon your resources. Having the contract means your Firm met certain minimum qualifications that CPA may need in the future and if the need and skill set line up, your firm could be asked for a proposal.

CPA suggests you carefully review the qualifications and experience in the new RFQ request. The Port is looking for potential firms that have all the resources in the RFQ under one roof and with the years of experience and project history asked for. The scoring on the RFQ will be specific on each qualification asked for. If you do not have those qualifications, your score in the RFQ process will reflect it.

There is no need to respond to the RFQ if your firm now has a continuous contract unless your firm did not previously have the skill set or years of experience and now you possess them. CPA welcomes all responses. Firms will not be penalized nor will it change your status if you do or do not respond to this RFQ, even if you already have an existing contract. CPA's existing contracts will not be canceled or done away with and will continue to be renewed as always. This RFQ does not replace the existing firm on continuing contracts but allows the Port access to skill sets and firms envisioned for future needs.

2. **QUESTION 02:** May we consider the 20 pages and Tab 3 (GSA Standard Form 330) content exempted from the listed 80-page maximum? If tabs are not to be exempted from the 80 page limit can information for consideration as part of the proposal be printed on the tab, so that the majority of the 80 pages can be used?

**RESPONSE:** Covers, backs, and divider tabs will not count as pages provided no additional information or company propaganda is included on those pages. GSA Standard Form 330 will count as part of the 80 pages.

3. **QUESTION 03:** May we include a cover on our proposal? If so, can you please verify

whether or not the front and back cover count toward the page count?

**RESPONSE:** Covers, backs, and divider tabs will not count as pages provided no additional information or company propaganda is included on those pages. GSA Standard Form 330 will count as part of the 80 pages

4. **QUESTION 04:** The RFQ states that submittals should be “clear, concise, indexed by subject...” Can you please confirm if organizing the document sections (within each tab) with section headings and sub-headings qualifies as “indexing by subject?” If not, can you please describe how you would like us to “index by subject?”

**RESPONSE:** With the number of proposals expected to be submitted, proposals should be organized by tab for the selection committee to review each proposal efficiently. Information not included under a specific tabbed section may result in points not being scored. Proposals should be clear and concise so that the selection committee does not have to infer or try to interpret what is being presented.

5. **QUESTION 05:** The RFQ states that submittals should be “numbered sequentially by section”. Can you please confirm if each tabbed section should start with page number one and numbered sequentially or if each section should be numbered sequentially, beginning with the page number following the last page number of the previous tab?

**RESPONSE:** The purpose of sequential page numbering is for the selection committee to easily reference sections of the Proposal for review and comment. Pages can be numbered sequentially from 1 to 100 or based on each section (tab) 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, ..., 22.1 or 1-1, 1-2, 2-1,2-2,... 22-1.

6. **QUESTION 06:** The full SF330 form (Tab 3) includes several items that overlap with information required in other tabbed sections. Overlapping form components include general information (also requested in tab 1); organizational chart (also requested in tab 9); resumes (also requested in tab 10); and project descriptions (also requested in tab 4). The GSA Standard Form 330 RFQ instructions (page 6) also state that this tab should include a list of “all relevant projects contracted within the last seven years.” The SF330 form does not contain a section that requires a list of all relevant projects contracted within the last seven years. Given the page limit and the amount of information requested in other sections of the proposal, can you please confirm if the GSA Standard Form 330 section (Tab 3) should contain the full SF330 Form (despite its duplication throughout other proposal sections) or if this tab should include only a list of relevant projects completed within the last seven years?

**RESPONSE:** We understand that there is overlap between the GSA form and other tabbed section. The GSA form is a standard quick reference to compare all proposal but more specific information should be included under other tabbed sections based on the point value assigned to each. Section 19 of the GSA form is where to list relevant projects. We are asking for only those relevant within the last 7 years. It is up to each proposer as to how much information you want to include under each tab, including Tab 3, that you think will provide the selection committee members enough information to select

Waterside General Engineering Services for Continuing Service Contract  
for the Canaveral Port Authority

your firm over another.

7. **QUESTION 07:** Design Build Knowledge (Tab 5)The RFQ is for Waterside General Engineering Services, which implies that the selected engineering firm would at most be preparing and authoring any potential design-build projects. Is this correct? Can you please confirm that role the Canaveral Port Authority is requesting is for the authoring of design-build projects for the Port and not the participation as a contracted entity in a design-build project? Can you please provide more information on what exactly the Port wants provided under this tab?

**RESPONSE:** Do you have experience in Design/Build projects? If so, show examples of the projects in Tab 5 of what your firm's role and responsibility was.

:

**END OF ADDENDUM #2**  
**Issued via USendIt**  
**by**  
**authority of the Canaveral Port Authority**