



MIAMIBEACH

City of Miami Beach, 1700 Convention Center Drive, Miami Beach, Florida 33139, www.miamibeachfl.gov

PROCUREMENT DIVISION

Tel: 305-673-7490, Fax: 786-394-4007

April 13, 2012

RE: ADDENDUM NO. 6 TO REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ) NO. 22-11/12, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MIAMI BEACH CONVENTION CENTER DISTRICT (the RFQ).

The following questions, and the City's responses thereto, are forwarded for your information:

Question #1: "RFQ Page 6, Section VI – Would the City kindly provide copies of the nine (9) submittal documents which are required with the RFQ response in Microsoft Word format? Specifically, the prospective proposer is requesting":

- **Insurance Checklist**
- **Proposer Information**
- **Acknowledgment of Addenda**
- **Declaration**
- **Sworn Statement/Section 287.133(3)(a), Florida Statutes - Public Entity Crimes**
- **Questionnaire**
- **Acknowledgment Letter**
- **Disclosure and Disclaimer**
- **Past Performance Survey**

Answer to Q#1: Yes. The MS Word format of the documents is available upon request. Please send requests to Maria Estevez, Assistant Procurement Director, at mestevez@miamibeachfl.gov.

Question #2: "RFQ Page 21, Section 10 – Would the City consider extending the deadline to receive Past Performance Surveys (page 47, Section VII) to 7 days after the submittal of qualifications? This extension would allow the proposers to focus on the completion of the response, and then request surveys from past clients based on the final selection of projects that are included. In addition, without control over the timing of when said surveys are received by the city, a given proposer would seemingly foreshadow the contents of his response, which is undesirable to this prospective proposer."

Answer to Q#2: No. The deadline to receive Past Performance Surveys remains **Monday, April 23, 2012.**

Question #3: RFQ – Requirements for Submittal; Miami Beach Based Vendor; Questionnaire Form; Other required Forms

It is assumed that the final entity with which the City contracts on this project will be some sort of special purpose company (SPC) set up with the exclusive intent to complete and finance the various components of this project. It is also envisioned that this SPC will be a joint venture of several companies, each bringing different expertise to the venture, and all benefiting the city.

This proposer has several questions around this area:

Question #3.1.: Should each major party submit company information as is required by section 4.a of the RFQ?

Answer to Q#3.1: Pursuant to Section III(B)(4)(a) of the RFQ (as page 20 thereof), company information should be provided for the Proposer and all proposal team members. In response to your question, in the event that the SPC will not be created by the time of submittal of the proposal, then company information should be provided for each of the proposal team members (i.e. what we assume you refer to as each “major party” in your question.)

Moreover, as iterated in Addendum #2, with reference to Section III(B)(4)(c) of the RFQ (Relevant Experience), the City wants at least five (5) comparable projects of comparable size and scope from the Master Developer (**and** five (5) comparable projects from the Lead Architect) where the Master Developer (or Lead Architect) has provided services similar to those described in this RFQ. If the Proposer is a joint venture, then the City will accept the requisite five (5) comparable projects from one or both members of the joint venture.

Question #3.2.: Assuming that the one or more of the entities proposed in the SPC are based in Miami Beach, will the City kindly provide guidance on how the proposer should respond in order to receive local preference bonus points (page 6, section 2.A.6)?

Answer to Q#3.2: If the SPC is not the Proposer, then it cannot qualify for local preference under the City’s ordinance. Pursuant to the City’s Local Preference Ordinance, the preference may only be awarded during the proposal solicitation process, and then only to an actual Proposer.

Question #3.3.: Does the City prefer to receive one (1) public entity crimes sworn statement from each member of the SPC, or will one statement on behalf of all the partners suffice?

Answer to Q#3.3: A Public Entity Crimes sworn statement is required from the proposing entity.

Question #4: “Is it the City’s intent to receive the Public Entity Crimes sworn statement from each member of the proposal team, including designers, advisors, etc? Or is one statement on behalf of the team acceptable?”

Answer to Q#4: See Answer to Q#3.3 above.

Question #5: “Has the City contracted, or does the city plan to contract with a Public Information specialist firm to assist with the public outreach on this project. Is the city planning to bear the costs of the public outreach envisioned in phase 2?”

Answer to Q#5: The City has not contracted and, at this time, does not plan to contract with a Public Information Specialist firm to assist with the public outreach on this project. The City is not planning to bear the costs of the public outreach envisioned in Phase 2.

Question #6: “Would the city consider amending section 2 of the evaluation criteria (page 6, section II.A.6) to read as follows?

“key personnel experience and qualifications (i.e., Principals and Project Executives or Managers). Contractor personnel will not be evaluated at this stage as part of this particular scoring criteria, unless the contractor firm is an equity participant in the Master Developer entity, and the experience of the personnel is on projects where the contractor was an equity participant in a similar development””

Answer to Q#6: No.

Question #7: “RFQ Section III.4.a, Section III.4.b. – The city has utilized the term “Developer Team” and “Proposal Team” in such a way that has created confusion for this proposer. Will the City kindly clarify specifically which members of the proposer entity are expected to provide information as part of this section?”

Answer to Q#7: Although the question does not specify where the City has used the aforesaid terms in ways that have “created confusion” for the Proposer, the term “Developer Team” is also intended to refer to the “Proposal Team”. As to the second part of your question, Sections III(B)(4)(a), III(B)(4)(b), and III(B)(4)(c) of the RFQ require information from all proposal team members.

Proposers are reminded to please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum as part of their qualifications submission.

Thank you,



Raul J. Aguila
Chief Deputy City Attorney
(Signing for Procurement Division)

F:\CMGR\\$\ALL\PONCEL\MBCC RFQ\Addendums\Addendum No.6.doc