



ADDENDUM NO. 1

**TO
RFQ 25-0513**

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR COUNTYLINE ROAD

TO ALL APPLICANTS:

The following changes are issued to add to, modify and/or clarify **RFQ 25-0513**:

1. Please refer to the attached "Frequently asked Questions" document and for additional answers and clarification associated with RFQ 25-0513.
-

All else remains the same. **This document must be signed and returned as part of your RFQ response.** Failure to return this document signed may result in your RFQ Response being rejected as non-responsive.

Name of Proposer: _____

Name of Individual Authorized to Sign: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____



CITY OF WEST PARK

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

For

RFQ 25-0513

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR COUNTYLINE ROAD

1. Can we get access to any studies, traffic studies, and roadway plans associated with this project?

Answer: Studies and roadway plans pertaining to any upcoming improvements are not available for any specific portion of this corridor. The purpose of the RFQ is to select a consultant that will assist the city in preparing plans as needed based on specific scopes of work.

2. As currently worded, we believe that the indemnity provision Section 5.2.6 and 11.8 of the proposal is not in compliance with FL Statute 725.08 and is unenforceable. Would the City consider rewording same to conform with the statute? Suggested language per FL Statutes 725.08: “The design professional shall indemnify and hold harmless the City, and its officers and employees, from liabilities, damages, losses, and costs, including, but not limited to, reasonable attorneys' fees, to the extent caused by the negligence, recklessness, or intentionally wrongful conduct of the design professional and other persons employed or utilized by the design professional in the performance of the contract.”

Answer: The sample contract agreement provided is based on requirements from a funding agency and will remain as is for the purposes of this RFQ.

3. Would the City please remove any reference to liquidated damages? We believe they are not applicable to the services of design professionals. Further,

Courts have often deemed liquidated damages as unreasonable and punitive as they are approximate losses that are hard to quantify.

Answer: Please see response to #4 above.

4. Would the City please remove Section 11.19 “Conflicts”? We believe that this provision is extremely difficult to comply with given how much work we do with private entities in the area. Additionally, this will be nearly impossible for us to enforce given our size and how many public and private clients we currently serve. If the City will not remove the provision, will it agree to limit the provision to only read: “Neither Consultant nor its employees shall have or hold any continuing or frequently recurring employment or contractual relationship that is substantially antagonistic or incompatible with Consultant’s loyal and conscientious exercise of judgment and care related to its performance under this Agreement?”

Answer: Please see response to #4 above.

5. The RFQ is requesting we use the appropriate Federal forms to show the firms data. Can you confirm if the Standard Form 330 is acceptable to use? If not, can you please provide the appropriate forms?

Answer: Standard Form 330 is acceptable

6. Is there a specific amount of referenced projects the City would like us to provide?

Answer: At least one relevant project from each of the five (5) references would satisfy the requirement.

7. In the evaluation criteria section on page 4 of the RFQ, it shows “Current & Projected Workload”, however it was not listed in the requirements on page 3. Can you confirm if that is part of the required criteria, and if so, is there a specific format?

Answer: Yes it is part of the required criteria; however no specific format is required to detail the current and projected workload of your roadway department/personnel.

8. What information is to be placed in Tab 1, Tab 2, Tab 3, etc...?

Answer: No particular format is specified as part of the response to this RFQ. At a minimum, the requested information should be provided.

9. How many tabs should there be and what should they be called?

Answer: Please see response to #8 above.

10. May we demonstrate the information using SF 330 I: A-I and SF 330 II?

Answer: Yes. Please see response to #5 above.
