

VILLAGE OF ROYAL PALM BEACH, FLORIDA

PROJECT NAME: **Village Hall Architectural & Engineering Design Services**
PROJECT NUMBER: **EN2001**

ADDENDUM NUMBER: ONE

DATE OF ISSUANCE: September 19, 2019

TO: Prospective Bidders

THIS ADDENDUM NO. One INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING:

1. Modify Section 4 of the Instructions as follows:

4. Consideration of Professionals

~~A selection committee will review and consider the qualifications of all Professionals received in accordance with the stipulated criteria. The selection committee has not yet been formulated and is not expected to be formulated until after the submittals are received. The selection committee will meet publicly to formalize the scoring criteria. Then they will individually review and rank the submittals of the Professionals based upon said scoring criteria. The committee will then reconvene to publicly determine the rankings and each member's scoring will become part of the public record. The top three firms will be required to present to the selection committee, subject to Sec. 286.0113, F.S. The committee will then independently re-score the top three firms. The committee will then reconvene to publicly determine the final rankings and each member's scoring will become part of the public record. The committee will then make a recommendation to the Village Council based on final rankings. The Village Council may require, at its sole discretion, a summary presentation of approximately ten (10) minutes from the top three (3) firms prior to award, also subject to above referenced state statute.~~

Selection Process:

Evaluation of the proposals will be conducted by a selection committee. The selection committee has not yet been formed and is not expected to be formed until after the proposals are received. Upon creation, the selection committee shall have a minimum of three (3) members. All meetings of the selection committee shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the Sunshine Law, except for components of the selection process conducted pursuant to Sec. 286.0113, F.S. Applicants shall receive notice by mail, fax or email of selection committee meetings. A quorum shall be a majority of committee members present except that if there are only three (3) members, then all three (3) must be present for quorum purposes. To participate at a public meeting for quorum purposes, the members of the selection committee must be physically present.

Upon creation of the selection committee, the committee members will individually review and rank the proposals based upon the scoring criteria (Exhibit E). The committee members then will convene a selection committee meeting to publicly review the scoring criteria, to announce their individual scores for proposals, to discuss any issues involving the proposals, and to determine the rankings of each proposer based on the scoring. The selection committee then shall short list no less than three (3) proposals, assuming that three (3) proposals have been received, based on the rankings. After the ranking of proposals, the selection committee may conduct interviews and/or presentations with the short-listed proposers. Whether the selection committee will conduct such interviews and/or presentations shall be at the sole discretion of the

selection committee. If interviews and/or presentations are to occur, your company will be contacted to schedule the interview or presentation.

There will be a separate scoring criteria for any interviews and/or presentations conducted by the selection committee (Exhibit F). If this separate scoring criteria is not included in the original RFQ, but is determined by the selection committee at a later time, then the selection committee shall send such scoring criteria to the short-listed proposers in advance of their scheduled interview and/or presentation.

In accordance with Sec. 286.0113, F.S., any interviews, presentations and evaluation committee meetings will be exempt from the public meeting requirement (Sec. 286.011, F.S.) in cases where the following activities occur:

(b)1. Any portion of a meeting at which a negotiation with a vendor is conducted pursuant to a competitive solicitation, at which a vendor makes an oral presentation as part of a competitive solicitation, or at which a vendor answers questions as part of a competitive solicitation is exempt from s. 286.011 and s. 24(b), Art. I of the State Constitution.

2. Any portion of a team meeting at which negotiation strategies are discussed is exempt from s. 286.011 and s. 24(b), Art. I of the State Constitution.

(c)1. A complete recording shall be made of any portion of an exempt meeting. No portion of the exempt meeting may be held off the record.

2. The recording of, and any records presented at, the exempt meeting are exempt from s. 119.07(1) and s. 24(a), Art. I of the State Constitution until such time as the agency provides notice of an intended decision or until 30 days after opening the bids, proposals, or final replies, whichever occurs earlier.

After the completion of any interviews and/or presentations with proposers, the selection committee members will independently evaluate the proposers' interviews and/or presentations, and score them based on the interview and/or presentation scoring criteria. The committee then will reconvene to publicly announce their individual scores for the short-listed proposers, add their individual interview and/or presentation scores to their original scores for such short-listed proposers, and create a final ranking. The committee then will make a recommendation to the Village Council based on the final ranking. The Village Council shall make the final decision with regard to the proposer(s) that should be chosen. The Village Council may require, at its sole discretion, a summary presentation of approximately ten (10) minutes from the short-listed proposers prior to making its final award to one or more proposers. Any presentations before the Village Council also will be subject to Sec. 286.0113, F.S.

In the alternative to the process outlined above, the selection committee or the Village Council may reject all proposals.

2. Modify the Schedule section of Exhibit A as follows:

SCHEDULE

- ~~October 3, 2020~~ October 3, 2019 – RFQ Deadline
- ~~October 17, 2020~~ October 17, 2019 – Selection Committee initial ranking meeting
- October 24, 2019 – Consultant presentations (top 3 firms)
- October 31, 2019 – Selection Committee final ranking meeting
- November 21, 2019 – Council approval of Consultant agreement
- February 2020 - 3D rendering of proposed building presented to Village Council
- June 2020 – Site Plan / Architectural and Aesthetic approval
- October 2020 - Begin Construction

3. Add Exhibit E Scoring Criteria Guidelines (6 pages)

4. Add Exhibit F Presentation Scoring Criteria Guidelines (6 pages)

APPROVED BY: Christopher A. Marsh, P.E., Village Engineer

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT: _____
Bidder

**EXHIBIT E
SCORING CRITERIA GUIDELINES
FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Village Hall Architectural & Engineering Design Services
EN2001**

Experience/Ability of Professional Personnel

Intent: To select a firm with top quality professionals

Indicators: The number of years key personnel with a firm have successfully practiced their profession.

A reasonable variety of facility types that the firm has designed over the years and/or extensive experience in the design of municipal projects.

Point Award: 6 – 30 points

Suggested scoring strategy:

Years Experience

- 1 to 3 years: 5 to 7 points
- 4 to 7 years: 8 to 10 points
- 8 to 10 years: 11 to 13 points
- 11+ years: 15 points

Types of Facilities

- Limited variety: 1 to 4 points
- Substantial variety: 5 to 9 points
- Municipal Projects: 10 to 15 points

Firm Name						
Years Experience						
Types of Facilities						
Subtotals						

Comments:

Past Performance

Intent: To select a firm that has demonstrated the ability to clearly understand municipal needs.

Point Award: 0 – 10 Points

Suggested scoring strategy:

The members of the Selection Committee will evaluate information presented by the firm during the process. In determining the point award, each member will make a judgment as to the perceived ability of the firm to perform satisfactorily.

Firm Name						
Subtotals						

Comments:

Understands Project

Intent: To select a firm that truly understands the needs of the Village and the limits that may be placed upon the Village with respect to the design of the facility.

Indicators: The firm should give clear evidence that it knows what they are talking about when they discuss municipal needs.

Point Award: 0 - 30 points
Suggested scoring strategy:

In determining the point award, each member will make a judgment as to the perceived degree of true understanding possessed by the firm with respect to the needs, as it impacts the Village, and expected outcomes for this specific project. Maximum points should be awarded to only those firm(s) that display an exceptional degree of understanding.

- 30 Points – Outstanding
- 20 Points – Good
- 10 Points – Satisfactory
- 0 Points – Poor

Firm Name						
Subtotals						

Comments:

Approach/Methods

Intent: To select a firm that is government oriented, willing to involve others, listens to people, and tries to satisfy the needs of the Village; a firm that is knowledgeable of local rules and regulations and a firm that is task oriented.

Indicators: Committee members should watch for negative indications during the firm's presentation that "they know what is best for us" instead of expressing a "willingness to work with us".

Point Award: 0 - 20 Points

Suggested scoring strategy:

In determining the point award, each member will make a judgment based upon their perception of the firm's willingness to be client oriented and the firm's planning and scheduling skills.

20 Points – Outstanding

10 Points – Good

5 Points – Satisfactory

0 Points – Poor

Firm Name						
Subtotals						

Comments:

Workload

Intent: To select a firm that will be able to give our needs full attention.

Point Award: 0 – 10 points

Suggested scoring strategy:

In determining the point award, each member of the Committee will make a judgment as to the perceived “readiness” of the firm to take on a new project. The most desirable situation would be a firm that is nearing completion on one (1) or more current projects and is already set up for another project. The least desirable situation would be a firm that currently has a maximum workload

Firm Name						
Subtotals						

Comments:

**SCORING CRITERIA POINT SUMMARY FOR
Village Hall Architectural & Engineering Design Services**

Firm Name						
Experience						
Past Performance						
Understands Project						
Approach						
Workload						
Total Points						
Individual Rank Score*						

*The firm with the highest "Total Points" will receive an "Individual Rank Score" of 1, firm with second the highest "Total Points" will receive an "Individual Rank Score" of 2, etc.

Committee Member Signature

Date

Committee Member Name (printed)

**EXHIBIT F
PRESENTATION SCORING CRITERIA GUIDELINES
FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Village Hall Architectural & Engineering Design Services
EN2001**

Village Hall Design Concept

Intent: To select a firm that has evaluated the project needs and budget as outlined in the request for qualifications.

Indicators: Village Hall access and use, structure concept, finishes, landscape, location, and cost; transition plan for maintaining existing operations at the Village Hall complex during construction and demolition.

Point Award: 0 – 40 points

Firm Name						
Subtotals						

Comments:

Past Performance

Intent: To select a firm that has demonstrated the ability to clearly understand municipal needs.

Point Award: 0 – 10 Points

Suggested scoring strategy:

The members of the Selection Committee will evaluate information presented by the firm during the process. In determining the point award, each member will make a judgment as to the perceived ability of the firm to perform satisfactorily.

Firm Name						
Subtotals						

Comments:

Understands Project

Intent: To select a firm that truly understands the needs of the Village and the limits that may be placed upon the Village with respect to the design of the facility.

Indicators: The firm should give clear evidence that it knows what they are talking about when they discuss municipal needs.

Point Award: 0 - 20 points
Suggested scoring strategy:

In determining the point award, each member will make a judgment as to the perceived degree of true understanding possessed by the firm with respect to the needs, as it impacts the Village, and expected outcomes for this specific project. Maximum points should be awarded to only those firm(s) that display an exceptional degree of understanding.

- 30 Points – Outstanding
- 20 Points – Good
- 10 Points – Satisfactory
- 0 Points – Poor

Firm Name						
Subtotals						

Comments:

Approach/Methods

Intent: To select a firm that is government oriented, willing to involve others, listens to people, and tries to satisfy the needs of the Village; a firm that is knowledgeable of local rules and regulations and a firm that is task oriented.

Indicators: Committee members should watch for negative indications during the firm’s presentation that “they know what is best for us” instead of expressing a “willingness to work with us”.

Point Award: 0 - 20 Points

Suggested scoring strategy:

In determining the point award, each member will make a judgment based upon their perception of the firm’s willingness to be client oriented and the firm’s planning and scheduling skills.

20 Points – Outstanding

10 Points – Good

5 Points – Satisfactory

0 Points – Poor

Firm Name						
Subtotals						

Comments:

Workload

Intent: To select a firm that will be able to give our needs full attention.

Point Award: 0 – 10 points

Suggested scoring strategy:

In determining the point award, each member of the Committee will make a judgment as to the perceived “readiness” of the firm to take on a new project. The most desirable situation would be a firm that is nearing completion on one (1) or more current projects and is already set up for another project. The least desirable situation would be a firm that currently has a maximum workload

Firm Name						
Subtotals						

Comments:

**PRESENTATION SCORING SUMMARY FOR
Village Hall Architectural & Engineering Design Services**

Firm Name						
Village Hall Design Concept						
Past Performance						
Understands Project						
Approach						
Workload						
Total Points						
Individual Rank Score*						

*The firm with the highest "Total Points" will receive an "Individual Rank Score" of 1, firm with second the highest "Total Points" will receive an "Individual Rank Score" of 2, etc.

Committee Member Signature

Date

Committee Member Name (printed)