

Addendum Date: August 26, 2008

CITY OF PENSACOLA, FLORIDA  
ADDENDUM #1  
TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

**MASTER PLAN UPDATE FOR THE URBAN CORE REDEVELOPMENT**

RFQ NO.: 08-044

The following items take precedence over the documents for the above named items.

All other terms and conditions shall remain the same.

**PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS ADDENDUM WITH  
YOUR PROPOSAL AS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.**  
*(this form does not count against the response page limit)*

1. The bid opening date has changed from August 28, 2008 at 2:30 PM, to September 12, 2008 at 2:30 PM.
2. See Pages 2-6 of 6 for Consolidated Summary of Inquiries and Responses.
3. The City of Pensacola Small Business Enterprise Directory is attached.

Company \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Authorized Representative \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**Master Plan Update for the Urban Core Redevelopment Area  
of the City of Pensacola, Florida  
RFQ 08-044**

**Consolidated Summary of Inquiries and Responses  
August 26, 2008**

- The RFQ indicates that you want a plan "update." Is this to be a stand-alone document or merely a supplement to the existing document? *We are looking for a new stand alone document that incorporates/acknowledges elements of the original plan, the numerous plan updates as well as plans and studies conducted but not formally incorporated into the current CRA Plan.*
- Does the City view this project as a major planning initiative with a budget to support that level of effort, or is this an update, more of a fine tuning of the previous plan? *The CRA views this project as a major planning initiative with a budget to support that level of effort, however as the RFQ states, the plan should also coordinate "the goals of previously adopted plans by incorporating them into a larger vision."*
- What is the budget for this project? *The 2008 budget is sufficient to develop a plan of this scope/magnitude and will be further negotiated with the successful respondent as the scope is further refined. Additional work may be phased as we begin implementation of the resulting plan.*
- Are you looking for a cost proposal? *This is an RFQ rather than RFP and we will not be making a selection based upon cost proposals.*
- Who did the original plan / what did the CRA not like *The original plan was developed by CRA and City Planning Staff in 1984 and substantially updated in 1989. Although many of the objectives in the plan are still valid and sound, the actual projects contained in the plan are complete or obsolete.*
- Is it your anticipation that this project will have a similar process used for previous planning projects, such as the Historic District Master Plan and the Waterfront Master Plan? *We are looking for responders to provide their approach/process to address the planning areas, but I will say the result would probably be more like the Waterfront Master plan - though much more detailed in some areas to meet statutory compliance. At this point we were not looking to establish an additional committee for the process as they did in the WMP.*
- To what extent would the city staff be involved in the project? Will there be a task force or committee? *The level of involvement of various City and CRA staff would ultimately be part of the final scope of work negotiated with the successful firm/team, but the two principle staff members working directly and closely with the firm/team will be the Community Development Director (AIA) and CRA Administrator (AICP). In addition, our Community Development and CRA Staff includes an AIA and 3 AICPs with extensive knowledge of the area. At this time we have not determined a final approach that would include a committee*

*or task force. However, the ultimate process/approach would be part of finalizing the scope of work.*

- *Would text changes for the Update be required to go before the Escambia County BOCC? Changes are not required to go before the BOCC. However there are notification requirements to all taxing authorities for all plan amendments.*
- *Would recommended enlargement of the district require Escambia County BOCC approval? Enlargement of the district is not under consideration.*
- *CRA requirements vary by County depending on whether a charter county is involved or not, plus some other nuances. Any light you can shed on this for me would be appreciated. Escambia is not a chartered county, however since the Pensacola Urban Core CRA was established prior to the recent statute changes, we are exempt from those provisions.*
- *On the CRA website, the DIB Parking Management Strategy is listed, but the link sends you to the Retail Market Strategy. Could you please provide a link to the Parking Management Strategy? The website has been corrected and the correct link is <http://www.downtownpensacola.com/DIB/committees/pt.asp>*
- *Will the master plan of the waterfront and downtown areas deal with the revitalization and housing strategies for low income or minority neighborhoods? This update incorporates the entire CRA which includes low income and minority neighborhoods. In addition, the plan must at minimum meet the statutory requirements for CRA Plans in regards to residential uses.*
- *In addition to the Conceptual Themes, Urban Core and Waterfront Goals and the Guiding Principles listed in the RFQ are there any other key issues or questions the City would like to have addressed or answered in this master plan update? Key issues were included in the RFQ*
- *Do sub-consultants need to be exclusive to the team for this submittal? No. Sub-consultants may partner with other teams.*
- *It is stated on page 8 of 18 that the “CRA intends to enter into an Agreement with a **single firm** that provides all the necessary disciplines required for the successful implementation of the proposed project.” Does this mean that a prime architect or planning firm with consultants will not be qualified nor considered for the project? No. Actually it means that we will only 'contract' with a single firm and not each individual firm (sub) on an assembled team.*
- *Do you have a preference regarding which discipline should lead the team’s efforts (e.g. arch./engineering, economic consulting, etc.) No preference at this time as long as the necessary disciplines are covered and the lead can demonstrate the ability to coordinate the team and communication.*

- On the forms at the back of the RFQ – do you need those signed by each member of a team (each subconsultant), or just the prime? *Just the prime.*
- Should all sub-consultants be identified in the response? For example, for a national firm, or a team of national firms, identifying the right local engineers or other local consultants might occur during the interview and/or negotiation periods of the process. I recognize that to get credits for small and minority owned businesses, they would need to be identified in the response. May a firm propose to round out the team once the specific scope has been negotiated or prior to the interview? *The Evaluation criteria includes "the qualifications and availability of the personnel to be assigned to the project." Undetermined personnel would likely be reflected poorly in the rating given for this area. The key to evaluating qualifications of any firm/team is knowing who actually comprises the team.*
- Do you anticipate the selected consultant team needing to have GIS capability? What about transportation planning / traffic engineering expertise? *The introduction to the RFQ does list GIS as a necessary component. The scope of services (although broad) also includes transportation and parking planning.*
- Has a past consultant been asked to pursue this opportunity as well? *Yes.*
- Who has done this type of work recently in your area? *HHI - Belmont-DeVilliers Neighborhood Land Use Plan, Urban Design Associates - Pensacola Historic District Master Plan, IBI Group (formerly KPMG) - Westside CRA Plan.*
- Are there any specific types of info. you are seeking? This is considered an RFQ, but the "approach to project" is one of the graded criterion, so I'm assuming this is really more of an RFP. *The approach to the project criterion is to gauge the connection of the consultants' understanding of the project and their approach(s) that in turn lines up with outcome.*
- Is there a specific outline of the required information to be submitted? Is the Written Response Evaluation Criteria intended to be the outline for this? *The written response criteria is a general outline for addressing the areas listed in the scope.*
- The Affidavit on Public Entity Crimes appears as if it has to be notarized by a Florida Notary Public. *A notary of any state is acceptable for the Affidavit.*
- The CRA RFQ notes MBE/SBE on the scoresheet. Does the City or CRA have an approved or registered list of vendors to include, or is it OK to include MBE/SBE folks that may be listed with other local governments in FL?. *If the firm is an MBE ( a state of Florida designation), then they should state that. The SBE designation is the City's and the firm must be from the within the 325 zip code (Pensacola area), so they could not be an SBE since they are from Orlando. SBE Vendor list attached.*
- In regards to the page count for responses to the RFQ, does the 20-page limit include the Table of Contents and Tabs/ Dividers, and also does the 20-page limit count towards double-sided printing (i.e. 10 sheets if double-sided)? *The page count would not include the TOC or*

*tabs/dividers as long as they are for organization of information only and do not contain any additional or substantive information. The 20 page limit refers to the number of 'page faces', therefore yes, 10 sheets if double sided.*

- Proof of Insurance, 52.209-5 FAR Certification, 52.209-6 FAR form, Public Entities Crimes form, and Certification/Authorization/Acknowledgement Form, SBE certification—insurance certifications, any SBE proof of certification, and forms are in addition to and do not count against the 20-page Statement of Qualifications response. *Yes*
- Regarding Format of the responses, the RFQ states that “The requirements stated do not preclude Offerers herein from furnishing additional information as deemed appropriate”. However, it also states that Responses shall be limited to 20 pages (with specified exclusions). Please clarify what shall be included in the 20 pages and what might be considered additional information. For example, do project example marketing sheets count toward the 20 pages? Resumes? *Although unlikely, if the respondent can address the areas requested in less than 20 pages, they can provide additional information up to the 20 pages. Marketing sheets and resumes would count toward the page totals.*
- Why the short turnaround time on the RFP - *the RFQ will actually be out for approximately 45 days, in excess of the usual 30 days. the delivery of the plan is approximately 9 months.*
- What factors, if any are driving the City's March 2009 project deadline? *Preliminary budgets for the 2010 FY are being prepared by this time. Although ambitious, it is goal that will be negotiated with the successful team based on the final scope of work. As stated in the RFQ, "the broad scope of the study may allow or require a phased, extended timeframe, subject to funding availability."*
- When do you plan to short list and interview? *Anticipate determination/notification of short list by mid to late September, depending on the volume of respondents.*
- Who will be on the selection committee? *Currently plan to have a 5-6 member committee comprised of CRA / City staff, elected official (1), Downtown Improvement Board, and area resident/business owners.*
- Is the City Council the CRA board – or is there a separate CRA board? *Though the CRA is a separate entity, the governing body of the CRA is made up of the same 10 elected members as City Council.*
- I have heard that the City Manager (Tom Bonfield) has moved on. True? Is there a new City Manager identified yet? *Yes. Alvin G. Coby, one of our Assistant City Managers, is now the Interim City Manager*
- Is there a list of consultants who have been contacted or have expressed an interest in this project? List below.

**Firms/Organizations who were sent notification of the RFQ and/or have expressed an interest**

APA  
Basile Baumann Prost Cole & Associates, Inc.  
Baskerville Donovan Engineers, Inc.  
BCI Engineers & Scientists  
Bellomo-Herbert & Company, Inc.  
Berger Singerman, Attorneys at Law  
Billing, Cochran, Heath, Lyles, Maro & Anderson  
Bowyer-Singleton & Associates, Inc.  
Caldwell and Associates  
Canin associates  
The Cardwell Law Firm  
CH2M Hill, Inc.  
Chen and Associates  
DAG  
Demand Star  
Dyer, Riddle, Mills & Precourt  
EarthTech Consulting, Inc.  
Economic Research Associates  
FL Assoc. of Housing & Redevelopment Officials  
Florida Panhandle Purchasing Group  
Florida Redevelopment Association  
Genesis Group  
George-Henry-George Partners (Maryland)  
Glatting Jackson Kercher Anglin, Inc.  
Gray Robinson, P.A.  
HDR, Inc.  
Hernandez - Calhoun Design International, P.A  
HHI, Inc.  
HSA Consulting Group, Inc.  
IBI Group, Inc.  
Karabashia, Eddington Planning Group, LLC  
Kimley-Horn & Associates/Urban Resource Group  
Land Design Innovations, Inc.  
Lawandales Planning Affiliates  
Lewis, Longman & Walker, P.A.  
Looney Ricks Kiss Architects, Inc.  
Miller Legg  
MSCW, Inc.  
PBS&J  
Place Planning & Design  
PMG Associates, Inc.  
Carter Quina, AIA  
Real Estate Research Consultants  
Renaissance Planning Group  
Reynolds, Smith & Hills, Inc.  
Robert P. Franke & Associates  
Spencer Maxwell Bullock Architects  
Stantec  
Strategic Planning Group, Inc.  
Swan Development Advisors, Inc.  
TBE Group, Inc.  
Todd, Eddie S. Jr. - Architect  
Urban Design Associates  
Wade-Trim, Inc.  
The Walker Collaborative  
WilsonMiller, Inc.  
WRT (Coral Gables)  
Zone Advisors, LLC  
Zyscovich