



**Town of Southwest Ranches
IN RESPONSE TO
RFQu 22-013 A CONTINUING CONTRACT
FOR PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL
AND /OR ENGINEERING SERVICES**

July 15, 2022

Questions & Responses:

1. Will RFQu 22-013 replace existing contract "RLI NO. 19-005 - Continuing Contract for Professional Engineering Services" or will this be a separate contract? **NO**
2. Does the Town prefer firms to submit on the individual disciplines or would you prefer a full team to cover all disciplines in Exhibit B? **The Town does not have a preference.**
3. Is the Town seeking to award firms per category? Should we submit for the services that we only provide in-house? Or should we submit with a team of subs covering all services outlined in Exhibit B? **The Town does not have a preference.**
4. Can firms pursue this RFQ as a prime consultant and subconsultant? **YES**
5. If the Consultant Firm has a private client that owns land in the Town of Southwest Ranches, does it preclude them from being selected? **All bids submitted will be evaluated to determine the most advantageous and in the best interest of the Town.**
6. Who are the incumbents? **NONE. This is a new bid to allow ARPA project performance.**
7. Who will the TRC members be made of? **Rod Iey, Public Works Director, Emily Aceti, Community Services Manager, Russell Muniz, Assistant Town Administrator.**
8. If Prime is active on Sams.gov do all their subs also need to be active on it as well? **YES**
9. Is there an overall total page count for the RFQ? **Bid documents = 98 pages total.**
10. Appendix H & P appear to be the same form. Do we have to complete both forms or can we omit one of them? **Forms NOT APPLICABLE should be marked as such and submitted.**
11. In Appendix M, are you asking that firms provide a bond with our proposal? If no bond is required, can you please remove/change the language that refers throughout? **Please mark the Appendix as NOT APPLICABLE.**
12. In Chapter 1, bullet #2 it looks like you would like us to provide our standard resumes, limited to one page in addition to resumes that will also be provided in the SF330; is this correct? **YES**



**Town of Southwest Ranches
IN RESPONSE TO
RFQ# 22-013 A CONTINUING CONTRACT
FOR PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL
AND /OR ENGINEERING SERVICES**

13. Do prime consultants need to include the following information for/from subconsultants in their responses? **YES**

- a. Qualifications such as resumes, project experience, firm info
- b. Licenses and Certifications
- c. Appendices A-Z
- d. Qualification Statement Appendix AA
- e. Scrutinized Companies Appendix AB
- f. Awards Management Appendix AC
- g. Certification of Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility & Voluntary Exclusion Appendix AD

14. "As currently worded, we believe that the indemnity provision section 8.4 on pages 9 and 10 of the proposal is not in compliance with FL Statute 725.08. Please consider rewording same to mirror with the statute. Suggested language per FL Statutes 725.08: "The design professional shall indemnify and hold harmless the agency, 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." **8.4 clearly states: "To the fullest extent permitted by Florida Statute 725.08." Therefore, the provision complies with 725.08 and should remain as is.**

15. "Would the County please remove Section 11.52 "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 when it comes to our subconsultants. If the County will not remove the provision, will it agree to limit the provision only to the employees working on this specific project and for the duration of the project only?" **NO Section 11.52 exists.**