

FORM I – CLARIFICATION REQUEST FORM

Clarification/ Question No.	Date Question Submitted	RFQ Section	Question	Respondent (Team Name)
1	2018-02-20	Part A – Section 7.5 and 7.7	<p>We note that Part A - Section 7.5 of the RFQ indicates that Respondents may identify information within their SOQ that is trade secret / confidential, and that this information would be treated as such by the County to the extent permitted by Florida law. However, the RFQ does not provide instructions for how Respondents should do so.</p> <p>We urgently request that the County amend the RFQ to provide clear instructions for Respondents to identify and submit trade secret and / or confidential information within their Submission Packages.</p> <p>For this purpose, we would suggest that the County consider a separate package for components of the Submission Package identified as confidential / trade secret by a Respondent.</p>	Miami Metro Justice Partners
2	2018-02-20	Part A - Section 4.3	<p>We urgently request that the County consider extending the deadline for submitting Clarification Requests.</p> <p>The current deadline would not allow Respondents to submit inquiries related to any Addenda, updated versions of the RFQ, or responses to Clarification Requests that the County issues in the 5+ week period between February 23 and the SOQ Due Date.</p> <p>Accordingly, we suggest that the deadline for submitting Clarification Requests be extended from February 23, 2018 to March 9, 2018 (i.e., a 14-day extension).</p>	Miami Metro Justice Partners
3	2018-02-20	Volume E	We are submitting a Request for Clarification regarding the requirements for Major Non-Equity Members to submit financial	Miami Metro Justice Partners

			<p>information in connection with the requirements set out in Volume E of the RFQ.</p> <p>Specifically, we note that based on the current drafting, a Respondent's Lead Architectural/Engineering Firm would be required to submit financial information in connection with Volume E.</p> <p>Based on market precedent for similar North American P3 procurements, a Lead Architectural/Engineering Firm would be engaged as a subcontractor or subconsultant to the Design-Build entity (i.e. the Lead Contractor), and therefore, it would not bear any financial risk with regard to delivery of the Project works. Accordingly, Lead Architectural/Engineering Firms are not typically required to submit financial information in connection with similar P3 procurement processes.</p> <p>We kindly request that the County amend the drafting in the current version of the RFQ to clarify that a Respondent's Lead Architectural/Engineering Firm is not required to submit Financial Information in connection with the requirements set out in Volume E of the RFQ.</p>	
4	2018-02-20	Part B – Section D-4	<p>Section D-4 states the following:</p> <p><i><u>“Describe Respondent’s Financial Lead’s background and experience in coordinating the financing for courthouses, High-rise Structures, or other vertical structures of comparable scope and complexity to this Project”</u></i></p> <p>We note that description underlined above does not include reference to experience financing availability-based P3 projects.</p> <p>Our inference is that it is not the intention of the County to exclude Respondent experience with the financing for availability-based DBFM and DBFOM P3 projects, and accordingly, we request that the County consider the following revision:</p>	Miami Metro Justice Partners

			<i>“Describe Respondent’s Financial Lead’s background and experience in coordinating the financing for availability-based DBFM/DBFOM projects, courthouses, High-rise Structures, or other vertical structures of comparable scope and complexity to this Project.”</i>	
5	2018-02-23	Part A – Section 6.4.1	Will the County please provide a breakdown of how the 450 points will be scored among the seven evaluation criteria under 6.4.1 Technical Qualifications and Capability? Is each evaluation criteria under 6.4.1 weighted equally? Due to the very strict page limits, this level of information is critical to putting together a response.	Miami Metro Justice Partners
6	2018-02-23	Part A – Section 6.4.2	Will the County please provide a breakdown of how the 450 points will be scored among the four evaluation criteria under 6.4.2 Financial Qualifications and Capability? Is each evaluation criteria under 6.4.2 weighted equally? Due to the very strict page limits, this level of information is critical to putting together a response.	Miami Metro Justice Partners
7	2018-02-23	Part A – Section 6.4.3	Will the County please provide a breakdown of how the 100 points will be scored among the six evaluation criteria under 6.4.3 Project Understanding and Approach? Is each evaluation criteria under 6.4.3 weighted equally? Due to the very strict page limits, this level of information is critical to putting together a response.	Miami Metro Justice Partners
8	2018-02-23	Part A – Section 6.4.1	Will the County please clarify the intent of evaluating Respondents and Team Members based on their experience with Traditional Delivery Method per 6.4.1.(e) when this project is not using a Traditional Delivery Method?	Miami Metro Justice Partners
9	2018-02-23	Part A – Section 6.3	What criteria will be used to determine if a Respondent is “responsible” per section 6.3?	Miami Metro Justice Partners

As outlined in [RFQ Part A, Section 4.5](#), all questions regarding the Project must be submitted to the County Procurement Manager by the date and time specified in [RFQ Part A, Section 4.3](#) using this Clarification Request Form. Addenda to respond to questions will be posted at BidSync.

This Clarification Request Form should be emailed to County Procurement Manager:

rita.silva@miamidade.gov

To comply with the Cone of Silence, the email must be cc'd to:

clerkbcc@miamidade.gov