



ADDENDUM NO. 2

Issue Date: December 28, 2022
 Project Name: Continuing Consulting Engineering Services
 RFQ Number: 2023015
 RFQ Opening Date: January 27, 2023

This addendum is being released to answer questions received to date. Duplicate questions may not receive a direct response. The information and documents contained in this addendum are hereby incorporated in the RFQ. This addendum must be acknowledged where indicated on the firm information form, or the SOQ may be declared non-responsive.

Questions and Answers

1. **How many firms is the County anticipating to award for this contract? Also, how many firms may be selected by discipline?**
 Award will be at the discretion and recommendation of the committee. There is no set quantity established.
2. **How much were the fees generated by each incumbent and by discipline on the previous contract?**
 Value of work orders approved by our Board is shown below. Categories for the existing contract are less broad.

Consultant	Prequalified categories	BCC Approved Total Award To Date
Aptim	Coastal	\$0
Arcadis *Did not renew	Roadway, Traffic and Transportation	\$66,523
Atkins	Utility Minor, Utility Major, Coastal, Roadway, Traffic and Transportation, Water Resources	\$343,849
Bowman	Roadway, Traffic and Transportation, Utility Minor	\$475,759
Carter	Utility Minor, Utility Major, Coastal, Roadway, Traffic and Transportation, Water Resources	\$61,700
CDM Smith	Utility Major, SWDD	\$401,198
Coastal Waterways	Coastal	\$0
Geosyntec	Coastal, SWDD, Water Resources	\$874,291
Jones Edmunds	Water Resources, Utility Major, Utility Minor	\$48,490
Kimley-Horn	Utility Minor, Utility Major, Roadway, Traffic and Transportation, Water Resources, SWDD	\$2,146,609
Keith & Schnars	Roadway, Traffic and Transportation	\$0
Marlin	Roadway, Traffic and Transportation	\$0

Addendum 2

Masteller & Moler	Utility Minor	\$180,925
MBV	Utility Minor, Roadway, Traffic and Transportation	\$412,678
Schulke, Bittle and Stoddard	Utility Minor, Utility Major, Roadway, Traffic and Transportation	\$144,800
Stantec	Coastal	\$0
Tetra Tech	Utility Major, Water Resources	\$204,331
WRMA	Water Resources	\$0
Overall Total =		\$5,361,153

3. Who are the technical reviewers for this contract?

The selection committee has not yet been identified, but will likely include staff from Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Utilities, and the Solid Waste Disposal District, as they are the primary using departments.

4. Who should the response be addressed to?

Delivery information for SOQs is shown on the cover page and in the General Instructions. Please reference the Submittal Instructions (second paragraph under Format), which indicates a cover letter is not desired.

5. Does the County prefer or require a particular font and font size for the SOQ submittal? Also, what page margins should be used?

Font size, margins, and general SOQ layout should be sufficient to enable the committee to easily read the information, and for the pages to not look overcrowded and/or overwhelming. We recommend no font size smaller than 11, and margins no smaller than .5 inch.

6. Will the cover, tabs and table of contents count against the page count of the submittal?

If your response is tabbed, there should be no table of contents, as it is unnecessary. If a tabbed response also includes a table of contents, then the TOC will count against the page limit for section 2. Covers and tabs will not be counted against the page limit, as long as they do not include any supplemental text. General images and titles are acceptable, but no SOQ content should be included on these pages, or they will be counted against the page limits.