

**SUPPLEMENT NO. 1**  
TO  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK FOR  
ROGER DEAN CHEVROLET STADIUM & SPORTS COMPLEX  
RENOVATION PROJECT

DATE OF ISSUANCE: FEBRUARY 10, 2022

This supplement consists of 4 pages and no attachment(s).

**QUESTIONS FROM PROPOSERS:**

**1. QUESTION:** While the ‘Short List Selection Criteria’ are relatively clear and direct correlations can be made to many of the Proposal Submittal Requirements, some correlations are not clear. Several of the 20 Submittal Requirements appear to be best categorized as “Pass-Fail” (meaning that we are required to include these items or our submission may be deemed non-responsive). The items we are assuming are not “scored” but are only Pass-Fail are:

- 2 – Letter of Intent from Surety
- 3 – Proposal Certification Form
- 4 – Addendum to Proposal Certification Form
- 14 – Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form

Can you please confirm that the above items are not “scored” towards the 100 points but are considered “Pass-Fail”?

**ANSWER:** The items listed above may affect responsiveness of the proposal if missing from the proposal, but are not “scored” towards the 100 points.

**2. QUESTION:** Several of the 20 Submittal Requirements appear to be included to transfer information that may be of value to the selection committee, but it is not clear to us in which of the seven scoring categories they may be included. The items we would like clarification on are:

- #9 – Project Management Services (Is that only to be scored under Final Selection Criteria #3)
- #16 – Exceptions to the JSL Form Contract
- #19 – Demonstrated Experience Working in Palm Beach County (Is the intent to provide more points for less work within the county, vice-versa, or for information purposes only)
- #20 – Other information that may be appropriate

For example, if we transmit an extensive listing of exceptions to the JSL Form Contract, might that result in a lower score, and if so in which category of scoring will it be counted? Can you please confirm whether the items above are scored, and if so, which category are they scored against?

**ANSWER:**

#9 – Project Management Services (Is that only to be scored under Final Selection Criteria #3) – Yes, #9 is used for scoring Final Selection Criteria #3

#16 – Exceptions to the JSL Form Contract - #16 will be considered as part of criteria #6 Pricing, to provide additional context to the values provided on the Financial Proposal Form (RFP Attachment F). JSL will

consider responses provided to #16, but those responses will not alter, amend, supplement or otherwise form any part of the Contract for Construction Manager At Risk Services (RFP Attachment H) without the approval of JSL.

#19 – Demonstrated Experience Working in Palm Beach County (Is the intent to provide more points for less work within the county, vice-versa, or for information purposes only) - #19 will be considered as part of criteria #1 Related Building Experience in Shortlist and as part of criteria #1 Qualifications during Final Selection.

#20 – Other information that may be appropriate – #20 is self-explanatory, if proposer has additional information not specifically requested regarding experience, qualifications, staff or project management services it may be provided for consideration, but is not required for responsiveness.

**3. QUESTION:** The Selection Criteria for #6, Pricing states that the “overall lowest number” will get the highest score. The Pricing Form contains both numerical items (the preconstruction fee and general conditions) that can be easily added, but also includes two percentage items (fee and contingency) that are not easily added. Will the evaluation be only on the preconstruction fee and general conditions? If the fee and contingency are also to be evaluated, please indicate the formula or logic that will be used to calculate a number for these percentages.

**ANSWER:** Quantified numbers will be scored based on value submitted by proposer. Percentage based submissions will be evaluated based on applying the percentage against a consistent anticipated Hard Cost value from the SD estimate. The same constant Hard Cost number will be applied against all responders, thus lowest percentage will score the highest.

**4. QUESTION:** For Proposal Submittal Requirements 7 and 8, Pre-construction and Construction staff respectively, the RFP asks: "Give a brief resume of key persons to be assigned to this Project." For ease of grading and consistently of competitors, can you please define the Key Personnel positions?

**ANSWER:** We will not define your staffing model, which is part of the responder’s project approach. We want to see how each responder intends to staff the program.

**5. QUESTION:** The RFP (RFP Attachment G/Page 2) provided denotes that CMAR will: "Substantially renovate two new clubhouse/administrative buildings for the Miami Marlins and St. Louis Cardinals to meet current and future Spring Training requirements..."

The SD Narrative (04 STRUCTURAL NARRATIVE; Page 66 of 192) states: "The existing clubhouses for both Major League organizations will be demolished and replaced with two ~70,000 SF, two-story clubhouses with similar features."

Please clarify the extent of renovation or new ground-up construction for the scope of work regarding two clubhouses/administrative buildings totaling ~140,000 SF.

**ANSWER:** Intent of the program is to demolish and construct new for each clubhouse.

**6. QUESTION:** The Pricing Form requires the submission of general conditions amounts for reimbursement as general conditions costs. However, the contract indicates both that the general conditions may be a cost of the work and as a lump sum (see 2.1.14 and 8.4.13 for example). Please clarify if the general conditions pricing is intended to be treated as a cost (perhaps with the number quoted as a cap) or a lump sum amount.

**ANSWER:** General Conditions Costs (which is a defined term within the RFP) must be included as lump-sum amounts on the Financial Proposal Form (RFP Attachment F), including one that assumes a single-phase schedule, and other that assumes a two-phase schedule.

Section 6.4 of the Form of Contract (RFP Attachment H) defines the specific costs that fall within the definition of "General Conditions Costs". The Financial Proposal Form (RFP Attachment F) requires potential bidders to provide the amount that Construction Manager proposes to be inserted as the GC Lump Sum in Section 1.1.7 of the Form of Contract (RFP Attachment H). Section 8.4.13 expressly states that any cost that falls within the definition of General Conditions Cost will not be considered a specific reimbursable Cost of the Work. Rather, all such costs will be reimbursed through the pre-established GC Lump Sum.

Section 2.1.4 requires that GC Lump Sum be included in the GMP Proposal. The GMP Proposal should not include any General Conditions Costs in the GMP Proposal outside of the GC Lump Sum.

**7. QUESTION:** On what date will the JSL/county provide responses to the RFI's?

**ANSWER:** NLT End of Day Thursday, February 10th

**8. QUESTION:** Language found with the RFP (for example RFP - Page 3) states: "JSL initially plans for the work to be performed in two major phases, with the first major phase to be completed between the end of the Spring Training Period (defined below) of 2023 and the beginning of the Spring Training Period of 2024, a pause in major on-site construction elements during the Spring Training Period of 2024, and a second major phase to commence after the Spring Training Period of 2024 with substantial completion on or before the Spring Training Period of 2025."

If CM elects to use a two-phase approach, does JSL have scope of work that must be prioritized within the first phase of construction?

**ANSWER:** JSL will work with the successful respondent to put together a project implementation plan that works for all parties and offers the greatest chance of success for the project. We don't want to assume availability of materials or CM approach at this time.

**9. QUESTION:** Due to the stadium's location adjacent to FAU and a heavily-trafficked commercial district in Jupiter, will there be any working hour or day restrictions imposed on this project?

**ANSWER:** At this time we do not anticipate any restrictions based on the surrounding businesses, however, the successful CM will be required to be sensitive to ongoing baseball operations as the primary function of the facility. This will be part of the project implementation plan that will be developed with the successful respondent.

**10. QUESTION:** Will any public or federal funding requirements, e.g. Davis Bacon & Related Acts, be a requirement of this project?

**ANSWER:** There will be multiple funding sources (County, State, Private). Accounting and reporting requirements associated with each of the sources must be adhered to. No federal funding has been identified at this time.

**11. QUESTION:** The SD drawings refer to a "New Group Area Above New Umpire Locker Room Area" (A10.1 3D Views) (located near first base), but RDCS Slideshow only mentions a "New group area on the third base line with a second level deck that is interactive." Please confirm if this area is to be included in

the scope?

**ANSWER:** Confirmed, this is intended to be an additive alternate for JSL's consideration. The first base fan area is an add alternate for the project. The scope is currently in the SD documents, including an occupiable roof over the new umpire locker rooms. This area connects to the proposed 360 concourse.

**12. QUESTION:** Will purchasing of the "Art in Public Spaces" be completed by the GC or by JSL/County? Will installation be completed by the GC?

**ANSWER:** It is JSL's intent to put the Art in Public Places requirement into the CM contract. The CM will be expected to contract this work and supply substantiating accounting records to certify the investment. The Design Team will work with the CM team to identify proposed locations and types of art that may work with the overall program

**13. QUESTION:** Please clarify if the Owner or Construction Manager will be providing Builders' Risk Insurance (BRI) on the Project. (There is an option for the CM to provide in the contract – General Conditions, p. 30)

**ANSWER:** For clarification, the owner of the facility is Palm Beach County, but JSL, as the developer of the project, intends to engage a construction manager at-risk in accordance with a development agreement with Palm Beach County. For purposes of responding to this question, we assume "Owner" refers to JSL. JSL will provide Builder's Risk insurance for the project.

**14. QUESTION:** Will there be opportunities to tour the facility?

**ANSWER:** JSL will not offer any tours of the facility as part of the RFP proposal or selection process.

**END OF SUPPLEMENT**