



CLARIFICATION ADDENDUM September 7, 2018

Request for Proposal No. RFP/011/18/SB – Playgrounds

The questions below have been presented for clarification. All additional questions must be submitted, in writing, before September 10, 2018. There will be a FINAL CLARIFICATION ADDENDUM issued on Monday, September 17, 2018 for all requested clarifications.

- Is there a budget assigned per park or an overall budget for all (3) parks? What is the overall budget for this RFP?
 - **A formal budget has not been established.**
- Is it the City's intent to have the entire play area(s) at each park be covered in shade or can shade that is integrated to the playground structure be utilized?
 - **Yes, it is the City's intent to have the entire play area under shade. If shade that is integral to the play structures is designed in such a way to provide adequate area shading it will meet the intent.**
- Regarding the demolition of the existing equipment, will the City be responsible to remove the concrete footers for the existing playground and shade structures?
 - **Yes, Removal of Existing and Foundations by the City of Winter Springs, see line #1, Appendix A, Scope of Work immediately following the narrative.**
- In Section 1.10 Certificates and Licenses, it states "Proposers must be qualified under Florida Law to perform the contract work required and upon request must present a copy of the license(s) required to perform the work". There are numerous references in other areas of the RFP to the vendor or proposer being responsible for pulling all permits for this project. There will be permits required for all of the shades and perhaps other items. With that being said, please clarify that in order to be considered responsive, firms submitting proposals must be licensed contractors, and because commercial building permits would be required they would need to be either a State Certified General Contractor or a State Certified Building Contractors.
 - **All respondents will be required to be a State Certified Building Contractor or a State Certified General Contractor**
- The scoring criteria has changed from the previous RFP. Previously, the most heavily weighted item of the scoring was the Price. This current RFP has the most heavily weighted element of the scoring as Design. Can you please explain specifically what design elements or items will be taken into consideration when calculating this portion of the score? Is it number of play features? Colors? Etc.

- **Scoring criterion is outlined in the RFP, the winning bid will be the most imaginative and creative.**
- Please confirm that according to page 40 of the RFP, Playground Project Specifications, each park must have a minimum of 2 separate play structures, one designed for age 2-5 and one designed for age 5-12. In order to be responsive. It would not be acceptable to submit a proposal with less than 2 units per park or a unit that is designed for ages 2-12?
 - **Submit proposal with elements that serve both age groups in separate systems (i.e. One for ages 2-5 and One for ages 5-12)**
- In the playground project specifications, it makes clear that utilizing a unitary surface or EPDM is required for this project in order to be responsive. What are the color requirements, must all of the rubber be 100% color, or is 50% black, 50% color acceptable?
 - **No color requirements. See RFP.**
- Is a bid bond required to be submitted with the proposal? If awarded the project, would Contractor need to provide a performance or payment bond?
 - **Yes, a Bid Bond is required to submit a bid and Payment and Performance Bonds will be required for the successful bidder.**
- The previous RFP required that 2 designs be submitted for each park, please confirm that only 1 design is needed for each park and that proposers can only submit 1 design for each park. Submitting more than 1 design would potentially create an unfair advantage.
 - **Each bidder has an equal opportunity to present designs for each park. No additional details available.**
- The last sentence of the RFP states that play features must be integrated into the rubber surface. This is an obvious requirement for all of the physical equipment, however from the photo, it appears that the example surfacing has inlaid designs into the rubber. Is this a requirement?
 - **Yes**
- With regards to Torcasso Park, the bid asks for a 2-5 and a 5-12 playground units. Is it acceptable to propose a 2-12 age appropriate as the previous bid allowed?
 - **Submit proposal with elements that serve both age groups in separate systems (i.e. One for ages 2-5 and One for ages 5-12)**
- Are we to include swings in each park?
 - **No**
- With regards to Central Winds Park, you have two separate playground areas – One 2-5 age appropriate and one 5-12 age appropriate existing playground area, do you want to maintain same age group, or change it to a 2-5 and 5-12, or would a 2-12 age appropriate playground be allowed?
 - **Submit proposal with elements that serve both age groups in separate systems (i.e. One for ages 2-5 and One for ages 5-12)**
- Please confirm that surfacing is to be PIP EPDM – will any other options be considered?
 - **Surface to be PIP EPDM. No alternates accepted.**
- Is there a preference for the border system to be used with the EPDM?
 - **Border system must meet or exceed the required materials and installation for typical PIP EPDM installations.**

- Please confirm that the site work and removal of the surfacing and existing underground footers is to be done by the contractor.
 - **No, Removal of Existing and Foundations by the City of Winter Springs, see line #1, Appendix A, Scope of Work immediately following the narrative.**
- Will you accept split quoting and billing? I.E. – product on one and installation by a sub on another.
 - **No – One Bid/Proposal must be inclusive of all scope.**
- Based on the information listed in the “SHADE STRUCTURES – Scope of Services” it appears that it is the intention of the city that the shades to be utilized at each park are to be separate, standalone shade structures that cover the equipment, as opposed to integrated shade structures that are actually part of the playground units themselves. The difference in the amount of shade provided by each option, the cost of the units, engineering and the installation is substantial, so clear clarifications on this are necessary. Must the shades be standalone units that cover the play equipment to be considered responsive?
 - **Shades can be either integrated into the playground structures or separate pieces of equipment. We are offering the bidders options to achieve the goals stated in the RFP with various options for creativity and cost savings.**
- Please elaborate on the size or shade requirements as it states 70’ x 90’ and then states that they must cover “all applicable areas”. By all applicable areas, do you mean that in order to be responsive, the shades presented in the proposal must cover all of the playground equipment entirely?
 - **No additional information is available. The shade structures (either separate are integral to the playground equipment) are to be designed to provide shade on as much of the equipment and play space as is practical and feasible.**
- Is there a pre-bid conference in the future? If yes, when and is it Mandatory or not?
 - **No**
- How much is the construction cost/estimated budget?
 - **Budget has not been established.**
- What is the square footage of the project?
 - **All available data is included in the RFP.**
- Who is the Designer/Engineer?
 - **Refer to RFP Appendix A – Scope of Services. Design by contractors.**
- Do you have a copy of the Plan Holder’s List available? If yes, can you email me a copy?
 - **No bidders list available for distribution.**
- Can I get a copy of any addenda that have been released to date?
 - **No addenda have been issued. All bidders will be provided addenda and information will also be posted online.**