



MINNESOTA SPORTS FACILITIES AUTHORITY
900 South 5th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

July 6, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: RFP Respondents

FROM: Steven C. Maki, PE

SUBJECT: New Stadium – RFP Owners Representative Services
Addendum No. 1 – Response to Questions

A few questions have come in and I thought I would respond in advance to the submittal date. Please note receipt of this addendum with your response to the request for proposal.

- How many copies of the submission in response to the RFP for Owner’s Representative services are required? **10 copies will be sufficient + 1 electronic version**
- The RFP document does not identify the quantity for the deliverables, are we to assume the same deliverables as the RFQ? **See prior answer.**
- Will the MSFA rank our qualifications that were submitted on June 22nd as part of the overall and final scoring process? If so, what percentage of the evaluation criteria will it fill? **There has been no specific determination of any overall or final scoring system at this time or that there will be one. The MSFA will determine which firm/or individual best meets its needs for the Owner’s Representative position.**
- Besides Exhibits 1 and 2, does the MSFA anticipate receiving and approach and finalized organization chart, etc.? **That would be desirable.**
- Does the MSFA need Non-Collusion statements from Prime and subs or just the Prime? Can we resubmit what was sent in the qualifications package for each team member on June 22nd? **Please include as a re-submittal.**
- Can the MSFA provide Exhibit 1 and 2 in Word format? **Exhibit 2 is available, I don’t have the collusion document in a word format.**
- The Authority notes in the Memorandum (bullet 3) to “Include any suggested or necessary subconsultants...” This appears to conflict with Memorandum bullet 6 where some services are deemed unnecessary that the Owner’s Rep might suggest or consider necessary as noted in bullet 3. What if a bidder still sees some services in the list of unnecessary services under bullet 6 as necessary? **Include as a specific breakout cost item. See the answer to the question below also.**

- The Authority notes in the Memorandum (bullet 6) that certain services “...will not be necessary for proposal purposes.” Will these services be considered in separate future RFQs/RFPs? Will they be necessary in the future via the Owner’s Rep? Will they not be necessary in the future? **Certain services are already in place and some will be solicited in the future (ie. Geotech, Design/architectural services, construction management or contractor services etc...).** I have tried to keep the focus on those specific services that are envisioned for the Owner’s Representative right now. It serves no purpose for you or other responders to include services that are not likely to be included at any time. I am not trying to preclude anything that should be included nor want to miss something that should be included.
- The Authority notes in the Memorandum (bullet 6) that it “...is seeking a full service firm.” Will the Authority be discounting or marking-down firms that carry one or more subconsultants on their team? **No**
- Can teams change the organizational chart submitted with their qualifications? **Yes.**
- Does the RFQ stand as a base that we build upon in the RFP including an approach? **It certainly could. You have some discretion certainly on how you approach the matter. I really would avoid a lot of marketing materials as they are not as important here as people on the project, experience in projects of this type, etc...**
- In addition to rates, is the MSFA looking for our full project costs? **Yes, we are looking for a not to exceed amount.**
- We plan to include rate escalation for ensuing years. Will this be appropriate? **Yes but please note accordingly and that escalation amount should be included in the not to exceed number.**
- Is there a page limit to the RFP? **Brevity is appreciated. Please hold to a 25 page max.**
- How many copies of our submission are required? Do you want an electronic copy of the submission? **Yes see prior answer and Yes.**
- If our sub-consultants price their services out by the "trip" will that be acceptable? **Yes, however we look for travel to be on a coach fare basis and other expenses as generally allowable by Federal government travel guidelines. See the U.S. General Services Administration guidelines.**
- The RFP clearly envisions an Owner’s Representative to be hired by The Project Group; and an Owner’s Representative to be hired by the MSFA; and possibly the Minnesota Vikings may as well hire its own Owner’s Representative. The role of the Owner’s Representative (and thus the staffing and compensation pricing) is clearly different depending upon which Owner’s Representative role a respondent is being considered for. To be absolutely clear, we respectfully ask the following:

Which Owner’s Representative is being sought be this RFP? **This Owner’s Rep solicitation and position is specifically for the Authority.**

Is it the intent to consider responses as submitted for any of the three positions or only for the MSFA’s Owner’s Representative? **The intent is this Owner’s Rep is only for the Authority at this time because it is unknown whether the project group would accept either the Authority’s Owners**

Rep or Team's Owners Rep as the project groups Owners Rep when that is constituted. It is potential that the project group's Owners Rep would be to solely mediate issues between the Authority and Team.

How should a respondent distinguish a submittal as being submitted for a particular role? **Submit only for MSFA Owner's Rep role at this time.**

Can a respondent respond with a submittal for all three roles? **The Team is likely looking separately for an Owner's Rep just as the Authority is. I believe they may have a firm in mind but do not know with certainty what is occurring with the Team or its intents. If and when the Project Group decides to solicit an Owner's Rep, there would be a separate solicitation for that role.**