



ADDENDUM NO. 1

TO: All Prospective Respondents

DATE ISSUED: October 19, 2026

SOLICITATION NO.: RFQ No. 2026-004

SOLICITATION TITLE: Treasure Island Stormwater Utility and Right-of-Way Improvements

RESPONSE DUE DATE: November 2, 2026, at 11:00 a.m.

ADDENDUM SUBJECT: Responses to Questions and Clarifications

This Addendum amends the above-referenced solicitation. Except as expressly modified by this Addendum, all solicitation requirements, terms, and conditions remain unchanged and in full force and effect. This Addendum is part of the solicitation documents. Respondents shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the manner required by the solicitation documents. Failure to provide the required acknowledgment may result in the Response being deemed non-responsive.

1. SOLICITATION REVISIONS

- 1.1 No revisions to the solicitation are being made under this Addendum. All original terms, conditions, requirements, and deadlines remain unchanged.

2. QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

- Q1. Can the Village confirm the anticipated project limits? Should respondents assume the project includes all Village-owned rights-of-way within Treasure Island, or are there specific priority areas currently identified for implementation? In addition to the proposed stormwater park, should the consultant anticipate improvements on any non-right-of-way properties, easements, or parcels, or should the scope be limited to public rights-of-way and Village-owned facilities?
- A1. The anticipated project area is Treasure Island, including Village-owned rights-of-way and the proposed Stormwater Park at 7560 West Treasure Drive, as described in Section 2 of the RFQ. Other areas of improvement may include outfalls and existing/proposed easements. Specific improvements and implementation priorities will be determined during project development.



- Q2. Does the Village anticipate authorizing services in phases (e.g., alternatives analysis, design, permitting, bidding support, and construction administration), or is the intent to negotiate and authorize services for the full project lifecycle through construction completion? Budgeting for permitting and/or construction prior to agreed upon design concepts would be more difficult.
- A2. The RFQ anticipates professional services through construction completion, as described in Section 2.1.6. The specific scope, schedule, compensation, and authorization of services will be established during contract negotiations.
- Q3. Please clarify what existing information and data will be made available to the selected consultant. This may include, but is not limited to, GIS mapping, hydraulic and flood models, groundwater and tidal data, survey and topographic information, utility records, CCTV inspections, condition assessments, permitting documentation, and previous engineering studies.
- A3. The Village will make available existing project-related information in its possession, as applicable. The Stormwater Master Plan is provided as Exhibit C for reference. Additional available information will be provided to the selected Consultant during project development.
- Q4. Should respondents anticipate including a public engagement or communications specialist as part of the proposed team? Or does the Village intend to lead public outreach and stakeholder engagement activities directly?
- A4. Section 2.1.6 includes public involvement services within the Consultant's scope. Respondents should propose a team capable of performing the services required by the RFQ.
- Q5. The RFQ references LEED AP or ENV SP credentials. Will the Village also recognize LEED Green Associate credentials as satisfying this requirement?
- A5. The Village does not consider the LEED Green Associate credential to demonstrate the level of proficiency desired for this project. However, the Village will consider other professional accreditations that demonstrate equivalency to LEED Accredited Professional (LEED AP) or Envision Sustainability Professional (ENV SP), as they relate to the scope of work.



Q6. Section 9.1 contains a Most Favored Nation provision. For larger firms with numerous active contracts across multiple jurisdictions, ongoing compliance verification may be challenging. Would the Village consider limiting this provision to comparable professional services contracts within Miami-Dade County or the State of Florida?

A6. The provision remains unchanged.

Q7. Has funding for the anticipated design and construction phases been fully identified or secured? If not, what funding sources is the Village currently pursuing or expecting to utilize? Additionally, are there any known funding constraints, grant requirements, or budget considerations that may affect project prioritization, phasing, or implementation? Given ongoing discussions surrounding Florida Amendment 3 and its potential impact on local government revenues, does the Village anticipate any effect on the funding strategy, delivery approach, or phasing of the Treasure Island Stormwater Utility and Right-of-Way Improvements project?

A7. Funding for the design and implementation phases of the Treasure Island Stormwater Utility and Right-of-Way Improvements project will primarily be provided through the voter-approved stormwater bond. The Village may also pursue supplementary state or federal grant opportunities to enhance or expand the project scope where appropriate.

At this time, the Village does not anticipate any funding constraints beyond standard requirements associated with potential grant programs, such as eligibility criteria, documentation, and schedule compliance. These conditions may influence project prioritization, phasing, or implementation depending on the final funding composition.

Regarding the potential impacts of Florida Amendment 3 on local government revenues, the Village is actively monitoring statewide developments. Based on currently available information, the Village does not anticipate any material effect on the funding strategy, delivery approach, or phasing of this project. Should future revenue impacts arise following statewide implementation, the Village will reassess capital planning priorities as necessary.

As described in Section 2.1.4, the Consultant shall evaluate implementation strategies and phasing that consider funding availability. The Village will determine project implementation based on available funding and applicable requirements.

Q8. We noticed that there is a page limit for special considerations. Is there an also page limit for the requested implementation strategy narrative?



- A8. No page limit is specified for Tab G – Project Implementation Strategy. Respondents should provide a concise narrative addressing the requirements of the RFQ.
- Q9. Regarding Tab E – Project Team/Personnel Qualifications, Item 5 (Page 6), the RFQ states: “For each task, list each individual Key Staff member, including subconsultants, and indicate their relative involvement on the task (based on number of hours per week). Also indicate the relative involvement of the Prime Consultant and each key subconsultant on the project in total.” Given that specific task assignments and staffing needs may vary as the project progresses, would the Village accept anticipated staff availability expressed as a percentage of each individual's available time, rather than estimated hours per week? We believe this approach would provide a clearer representation of the team's capacity and commitment while allowing flexibility as the project scope and schedule are further defined.
- A9. The Village understands that specific task assignments and staffing levels may evolve as the project advances. Accordingly, the Village will accept anticipated staff availability expressed as a percentage of each individual team member's available time, in lieu of estimated hours per week. Percentages should reasonably reflect expected levels of involvement and provide a clear representation of team capacity, commitment, and the proposed distribution of responsibilities. Final staffing levels will be confirmed during subsequent phases of scope development.
- Q10. As a follow-up to our previous question regarding Key Staff involvement under Tab E – Project Team/Personnel Qualifications, we would also like to request clarification on Form 8 – Key Staff & Proposed Subcontractors (Page 45 of 66). Form 8 requires respondents to identify each Key Staff member's concurrent project commitments, including “Commitment (Hours/week).” Would the Village also accept percentage of availability in lieu of hours per week for this section? We believe expressing availability as a percentage would provide a clearer representation of each team member's overall capacity to support the project.
- A10. See response A9.
- Q11. In regards to RFQ # 2026-004, we had the following questions: Page 14, Section 2.2 Appropriation/Grant Funding. We noted that the box is unchecked. Can the City confirm whether it intends to fully fund the project without relying on appropriation or grant funding?
- A11. The unchecked box in Section 2.2 does not constitute confirmation that the Project will be funded exclusively with Village funds. Funding sources and applicable grant requirements will be identified as funding is established.



3. ATTACHMENTS

- 3.1 No additional documents or attachments are being issued with this Addendum.