

August 27, 2026

POLK COUNTY, A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

ADDENDUM #1

RFP #26-320

**Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement
Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed**

This addendum is issued to clarify, add to, revise and/or delete items of the RFP Document for this work. This Addendum is a part of the RFP Document and acknowledgment of its receipt shall be noted on the Addendum.

Contained within this addendum: Revisions, Questions and Answers

To obtain a copy of the grant agreement, Davis-Bacon, Section 3 Compliance, updated copy of Exhibit 4 – Conflicts of Interest and Drug Free Workplace form please go the following FTP site: <https://ftp3.polk-county.net>, you will be prompted for a User ID and Password. The User ID is *procurevender* and the password is *solicitation*. After you have logged in to the FTP site, double click on the file folder “**RFP 26-320, Engineering Services- Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed.zip**”, select “Open” or “Save As” to download the Bid documents, drawings, and technical specifications. If you need assistance accessing this website due to ADA or any other reason, please email Jason Flucker-Williams at jasonfluckerwilliams@polkfl.gov.

Jason Flucker-Williams

Jason Flucker-Williams

Procurement Analyst

Procurement Division

This Addendum sheet should be signed and submitted with your submittal. This is the only acknowledgment required.

Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____

Company: _____

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

REVISION

DELETE IN ITS ENTIRETY:

Evaluation Criteria (pg. 12)

Tab 4 – Interaction with County and Regulatory Agency Staff (5 Points)

Tab 5 – Timely Completion of Projects (5 Points)

REPLACE WITH:

Evaluation Criteria (pg. 12)

Tab 4 – Interaction with County and Regulatory Agency Staff (10 Points)

Tab 5 – Timely Completion of Projects (10 Points)

DELETE IN ITS ENTIRETY:

Elevation Level 2 (Scoring)

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| • Approach to Project (Tab 2) | 35 Points |
| • Experience, Expertise, Personnel, and Technical Resources (Tab 3) | 35 Points |
| • Interaction w/ County & Regulatory Agencies (Tab 4) | 10 Points |
| • Timely Completion of Projects (Tab 5) | <u>10 points</u> |
| Subtotal Points | 80 points |

REPLACE WITH:

Elevation Level 2 (Scoring)

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| • Approach to Project (Tab 2) | 35 Points |
| • Experience, Expertise, Personnel, and Technical Resources (Tab 3) | 35 Points |
| • Interaction w/ County & Regulatory Agencies (Tab 4) | 10 Points |

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

-
- | | |
|---|------------------|
| • Timely Completion of Projects (Tab 5) | <u>10 points</u> |
|---|------------------|

Subtotal Points	90 points
-----------------	-----------

DELETE IN ITS ENTIRETY:

Exhibit “4” Conflicts of Interest (pg. 46)

If the Respondent developed or drafted specifications, requirements, statements of work, or invitations for bids or requests for proposals for the work outlined in this RFP 26-370, the Respondent may not be considered for work under this RFP.

The Respondent hereby attests and certifies that they did not participate in the development or drafting of this RFP 26-370.

REPLACE WITH:

Exhibit “4” Conflicts of Interest (pg. 46)

If the Respondent developed or drafted specifications, requirements, statements of work, or invitations for bids or requests for proposals for the work outlined in this RFP 26-320, the Respondent may not be considered for work under this RFP.

The Respondent hereby attests and certifies that they did not participate in the development or drafting of this RFP 26-320.

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Questions and Answers

Question 1: What is the period of performance for the CDBG-DR grant that was awarded?

Answer 1: Upon execution to August 2030.

Question 2: Do design and construction both need to be completed within the grant period of performance?

Answer 2: Yes.

Question 3: “Modeling updates” are mentioned in the list of final design services. Can the County provide more information about current stormwater modeling that is available including:

- Software type/preferences
- If applicable, locations within the watershed where existing modeling has been completed
- If applicable, how recently were existing models completed?

Answer 3: Determining this information would be a part of the negotiated contract scope and would be gathered during the data collection phase of the project once awarded.

Question 4: The background section mentions project coordination across the Lake Hancock basin. If other stormwater projects are already in progress, can the County provide more information about the scope & timeline of those projects?

Answer 4: Over the years there have been significant number of studies conducted at specific project locations. Determining this information would be a part of the negotiated contract scope and would be gathered during the data collection phase of the project once awarded. In addition, Polk County Roads and Drainage and City of Lakeland Stormwater have ongoing projects within the basin.

Question 5: Are there any teaming requirements for this project?

Answer 5: No, the vendor will be required to work closely with Polk County staff and neighboring municipalities as necessary.

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Question 6: The Evaluation Criteria section (Pages 10–12) assigns Tab 4 – Interaction with County and Regulatory Agency Staff = 5 points and Tab 5 – Timely Completion of Projects = 5 points. Elevation Level 2 (Page 13–14) assigns Tab 4 = 10 points and Tab 5 = 10 points. Which point values govern?

Answer 6: Tab 4 – Interaction with County and Regulatory Agency Staff and Tab 5 – Timely Completion of Projects under the Evaluation Criteria section on Pages 10–12 are each worth 10 points.

Question 7: Under either reading, the criteria total 90 points, not 100 (Tab 2 = 35, Tab 3 = 35, Tab 4, Tab 5, Tab 6 = 10). Please confirm the maximum available score per Selection Committee member and the maximum total score.

Answer 7: The maximum total score is 100 points. The Procurement Division will score each proposal on Tab 6 – Surveys of Past Performance for a maximum of 10 points. Each Selection Committee member shall score each proposal on the following evaluation criteria.

• Approach to Project (Tab 2)	35 Points
• Experience, Expertise, Personnel, and Technical Resources (Tab 3)	35 Points
• Interaction w/ County & Regulatory Agencies (Tab 4)	10 Points
• Timely Completion of Projects (Tab 5)	<u>10 points</u>
Subtotal Points	90 points

Question 8: Tab 3 requires a minimum of three (3) and maximum of five (5) projects. Exhibit 1 states surveys shall be sent to all clients identified under Tab 3, but the Tab 6 scoring table states Procurement "will take the average of all three surveys." If a Proposer submits five projects and five surveys, will all five be averaged, or only three? If three, which three would govern?

Answer 8: If a proposer submits (5) projects and (5) survey, all (5) will be averaged.

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Question 9: Will a Proposer be penalized under Tab 6 if a reference does not return a survey despite documented good-faith effort, or if Procurement is unable to reach a reference?

Answer 9: Proposers are responsible for ensuring that completed reference surveys are received for the projects identified under Tab 3. Procurement will score Tab 6 based on the completed surveys received in accordance with the evaluation criteria. A documented good-faith effort to obtain a survey will not substitute for a completed survey.

Question 10: Exhibit 1's survey form ends with "Please fax or email the completed survey to: _____" (blank). Please confirm the completed survey is returned directly to the Proposer for inclusion under Tab 6 and confirm no separate submittal to the County is required.

Answer 10: The proposer is responsible for ensuring that completed reference surveys are returned directly to the proposer and included in the proposal under Tab 6. Procurement will not contact references to obtain completed surveys. All required reference surveys must be included with the proposer's submittal to be considered under Tab 6.

Question 11: The Scope of Services (Page 9) states the County "will identify which firm(s) will be recommended to enter into project specific agreements as part of Elevation Level 3, Interviews," and Elevation Level 3 states the Selection Committee "are required to conduct interviews." However, the Proposed Meeting Dates document states the Committee may decide at the October 7 meeting not to interview and instead recommend contract negotiations with the highest-ranked Proposer. Please clarify whether interviews are mandatory when three or more Proposers advance to Elevation Level 2.

Answer 11: Yes. If there are three (3) or more Proposers in Elevation Level 2, the Selection Committee will elevate no fewer than the three highest-scored Proposers to Elevation Level 3 for interviews, in accordance with Section 287.055(4)(a), Florida Statutes.

Question 12: Elevation Level 3 lists "Volume of work previously awarded to each Proposer by the County" as a ranking factor. Please clarify the look-back period and whether continuing-service / master-service-agreement work orders count toward this factor.

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Answer 12: The look-back period will be based on the prior year's spend for each proposer. Continuing services and master-service-agreement work orders will count toward this factor.

Question 13: Tab 1 item (i) requires a "Drugfree Workplace" submittal, but no form appears in the RFP package. Please provide the required form or confirm a Proposer-generated statement is acceptable.

Answer 13: Please visit the FTP site to get a copy of the drugfree workplace form.

Question 14: Exhibit "4" – Conflicts of Interest references "RFP 26-370" twice in its body (26-370 is the concurrent Grant Administration solicitation). Please issue a corrected Exhibit 4 referencing RFP 26-320 or confirm that Proposers may strike and initial the correction.

Answer 14: Please visit the FTP site to obtain an updated copy of Exhibit 4 – Conflicts of Interest.

Question 15: Tab 1 items (a)–(c) carry a two-page limit. Please confirm that items (d)–(l) — incorporation documents, FBPE Certificate of Authorization, Attachments A and B, Exhibit 4, Drug-Free Workplace, Incorporation Information, Immigration Affidavit, and E-Verify Certification — are excluded from any page count.

Answer 15: Items (d)–(l) under Tab 1 – Executive Summary are excluded from the page count.

Question 16: Tab 3 imposes per-item limits (one page per project, one page per resume, two pages for key-staff availability) but no overall Tab 3 limit. Please confirm there is no aggregate page limit for Tab 3 and confirm whether the organizational chart and sub-consultant descriptions/resumes are excluded from the resume page counts.

Answer 16: Tab 3 – Experience, Expertise, Personnel & Technical Resources does not have an aggregate page limit. Proposers shall adhere to the maximum page limits specified for individual items under Tab 3. There are no specified page limits for the organizational chart or sub-consultant descriptions/resumes; however, the information provided should be brief and limited to key personnel who will be assigned to perform the intended services.

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Question 17: Please confirm that tab dividers, covers, and tables of contents do not count toward page limits, and advise whether minimum font size, font type, or margins apply.

Answer 17: Tab dividers, covers, and tables of contents do not count toward the specified page limits. There are no minimum font size, font type, or margin requirements; however, all information provided should be clear and legible.

Question 18: The Kiteworks file-naming instruction references a "Cost Tab, if applicable." Consistent with CCNA (F.S. 287.055), please confirm that no fee or cost information is to be submitted with the proposal and that compensation is negotiated only at Elevation Level 4.

Answer 18: No fee or cost information shall be submitted with the Proposal. The reference to a "Cost Tab, if applicable" in the Kiteworks file-naming instructions is not applicable to this RFP. Compensation will be negotiated at Elevation Level 4 in accordance with Section 287.055(5), Florida Statutes.

Question 19: Please confirm the deadline to email the Procurement Analyst for a Kiteworks upload link is 48 hours prior to 2:00 p.m. on September 2, 2026 (i.e., by 2:00 p.m. Monday, August 31, 2026).

Answer 19: The 48-hour timeframe is highly recommended, but not mandatory. Proposers are encouraged to request a Kiteworks upload link early to allow sufficient time for the Procurement Analyst to provide the link prior to the Proposal due date and time. Requests made closer to the proposal deadline may not allow sufficient time for the upload link to be provided, in which case the proposer will be required to submit a physical copy of its proposal in accordance with the solicitation requirements.

Question 20: The Notice and the RFP Package both reference "RFP Package 2." Please confirm the currently posted package is the controlling version and that no prior package remains in circulation.

Answer 20: The currently posted Notice and RFP Package are the only versions for this solicitation. There is no prior RFP package in circulation.

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Question 21: Have the specific project components and sites already been defined in the Florida Commerce Subrecipient Agreement (MS024) Scope of Work, or will the selected firm develop and screen alternatives? Please make the Exhibit A scope of work and approved project description(s) available to Proposers.

Answer 21: Please refer to Exhibit A – Scope of Work for the specific project components, sites, and approved project information. Exhibit A is available on the FTP site and begins on Page 21 of the Exhibit 2 – Grant Agreement file. Please follow the instructions on Page 1 of the RFP Package to access the FTP site.

Question 22: What existing data will the County provide to the selected firm — H&H models (ICPR, XPSWMM, SWMM, HEC-RAS), LiDAR/topographic data, watershed or stormwater master plans, prior feasibility studies, water quality monitoring data, as-builts, and existing survey or geotechnical data?

Answer 22: Determining this information would be a part of the negotiated contract scope and would be gathered during the data collection phase of the project once awarded.

Question 23: Several key control structures in this watershed are owned and operated by SWFWMD (e.g., the Lake Parker outlet and the P-11 structure on Saddle Creek) and by the City of Lakeland (Lake Bonny–Lake Parker structure and pump). Will work involve modification of these assets, and are interlocal or partnership agreements in place with SWFWMD, the City of Lakeland, and the City of Bartow?

Answer 23: All control structures within project boundary of the watershed should be evaluated. Engineering recommendations may involve recommendations to some of these assets, this would be determined through the design process.

Question 24: For Project 2 (21st Century Water Quality Improvement Solutions), have target locations, target pollutants, and load-reduction goals been established (e.g., tied to the Lake Hancock / Lower Saddle Creek TMDL or an adopted BMAP)? Is the County seeking specific technologies (algae harvesting, media-based nutrient removal, STAs/wetland treatment, nanobubble, dredging), or is technology selection part of the alternatives analysis?

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Answer 24: Technology selection and location within the project boundary is a part of the design process. The 21st Century means that not only is there a water quality improvement solution, but there are additional benefits created as a result of the treatment.

Question 25: The Background states the \$70,000,000 award supports the overall program, while the two projects listed total \$44,300,000 (Project 1: \$39,800,000; Project 2: \$4,500,000), inclusive of design and construction. Please clarify how the remaining ~\$25,700,000 is allocated (land acquisition, grant administration, construction consultant, contingency) and confirm the engineering fee budget or percentage the County anticipates for each project.

Answer 25: Please review the Grant agreement for the details of the budget breakdown and requirements.

Question 26: The Background states the County will separately procure a "construction consultant(s)." The Scope of Services under this RFP includes CEI services. Please clarify the division of responsibility and confirm whether CEI is within this contract, a separate procurement, or an optional task.

Answer 26: CEI would be a part of this agreement. Construction services would be separate.

Question 27: Is any portion of this work expected to be delivered under an alternative delivery method (CMAR, design-build, progressive design-build)?

Answer 27: Construction services must be procured through federal CDBG-DR requirements.

Question 28: Will the design be delivered as a single construction package per project, or is phased/multiple-package bidding anticipated? Approximately how many construction contracts does the County expect per project?

Answer 28: This will be determined during the study/design phase.

Question 29: May firms submit proposals for only one of the two projects identified within this RFP?

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Answer 29: Yes. Proposers may submit a proposal for one or both of the projects identified within the RFP. Proposers are not required to submit for both projects.

Question 30: May a front cover and cover letter be included with Tab 1 – Executive Summary and not have that count against the two-page limitation?

Answer 30: No. If a front cover and cover letter are included within Tab 1 – Executive Summary, they will count toward the two-page limitation applicable to items (a)–(c).

Question 31: Will participation in this project preclude consultants from performing long-term follow-on work related to this project?

Answer 31: No.

Question 32: For the maximum of five projects highlighted in our proposal, can one be from our subconsultants?

Answer 32: No. The projects provided under Tab 3 must be projects performed by the Proposer as the prime firm.

Question 33: Key staff resumes are limited to one page, but is there a limit to the number of key staff that may be included?

Answer 33: No.

Question 34: Does Polk County have a preferred H&H model for this project? Will existing and current model efforts be provided as a baseline?

Answer 34: The County does not have a preferred model, but there are several existing that should be reviewed during the data collection and baseline conditions phases and a recommendation made while working with County feedback.

Question 35: Project selection: Can a proposer elect to be considered for only Project 1 or Project 2, or will all proposers be evaluated and ranked for both projects?

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Answer 35: Proposers may not elect to be considered for only one project. Proposers shall submit a Proposal in response to the RFP in its entirety and will be evaluated and ranked in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP.

Question 36: For the \$4.5M 21st Century Water Quality Improvement Solutions project (Project 2) treatment approach, will the awarded engineer be expected to evaluate alternative and/or supplemental nutrient-removal technologies as part of the design process?

Answer 36: Yes. The awarded consultant will be expected to evaluate alternative and/or supplemental nutrient-removal technologies, as well as identify the most effective locations.

Question 37: Design basis and budget: The original grant application contemplated 3-MGD algae harvesting system. Is 3 MGD still the intended design basis and is the \$4.5M construction budget intended to cover the complete installed system — equipment, site work, piping, electrical, utilities, monitoring, startup, and commissioning?

Answer 37: Yes. The 3-MGD algae harvesting system should be considered as one of the technologies evaluated during the design phase. The budget would also cover acquisition of land if necessary.

Question 38: If a technology/equipment provider participates as a subconsultant to the engineering team in developing the basis of design or performance specifications, would that affect the provider's eligibility to subsequently furnish equipment under the project's federal procurement requirements? It would be helpful to understand the County's anticipated procurement approach for the water-quality equipment.

Answer 38: Any procurement of equipment or technology under the project must comply with all applicable procurement and audit requirements of the grant agreement.

Question 39: The overall grant includes a separate \$23.1M Peace Creek Headwaters Restoration construction component, but it isn't identified as a separate project under this RFP. How does the County intend to handle the engineering and procurement of that component?

RFP 26-320 – Engineering Services for Water Infrastructure Repair & Water Quality Improvement Solutions for the Lakeland to Bartow Lake Watershed

Addendum #1

Answer 39: The design and engineering for that project is not funded through this grant project.