



ADDENDUM NUMBER 3

October 26, 2009

to

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

for

Ticketing and Baggage Claim Curbside Modernization and Related Work

HCAA Project Number 8030 10
TAMPA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
Tampa, Florida

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE MADE AND HEREBY BECOME A PART OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL DATED SEPTEMBER 24, 2009, FOR TICKETING AND BAGGAGE CLAIM CURBSIDE MODERNIZATION AND RELATED WORK AT TAMPA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, TAMPA, FLORIDA, AS PREPARED BY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.

QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS:

1. Can you please confirm that Addendum 1 eliminates the option of listing additional specialty consultants in the submittal?
Correct, Addendum 1 eliminates the option of listing additional specialty consultants.
2. Can you provide the name of the Signage Consultant that did the original landside terminal signage?
Information on the original landside terminal signage consultant is not available. The landside terminal building underwent a renovation and expansion in the mid 1980's, this project included work on the curbside signage. The graphics designer for this project was The Bugdal Group.
3. Should we utilize the same form (Appendix D) that you provided for both 6.3A and 6.3 B?
Yes
4. Should the SF 330 contain only resumes for key and support personnel?
Yes
5. Regarding the Organizational Diagram in **Section 6.1B** – do you want to see only the firms and personnel listed in Appendixes A and B, or should we include specialty consultants who we anticipate using but do not appear on Appendixes A and B?
Clearly identify key and support personnel only, additional firms and personnel roles and responsibilities should be discussed in the narrative response to Section of 6.1 C
6. Similarly, for **Section 6.1C** – should our written narrative regarding roles and responsibilities only include firms on Appendix A, or should we include the specialty consultants not listed on Appendix A?
See response to #5 above.

7. For the information requested in **Section 6.8 Attachments**, should the information be only for (1) the submitting firm, (2) from the firms and key/support personnel listed in Appendixes A & B, or (3) our entire team including anticipated specialty consultants not listed on Appendixes A & B?
Attachments should be provided for the firms and key and support personnel listed on Appendixes A and B.
8. I noticed that RS&H prepared the PowerPoint presentation for the project. My thought is that they would have inside knowledge about the project and would have an advantage over the other firms. Are they precluded from submitting on the project?
RS&H provided the conceptual design services related to ticketing and baggage claim curbside modernization while they were the Authority's General Consultant. The Authority's policy does not prohibit the Authority's current or former General Consultant from submitting on or otherwise competing for subsequent Authority work or projects. Furthermore, the final conceptual design presentation was made available to all potential proposers. Therefore, the Authority does not feel that RS&H's involvement in the previous conceptual design project would provide an advantage.
9. Regarding Section 6.1.C. the statement in that section is to "Provide a written response clearly defining responsibilities, contractual relationships and roles of all design team firms". The part that we want to be certain we are completely clear on is the reference to "all design team firms". Does the Authority want the written response to include all design firms or only those firms that appear in Appendix A?
See response to #5 above.
10. In regard to the SF330, do you prefer to see resumes for:
Just the individuals included in Appendix B; or
All design team firms (including key, support and other members of the team) as indicated in Section 6.1.c?
Just the individuals included in Appendix B

ATTACHMENTS

HCAA PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT



Keith Schrimp, Senior Architect

End of Addendum 3