

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Northeast Florida Military Installation Resilience Review RFP

QUESTIONS & RESPONSES

TO THE RFP FOR

Northeast Florida Military Installation Resilience Review

December 20, 2024

Northeast Florida Regional Council

40 East Adams Street, Suite 320, Jacksonville, FL 32202

Tel: (904) 279-0880

<http://www.nefrc.org>



Northeast Florida Regional Council

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Northeast Florida Military Installation Resilience Review RFP

- 1) Section 7 – Paragraph B – Staff Availability references a requirement to provide a list of current projects, project end dates, and the availability of key personnel proposed for this project.

It is not clear for whom the list of current projects and project end dates applies. Is this a list of projects for the consultant(s) submitting the proposal or the consultant staff members proposed for the project team?

Answer: The intent of the request is to ensure that staff assigned to the project have enough capacity and availability to successfully complete all tasks of the NE Florida MIRR. Please demonstrate key staff members' capacity to manage and complete the workload associated with this project.

- 2) Section 8 – Statement of Qualifications refers the reader to page 21 for further guidance on what should be included in the Statement of Qualifications. Is the additional guidance found on page 21 limited to the following statement:

“ . . . The proposal shall include sufficient information to enable the Northeast Florida Regional Council to fully evaluate the capabilities of the Contractor and the proposed approach to providing the specified services. Contractors and/or teams should demonstrate understanding of the proposed project.”

Answer: Please refer to page 20 instead of page 21 and include all information outlined in letters A-E. This was simply an error in the page reference.

- 3) Is the appropriate place to include brief overviews of projects relevant to the Military Installation Resilience Review Development project in Section 8 – Statement of Qualifications, which has a 10-page limit?

Answer: Yes

- 4) Section 9 – Contractor References includes a Reference Form – Appendix A to complete. Is there a limit on the number of references that can be provided in the proposal?

Answer: Yes, there is a limit of three references.

- 5) Page #21 “Submittals must be easy to read in Times New Roman or Arial, no smaller than 11 and adhere to the page limits set forth herein”

Question: Is it acceptable if labels within images or graphics are smaller - Y/N

Answer: Yes, smaller font is acceptable for labels within images or graphics.



QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Northeast Florida Military Installation Resilience Review RFP

- 6) Can the NEFRC please expand on the 'Priority Analysis' deliverable for Task 2? There is no mention of priority analysis being conducted within the scope of Task 2. Is this the same deliverable as the 'Priority Sector Analysis' deliverable for Task 3?

Answer: The Priority Analysis for Task 2 is based on community and base engagement specific to stakeholders' feedback, whereas the Priority Sector Analysis for Task 3 is based on data and analysis in relation to threats and hazards and their impacts on critical sectors, services, and operations.

- 7) Can the NEFRC please clarify the goals of the Unified Resilience Assessment Standard? It is not defined within the scope.

Answer: Department of Defense (DoD) installations have not consistently assessed risks from extreme weather and climate change effects or used consistent projections to anticipate future climate conditions and the corresponding impacts on community infrastructure, which support the installations. This deliverable will reflect an agreement between the subject installations on resilience assessment standards. A regional assessment standard will be developed in partnership with other statewide efforts, such as those ongoing efforts in the Northeast Florida region, as appropriate.

- 8) Is the cost-benefit analysis described in Task 8 referring to the same cost benefit analysis for site-specific actions described in Task 6?

Answer: No, the cost benefit analysis described in Task 6 should be based on data in reference to evaluating multiple site-specific solutions, whereas the cost benefit analysis described in Task 8 should be based on the value of the development of community partnerships in comparison with single entity action and should be based on Unified Resilience Assessment Standards.

- 9) Can the NEFRC please clarify the intention of the draft agreements listed in Task 8?

Answer: This deliverable will reflect an agreement between the subject installations on resilience assessment standards. A regional assessment standard will be developed in partnership with other statewide efforts, such as those ongoing efforts in the Northeast Florida region, as appropriate.

- 10) Would the NEFRC consider extending the deadline for the proposal submittals due to the holiday schedule when many staff are out of the office?

Answer: No

