Office of the Mayor-President Purchasing Division



City of Baton Rouge Parish of East Baton Rouge 222 St. Louis Street, 8th Floor P.O. Box 1471 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821 225/389-3259 FAX 225/389-4841

purchasinginfo@brgov.com

Paul Narcisse
Director of Purchasing

ADDENDUM NO. 1 ISSUED FEBRUARY 18, 2025

Request for Proposals for the Baton Rouge Convention Center Expansion and Headquarters Hotel Development Project, RFP Solicitation No. 2024-16-4010 for the City of Baton Rouge/Parish of East Baton Rouge

Your reference is directed to the above-referenced RFP scheduled to open on April 8, 2025, at 2:00 PM CST.

The following text is being added to the RFP solicitation:

GENERAL CLARIFICATIONS

The following general clarifications are made to supplement and, when in conflict with the terms of the RFP, supersede any information in the RFP.

1. **Experience and Qualifications.** The City-Parish wishes to supplement the language of the RFP to include the following:

The City-Parish wishes to identify a Respondent/Respondent Team that possesses and can illustrate in its response the following

- a. The ability to identify the Developers that may have serious interest in the Baton Rouge market and the Project. It is recognized that there are numerous developers that focus on larger, more robust markets. The Respondent should provide support that it has a deep understanding of the Baton Rouge market, the Project and can identify specific Developers who may have an interest in the Project.
- b. The City-Parish wishes to emphasize its interest in a highly qualified Developer who will bring a quality hotel franchise, directly or through a license. If the City-Parish can not attract a highly respected "flag", then it will terminate the Developer selection process. The flag should have strong quality based brand with a global marketing program.

c. Community engagement and education (not only in the Downtown area, but within the Greater Baton Rouge community) is a key component of this process. The Respondent shall provide its specific concept and process for community engagement.

2. Innovative Concepts. The City-Parish wishes to supplement to the language of the RFP to include the following:

The City-Parish wishes to encourage and emphasize innovative development concepts that may include other mixed uses, such as office, multi-family housing, independent commercial and retail.

The Respondent shall provide its innovative concepts of the utilization of the entirety River Center site including the two existing parking garages.

3. Small Entrepreneurship (MBE/SBE/WBE Initiatives.

The City-Parish recognizes that this is a solicitation for professional services and the ability to incorporate small entrepreneurship initiatives are limited. The City-Parish intends to have each Respondent assemble the best team in the nation to undertake this project.

4. Attachment B-1 Pricing Schedule Example.

In an effort to bring some consistency to the evaluation of each Respondent's fee proposal, Attachment B-1 will be substituted in its entirety and is provided in Excel format.

The City-Parish wishes to identify the components of services to be provided by the Respondent as part of its "Base Fee" and those services to be provided by third-party consultants ("Sub-Consultants") that will be retained by the Respondent and reimbursed by the City-Parish.

The list included in the new schedule is illustrative and may be supplement by each Respondent; however, the Respondent should respond to the questions related to the Sub-Consultants identified in the schedule.

Importantly, the City-Parish would prefer that the Respondent identify any and all Sub-Consultants that may be a part of the Respondent's team that will be reimbursed by the City-Parish. This relates to questions in the RFP as to identification of the Respondent's team and staffing. The Respondent will be reviewed taking into account the quality, experience and expertise of the entire

Respondent team, including the proposed Third-Parity Sub-Consultants.

However, if the Respondent wishes to retain a Third-Party Consultant in the future, the Respondent will have to obtain the approval of the City-Parish for retaining the Third-Parity Consultant to be reimbursed by the City-Parish.

The inclusion of a Respondent Team Member in the Attachments is not to be deemed an indication that the City-Parish is requiring the Respondent to include any one or more of the Sub-Consultants. It is within the sole discretion of the Respondent to assemble the team that it deems best to perform all of the Scope of Services.

Additionally, a section of the proposed reimbursable costs that the Respondent is proposing in compliance with the language of Section 1.5 – Financial Proposal – Last bullet point.

Respondent Questions.

The following responses are being provided to questions asked during the Inquiry Period with the responses in blue.

- Q1 General Formatting Does the proposal have to be provided in Word, or can it be provided in PDF format? Word format will not allow for optimal inclusion of visual content such as graphs and tables. Would it be acceptable to submit a designed PDF of the full proposal in addition to a Word document of the scope narrative?
- R1 Please provide your response in both formats. Please feel free to incorporate graphics in the Word format by integrating a pdf format graphic or the snipping tool or similar tools.
- Q2 Exhibit B Should Exhibit B be considered the final authority on formatting for this proposal, and shall the applicants disregard previous formatting requirements outlined in the RFP in favor of those outlined in Exhibit B? Content and formatting requirements outlined earlier in the document do not fully align with those outlined in Exhibit B.
- R2 Exhibit B is illustrative and the Respondent should adhere to the formatting requirements set forth in RFP. You will note that new
- Q3 Exhibit C Should these requirements be incorporated into the larger proposal document, or should they be addressed separately and included as addenda at the end of the document?
- R3 You can certainly incorporate in the larger proposal, but it must be an addendum at the end of the document.

- Q4 Page 15 Can you confirm that the mention of "janitorial services" is an error and not required of the Owner's Advisor? [Technical Proposal Respondent's Qualifications and Prior Experience]
- R4 Please consider this deleted.
- Q5 Page 16 Can you clarify the requirements of the Staffing Plan? A few of the bullets do not appear to directly relate to the Owner's Advisor role/are not complete. (Unless this may be omitted in favor of the proposal content requirements outlined in Exhibit B, which does not include a Staffing Plan).
- R5 Simply, how do you intend to staff the project to execute the full scope of services. Are you using "in house" talent for scope of services? Are you going to use third-party consultants for other identified services?

I believe that the new Attachment B-1 provides a good outline for what the City-Parish is requesting. Please keep in mind that the updated Attachment B-1 can be supplemented with other potential team members that a Respondent believes would benefit the project.

- Q6 Project/Process Clarification Does the City of Baton Rouge have a preference as to whether (i) the City hires a cost consultant for the Project, (ii) the Owner's Advisor hires a cost consultant acceptable to the City as part of the Owner's Advisors scope of work but after award with the costs being added to the Owner's Advisor's work as an additional service, or (iii) proposers include the cost consultant with its proposals? Note that the alternative (ii) provides for a more streamlined approach and allows the creation of the strongest consulting team for the City.
- R6 The City-Parish believes that there is more efficiency in the Owner's Advisor hiring each Third-Party Consultant the cost of which would be reimbursed by the City-Parish.
- Q7 Project/Process Clarification Will the architect that is part of the Owner Advisor's team be precluded from being part of a team that is eventually selected to design the Project?
- R7 Yes. It is contemplated that the Owner's Representative's "Primary Team Members" identified on Attachment B-1 will be available to continue to provide independent advice to the City-Parish through planning, permitting, construction and at least one-year of operations at the option of the City-Parish.

Q8 Per Section 1.5, "Proposal Response Format," Page 14, the RFP states: "Follow the format and order of presentation described below." However, per "Attachment A," Exhibit B, "Format Requirements for Proposal," Pages 49-51, Exhibit C, "Minimum Requirements for Owner's Advisor," Page 52, and Exhibit E "Proposer Disclosures," Pages 54-59, there is additional information being requested.

Question: Can you provide clarification about where the additional information requested in "Attachment A" exhibits should be included in the "Proposal Response Format?"

- R8 All of the information contained in the body of the RFP and the attachments must be provided. Although the Respondent may populate the requested information in the attachments, it is free to include the information in its
- Q9 Per the RFP, "Approach and Methodology," Staffing Plan, Page 16, there seems to be a few words missing in bullets 1 and 3.

 Please provide the specific language for each of these bullets.
- R9 Bullet 1: "Provide a detailed narrative of the Proposer's transition plan for the start up of the Scope of Services"

Delete bullet 3

Q10 Per the RFP, Technical Proposal, "Respondent's Qualifications and Prior Experience," Page 15, it states "Present examples of prior engagements where the vendor provided janitorial services, demonstrating successful and above satisfactory outcomes. Highlight how these examples align with the City-Parish's goals and objectives. (See Section 1.1.2)"

Question: Should the Respondent provide additional examples other than "janitorial services?"

- R10 Delete in its entirety.
- Q11 The RFP asks for three (3) client references on Page 16 and five (5) client references on Page 49.

Question: How many client references should the Respondent provide?

R11 Three (3) or more client references is acceptable.

Q12 Per the RFP, Cover Letter, Page 14: Bullet #1., states "The person signing the proposal must be:" and then goes into the second bullet which does not speak to it.

Question: Can you please provide the additional language that goes at the end of Bullet #1?

- R12 "The person signing the proposal must provide written authorization from the Respondent of his/her authority to bind the Respondent (for example, a Resolution of Authority).
- Q13 Page 28, 2.2 Period of Agreement the RFP indicates the "contract...shall cover all project components through project completion." Page 46, Contract Renewal indicates a 12-month contract, (2) 1 year renewals and a maximum contract time of 12 months.

Question: Please clarify the intent related to the duration of the contract.

- R13 "Contract Term: initial 12-month contract with multiple (1) year renewals with the agreement of the parties with a maximum contract term of thirty-six (36) months. The Respondent's response should take this Contract Term into consideration for purposes of its proposal for its Fee staging and benchmarking."
- Q14 Per the RFP, Page 23, 1.27, 3rd Paragraph indicates that the Contractor should not submit its own terms and conditions. Page 28, 2.6.2, last sentence requests Contractor to submit "terms and conditions which the Proposer wishes the City-Parish to consider."

Question: Please clarify what is to be submitted relative to alternative terms and conditions?

R14 "The City-Parish will consider terms and conditions which the Respondent wishes the City-Parish to consider."

It should be understood that material changes to the City-Parish contract may result in an adverse view of the Respondent's proposal.

Q15 Per the RFP, Page 30, first bullet – references the Proposer and the Library reaching contractual agreement.

Question: Please clarify the role of the library related to this project?

R15 Delete. The library is not a component of this Project.

Q16 Per the RFP, Page 31, (15) – Demonstration of financial strength and capacity to perform services.

Question: Please clarify what information is needed in order to evaluate the financial strength of our team?

R16 This is up to each Respondent to provide what information it wishes to provide to demonstrate financial strength and capacity recognizing that the information will become a public document subject to the Louisiana Public Records Act.

The addendum is hereby officially made part of the referenced solicitation and should be attached to the bidder's bid or otherwise acknowledged therein.

Signature	Date	Respondent

BATON RC	BATON ROUGE CONVENTION CENTER EXPANSION AND HEADQUARTERS HOTEL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	EXPANSION AND HE	ADQUARTERS H	HOTEL DEVELOR	MENT PROJECT	
	OWNER'S	OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE SELECTION PROCESS	ELECTION PROC	ESS		
		PRICING SCHEDULE FORMAT	FORMAT			
		PROFESSIONAL FEES	FEES			
	[Full Description of Base Fee Proposal for Respondent "Base Fee"]	Fee Proposal for Respond	lent "Base Fee"]			· •
RESPONDENT TEAM MEMBERS ("PRIMARY TEAM MEMBER" indicated with an *)	Name if Known	This Specific Scope of Service to be included in Respondent's General Scope of Services (Yes/No)	Included in Base Fee (Yes/No)	To be provided by Third Party Sub- Consultant (Yes/No)	Respondent's Description of Third- Party Sub- Consultant's Scope of Services if Utilized	If provided by Third- Party Consultant, Estimate of Reimbursable Fee and Costs (which is subject to change)
Feasibility and/or Market Research Consultant*						· σ
Architectural/Design*						€
Civil Engineering						· ·
Geotechnical Engineering						· ·
Structural Engineering						· ·
Financial Advisor*						· ·
Cost Consultant*						
Traffic/Transportation Consultant		-				₩

Parking Consultant						ь
Construction Oversight Consultant						ь.
Hospitality Consultant						€9
Convention and Event Venue Consultant						
Mixed-Use/Retail Consultant						
Facility Management Consultant			440			
Community Engagement Consultant						\$
Project Marketing Consultant						. ↔
[отнек]						\$
5 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)						
TOTAL OF BASE	TOTAL OF BASE FEE AND PROJECTED THIRD-PARTY CONSULTANTS ("RESPONDENT FEE PROPOSAL")	-PARTY CONSULTAN	ITS ("RESPONDE	INT FEE PROPOS	SAL")	€ 9
	PROPOSED O	ED OTHER REIMBURSEABLE COSTS AND FEES	BLE COSTS AND	FEES		
DESCRIPTION		PURPOSE				AMOUNT OF PROPOSED REIMBURSEMENT
						\$
						\$

1	30	ī	ï	1	
υ	ь	₩	₩	€9	ь
) FEES
					THER COSTS AND
					URSEMENT OF O'
					TOTAL OF PROPOSED REIMBURSEMENT OF OTHER COSTS AND FEES
					T