



Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Commissioners
Richard A. Corbett
Chairman
Tampa

Brian S. Yablonski
Vice Chairman
Tallahassee

Ronald M. Bergeron
Fort Lauderdale

Aliese P. "Liesa" Priddy
Immokalee

Bo Rivard
Panama City

Charles W. Roberts III
Tallahassee

Executive Staff
Nick Wiley
Executive Director

Eric Sutton
Assistant Executive Director

Karen Ventimiglia
Chief of Staff

Finance and Budget Office
Stuart Potlock
Purchasing Director

(850) 488-3427
(850) 921-2500 FAX

Managing fish and wildlife resources for their long-term well-being and the benefit of people.

620 South Meridian Street
Tallahassee, Florida
32399-1600
Voice: (850) 488-4676

Hearing/speech-impaired:
(800) 955-8771 (T)
(800) 955-8770 (V)

MyFWC.com

DATE: May 7, 2014
ADDENDUM NO.: 1
BID NO.: FWC 13/14-31
BID TITLE: Sea Turtle Education Campaign
ADD: Questions and Answers
UPDATE: Evaluation Criteria Clause and Reference Form

The Commission hereby amends FWC 13/14-31 with the following answers to written questions and modifications or clarifications to the original RFP. This Addendum Acknowledgment Form shall be signed by an authorized vendor representative, dated, and returned to the Commission prior to the opening date and time specified in the Calendar of Events.

Sharita Newman,
Procurement Manager

ADDENDUM ACKNOWLEDGMENT FORM

VENDOR NAME: _____

VENDOR FEID#: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY/STATE: _____

PHONE #: _____

FAX #: _____

E-MAIL: _____

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE: _____

TITLE: _____

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Is the \$270K the net amount for the four year plan, or is it per year?
This is the total amount over the four years.
2. Has there been any previous effort supporting similar campaigns in the area?
There are small local efforts but nothing across the Panhandle.
3. Is the quarterly reach objective (75% to 85%) Or is this the expected build up over the period of the four years?
No, objective has been set at this time.
4. What is the expected media ratio 2 to 1, 3 to 1, and is this considered a PSA campaign in its totality.
No, this is not considered a PSA campaign in its entirety, the amount of media is depended upon all parties.
5. Have you done any research on current awareness on Sea Turtles?
No.
6. What demographic groups are priority for this effort? Any particular ethnicity, age group?
Tourists and local beachfront property owners who would be visiting the beach or renting units along the beach, all age groups.
7. Is there any seasonality (time of year) that should be taken into consideration?
Yes nesting season and tourist season coincide – May through August, with less need through October.
8. Is there an incumbent?
No, there is no incumbent other than existing agency staff.
9. If yes, is the agency generally pleased with the work from the incumbent? What is the incumbent's budget?
N/A
10. Is there an existing awareness campaign? If so, do you desire to change direction or to continue with the look and feel of the existing materials?
Agency staff continually use different methods to promote education about marine turtles, their nests, and nesting habitat. This includes the agency website <http://www.myfwc.com/wildlifehabitats/managed/sea-turtles/> , Facebook, press releases, and training. But there is no designated educational campaign.
11. How much advertising is currently being done?
As noted above.
12. What advertising vehicle has been found to be most effective?
This is unknown.
13. What is the timeline for creating the communication plan?
Two weeks to identify the target audiences and develop key campaign messages and 30 days after that to develop and deliver the Sea Turtle Educational campaign.
14. Will responses from local contractors be judged preferentially?
No, responses will be evaluated as outlined in the RFP.

15. What specific goals do you have for this campaign?
A quantifiable increase in knowledge about sea turtles, lights, their occurrence in the Panhandle, by tourists and locals.
16. Could you elaborate on the request for a fixed-price contract? I can't answer this one.
We are requesting a fixed price for the development of the campaign (or whatever we called it in the RFP). You may just want to paste in the paragraph from the RFP where we talked about this. I thought we addressed the fixed price portion and then adding specific elements of the plan later.
17. Who at the FWC/Florida Department of Environmental Protection will be the selected agency's primary point of contact?
Karen Williams is the FWC contract manager, Pearce Barrett is DEP's contract manager.
18. Who will be tasked with reviewing and approving creative elements and the communication plan?
Both FWC and DEP project managers as well as staff in the FWC's marine turtle program in the Imperiled Species Management Section and Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. Staff in the FWC Community Relations office and Office of Public Access and Wildlife Viewing Services.
19. We understand that the vendor will be tasked with audience identification. However, who do you believe is your primary audience? Tourists? Locals? Business owners?
Tourists will be an important primary audience, but locals and business owners must also be included.
20. What do you feel are the most common misconceptions about sea turtles along the Panhandle?
There is a general lack of knowledge that sea turtles nest on Panhandle beaches and how visitors impact them by leaving equipment on the beach or leaving lights on in their rental units.
20. Do you have any existing research about the level of awareness regarding sea turtles in the seven counties noted in the RFP?
No.

The following modifications to the RFP are made and highlighted in yellow.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. General

1. The FWC reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals received and reserves the right to make an award without further discussion of the responses submitted. Therefore, responses should be submitted initially in the most favorable manner.
2. A non-responsive proposal shall include, but not be limited to, those that: a) are irregular or are not in conformance with the requirements and instructions contained herein; b) fail to utilize or complete prescribed forms; or c) have improper or undated signatures. **A NON-RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.**

3. The FWC may waive minor informalities or irregularities in the proposals received where such are merely a matter of form and not substance, and the corrections of which **ARE NOT PREJUDICIAL** to other respondents.

B. Scoring

Up to 100 points shall be awarded based on the categories outlined below.

1. **Prior and Related Experience** – Total 20 Point Value

Proposer's prior business experience as it relates to this project. Consideration shall be given to both the extent and type of prior experience by the Proposer.

2. **Project Plan** – Total 60 Point Value

- A. Demonstration of Understanding (10)
- B. Approach (15)
- C. Experience and ability (5)
- D. Optional Services offered and the costs of those optional services (10)
- E. Vendors Project Plans/Drawings if applicable (20)

3. **Price** - Total 20 Point Value

1. Each evaluation member independently evaluates each proposal and records their ratings on a score sheet. With the exception of the cost evaluation, scores shall be made as follows:

- 0 (zero) - Not addressed at all in Vendors response.
- Low Points - Vendors response shows limited applicability.
- Median Points - Vendors response shows some applicability.
- Highest Possible Points - Vendors response shows substantial or total applicability.

Please note: Evaluator independently chooses the score based on their own judgment. Failure of the vendor to provide any of the information required in their RFP response should result in a score of zero (0) for that element of the evaluation.

2. The vendor submitting the lowest cost will receive the maximum points for the cost element of the evaluation. The other vendor's scores will be based on a relative percentage of the dollar amount higher than the lowest cost or price submitted by the lowest priced respondent.

Note: A formula may be used by FWC when scoring the cost proposal. The following cost formula may be used to determine the number of points added to the scores of the offers under review:

$$\text{Cost Factor} = a/n \times (b) = c$$

Where:

a - Lowest proposed cost

n - Proposed cost for Respondent under review

b - Number of maximum points awarded for lowest proposal

c - Score awarded to next lowest cost

3. References: Past performance will be scored based on answers to a standard group of questions received from three (3) of the respondent's references, as described in the Attachment B, Evaluation Questionnaire for Past Performance. The FWC will attempt to contact the reference by phone up to a maximum of four (4) times. In the event that the contact person for the reference cannot be reached following the specified number of attempts, the respondent shall receive a score of zero (0) for this element of the evaluation. The FWC will not attempt to correct incorrectly supplied information.

ATTACHMENT C
FWC 13/14-31
REFERENCES FORM

In the spaces provided below, the respondent shall list all names under which it has operated during the past five (5) years.

On the following pages, the respondent must provide the required information for a minimum of three (3) separate and verifiable clients. Do not list projects completed for the Commission (see next paragraph). Information on each client must be provided on this Attachment. Any information not submitted on this attachment shall not be considered. All clients listed must be for the provision of **software services** similar to that described in this solicitation. Confidential clients shall not be included. Any additional references listed, over the minimum of three required, will be considered in determining if the respondent has satisfied the requirements for the three references as set out herein.

The Commission will review its records to identify all contracts that the respondent has undertaken with the Commission, where the respondent was the prime vendor, during the last five (5) years (in effect during or after September 2009) for use in the evaluation of Past Commission Performance, if applicable.

The same client may not be listed for more than one (1) reference (for example, if the respondent has completed for project for the Florida Fish and Wildlife – Region One and one project for the Florida Fish and Wildlife – Region Two, only one of the projects may be listed because the client, the Florida Fish and Wildlife, is the same).

Clients that the respondent has provided having any affiliation with the respondent (i.e. under common ownership, having common directors, officers or agents, or sharing profits or liabilities) may not be used as Past Performance references under this solicitation. Also, clients that the respondent has listed as subcontractors in their response may not be used as Past Performance references under this solicitation.

In the event that the respondent has had a name change since the time work was performed for a listed reference, the name under which the respondent operated at the time that the work was performed must be given at the end of the project description for that reference.

In the event that respondents submit a response as a joint venture, at least one (1) past performance reference client must be listed for each member of the joint venture. However, the total minimum number of clients to be listed remains three (3).