CITY OF TALLAHASSEE

NOTICE TO RESPONDENTS **August 21, 2026**

ADDENDUM No. 2

RFP-089-26-RR - RE-BID OF ON-AIRPORT RENTAL CAR CONCESSIONS AT TALLAHASSEE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

1. This addendum incorporates change(s) and/or clarifications to the above referenced RFP only in the manner and to the extent stated herein and shall become part of the resulting contract.

2. Bidder must acknowledge this addendum by accepting the addendum in Euna Procurement Portal.

3. If you have any questions on this or any related matter, please contact:
   E-mail: regina.register@talgov.com or through FRS TDD at 771.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

This addendum is being issued to provide answers to timely received questions during the Questions and Answers period.

Avis Budget Car Rental, LLC

Question re: space allocation for current occupants: RFP Section 3.5 Please clarify if Ready /Return spaces, Counters, and QTA's will be "grandfathered" for current occupants and not allocated by the succession of the awarded bids.
ANSWER: Delete subsection entitled "Grandfathering" from Section 3.5 Initial Space Allocation and replace with the following: **Grandfathering.** The City may permit successful Respondent(s) who currently occupy certain Exclusive-Use Areas, as defined in the current rental car concession agreements, the continued use or "grandfathering" of said Exclusive-Use Areas. All determinations regarding "grandfathering" will be on a case-by-case basis and at the sole discretion of the Director of Aviation.
Question re: Proposed Brands (Attachment 3): RFP Section 2.6.1 Please clarify: On the Proposed Brands form, there is no place for "Counter Preferences" but in the RFP, there is a reference to complete and include Attachment 3 - Proposed Brands and Counter Preferences.
ANSWER: Respondents need only include Proposed Brand and/or Trade Name on Attachment 3 and may ignore the reference to "Counter Preferences" in Section 2.6.1.

CITY OF TALLAHASSEE

ENTERPRISE

Questions – RFP No. RFP-089-26-RR Rental Car Concessions at TLH: 1. QUESTION: Will the City please confirm if a Bidder is allowed to submit more than one (1) Bid, so long as it doesn't duplicate brands within its bid
ANSWER: Respondents are NOT allowed to submit more than one (1) proposal or bid but may include up to three (3) brands within the single proposal or bid.
2. Additional Clarification Questions. Bidders should have an opportunity to ask clarification questions once the City provides responses to the initial questions asked through August 6th. QUESTION: Will the City please add a 2nd round of clarification questions to the RFP timeline, and allow Bidders up to five (5) business days after the next Addendum is issued to submit questions? **ANSWER:** No, there will not be a second round of Q&A, but an updated schedule is included with this addendum. QUESTION: If the City allows a 2nd round of clarification questions, we respectfully request ample time between the time City issues answers/final Addenda and the time Proposals are due? It should be no less than 3 weeks to allow Bidders to prepare their bid responses.
ANSWER: See previous response.
3. QUESTION: Please confirm that if City accepts fewer than three (3) Proposals, that no additional concessionaire will be added during the term of the Contract, other than those companies that are successful in this RFP process. Any RAC interested in operating at Tallahassee should not be able to NOT respond now, wait until it sees which companies bid and what MAGs are bid, and then enter into a contract at the minimum as this undermines the RFP process.
ANSWER: It is the stated intention of this RFP to select up to three (3) respondents and for all available concession spaces, ready-return spaces, and QTA spaces to be filled as a result of this solicitation. The City reserves the right to review all options that may be available and take the necessary steps to fulfill the stated intention.
4. QUESTION: Further, if City accepts fewer than 3 Proposals, please confirm that Airport will (i) first offer any resulting Rental Car Facilities (i.e., counters/back offices, Ready/Return spaces, QTAs) to the successful Proposers, and (ii) all counters/back offices, Ready/Return spaces, QTAs will be allocated amongst the successful Proposers.

ANSWER: It is the stated intention of this RFP to select up to three (3) respondents and for all available concession spaces, ready-return spaces, and QTA spaces to be filled as a result of this solicitation. The City reserves the right to review all options that may be available and take the necessary steps to fulfill the stated intention. This may include offering additional concession spaces, ready-return spaces, or QTA spaces to successful proposers.
5. QUESTION: Please confirm that City will work with successful Proposers to remove separation walls within the counter/back-office areas, with the work to be completed by the City.
ANSWER: Yes.
6. Peer-to-Peer Companies. QUESTION: Are there any peer-to-peer (P2P) / non-traditional rental car companies providing service at the Airport? **ANSWER:** Yes. QUESTION: If so, does the Airport have any formal written agreements with these operators? **ANSWER:** Yes. QUESTION: When does the existing P2P agreement expire? **ANSWER:** February 24, 2027. QUESTION: What are the terms of that agreement – (i.e., what is the arrangement for pick-up and drop-off of customers; what are the fees that operators pay to the Airport)?
ANSWER: This RFP is for selecting On-Airport Rental Car Operators and not peer-to-peer operators.
7. Fixed Base Operations (FBO). QUESTION: Is this rental car concession opportunity inclusive of FBO operations? **ANSWER:** Yes. QUESTION: If so, please confirm that only successful Bidders will be authorized to provide FBO service during the new term.
ANSWER: Yes.
RFP: 8. RFP, Section 1.9 (pgs. 9-10), Insurance Requirements. QUESTION: Will the City please confirm that if the insurance provisions in the RFP and the Concession and Lease Agreement differ, that the Agreement prevails? **ANSWER:** The Order of Precedence is established in Section 3.12 and shall govern.

QUESTION: Will the City confirm that Respondents can satisfy the required liability limits through umbrella, excess, self-insured, or other equivalent coverage provided the required coverage limits are maintained?

ANSWER: Yes, Respondents can potentially satisfy the required liability limits through umbrella, excess, self-insured, or other equivalent coverage provided the required coverage limits are maintained. Please see Section 1.9.7 that indicates any deductibles or self-insured retentions must be declared to and approved by the City.

QUESTION: Will the City please strike "Owned/leased autos, Non-owned autos, and Hired autos" from subsection 1.9.1 and replace with "Any auto"?

ANSWER: No Change in verbiage. Insurance coverage that applies to "Any Auto" will satisfy the City's insurance requirements.

QUESTION: Will the City please replace "covered" with "included" in line 2 of bullet point one in subsection 1.9.2?

ANSWER: No Change, "Covered" will remain.

QUESTION: Will the City please replace "$2,000,000" with "$1,000,000" next to "Annual Aggregate" in subsection 1.9.4?

ANSWER: The City is requiring $2,000,000 in annual aggregate coverage, not $1,000,000.

9. RFP, Section 1.9.6 (pg. 10), All Coverage: QUESTION: Will the City please strike, "and without further notice to Contractor" from the third bullet point of this section?

ANSWER: No, the verbiage will remain.

QUESTION: Will the City please replace "named" with "included" in the fourth bullet point of this section?

ANSWER: No, "named" will remain.

QUESTION: Will the City please replace "as its interests may appear" with "where their interests may appear arising in whole or in part by the conduct of the Respondent" in the fourth bullet point of this section?

ANSWER: No, the verbiage will remain.

10. RFP, Section 1.9.7 (pg. 11), Deductibles and Self-Insured Retention: QUESTION: Will the City please strike this section entirely as deductible and self-insured retention are the responsibility of the insured?

ANSWER: No, the section will remain.

11. RFP, Section 1.9.8 (pg. 11), Acceptability of Insurers: QUESTION: Will the City please replace “B+X” with “A-VII” in this section?
ANSWER: No, the B+X rating will remain.
12. RFP, Section 1.9.10 (pg. 11), Subcontractors: QUESTION: Will the City please replace “include” with “require” in this section?
ANSWER: No, “include” will remain.
13. RFP, Section 2.6.2 (pg. 21), TAB 2 – References. QUESTION: Will the City please waive the requirement for references from incumbent concessionaires? **ANSWER:** No. QUESTION: If the City will not waive the requirement for references for incumbents, please confirm that the City will allow incumbent Bidders to use the Airport as one of the required references?
ANSWER: No.
14. RFP, Section 2.6.3 (pg. 21), TAB 3 – Experience/Past Performance. Experience to describe “contracts awarded…date of award”. QUESTION: Please confirm that the City will allow Bidders to list the airports where we’ve operated for the last 5 years.
ANSWER: Yes.
15. RFP, Section 2.7.1 (pg. 23), Technical Scoring Criteria Table & Section 2.7.3 (pg. 24), Cost/Fee Scoring. QUESTION: Will the City update the Factor(s) to align with the Technical Score Maximum Points? **ANSWER:** The Technical Scoring Criteria table in Section 2.7.1 is deleted and replaced with the following.

CITY OF TALLAHASSEE

2.7.1 Technical Scoring Criteria Table

CRITERIA	EVALUATOR MAX SCORE	FACTOR	TECHNICAL SCORE MAXIMUM POINTS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL			
Tab 1 – Executive Summary/General Information	0	0	0
Tab 2 – References	10	2.5	25
Tab 3 – Experience/Past Performance	10	3.5	35
Tab 4 – Resumes	10	1.5	15
Tab 5 - Forms	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tab 6 - Cost/Fee Proposal	10	2.5	25
Total Maximum Points Allowed			**100**

QUESTION: Will the City confirm that the maximum number of MAG points is 30? If so, please update the table in Section 2.7.1 accordingly.

ANSWER: The maximum number of MAG points is 25 as stated in the Technical Scoring Criteria Table in Section 2.7.1. Section 2.7.3 included a fictional scoring example using an assumed 30-point total for the purposes of illustrating how the MAG points would be assigned.

16. RFP, Section 3.9 (pgs. 28-29), Installation and Lease Space Improvements – New QTA Facility. This section and provisions outlined in the Agreement appear to indicate that RACs may be responsible for completing improvements within the administrative/back-office areas of the New QTA Facility, but these sections appear to differ from Exhibit G-1, Line 31 which states that the Owner will provide RAC administrative space finishes. Providing fully built-out back-office space in a neutral finish supports efficient future reallocations and operational changes. QUESTION: Will the City please confirm that Exhibit G-1 governs?

ANSWER: To clarify the responsibility for the interior or administrative spaces within the New QTA Facility, Section 3.9 Is deleted and replaced with the following:

The Leased Premises and Common Use Areas within the New QTA Facility remain under construction and once completed, Exhibit B-4, New QTA Facility Site Plan, shall be updated to reflect the final areas and substituted in accordance with the Agreement. Upon receipt of a Certificate of Occupancy, the City shall provide the completed site and building, inclusive of core systems as detailed in Exhibit G-1 including mechanical, electrical, plumping, car wash, fueling, etc. Each building is unfurnished and individually metered for all utilities.

At their sole cost and expense, successful Respondent(s) shall be responsible for any interior furnishings within the Lease Premises necessary for operations. This may include any furnishings, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E); any CCTV or other security infrastructure, and any signage, trade dress/branding elements, or other supplies required for operations. No structural changes to the

site or building may be made and all FF&E materials proposed must comply with applicable City requirements and remain subject to the Agreement's terms and conditions.

All signage installed within the Leased Premises shall be coordinated with and approved by the Director or the Director's designee in advance and in writing to ensure consistency and standardization. Successful Respondent(s) shall bear all costs associated with signage maintenance, including labor, materials, and fees, unless otherwise agreed to in advance and in writing by the Director.

QUESTION: Will the City please identify the improvements and finishes that will be provided by the City within the New QTA Facility versus those that will be the responsibility of the RAC?

ANSWER: Refer to the response above and Exhibit G-1.

RENTAL CAR CONCESSION AND LEASE AGREEMENT (CA): 17. CA, Article II, Section 2.3, New QTA Facility & Section 8.4(B), New QTA Facility Space Plans and Specifications. QUESTION: Will the City please clarify the timelines in each of these sections and why they differ? Currently, there are different post Certificate of Occupancy timeline dates in each.

ANSWER: The New QTA Facility is currently under construction and is anticipated to be completed in 2027. The City will continue to share updates on the progress and schedule with selected Respondents to coordinate the transition to the new facility.

18. CA, Article III, Section 3.3(B), QTA Facility Rights. QUESTION: Will the City please clarify whether inoperable vehicles awaiting transport, repair, insurance inspection, or disposition may be temporarily stored within a RAC's assigned QTA space, and if so, what limitations or requirements apply?

ANSWER: Section 3.3(B) of the Agreement will be revised as follows:

Lessee shall not store damaged, wrecked, or inoperable vehicles within the Leased Premises for longer than thirty (30) calendar days without written approval from the Director.

19. CA, Article III, Section 3.9(D), Reports or Notice of Spills, Leaks, or Discharges. QUESTION: Will the City please add the following to line 11 of this paragraph to read, "Lessee shall have an updated contingency plan, if required by any local, County, state, or federal regulatory agency, in effect relating to releases that provides minimum standards…"?

ANSWER: No, but Section 3.9(D) of the Agreement will be revised to strike the word "updated" from Line 12.

20. CA, Article IV, Section 4.12, Phased Ramp-Up of Fair Market Value Building Rent – New QTA Facility. Charging FMV Facility (Building) Rent for a New QTA Facility that is being fully funded with CFCs is not aligned with the Rental Car industry standard custom and practice across North American Airports, where: • "Ground Rent" rate (at-grade "land rent" only) on the RAC's allocated space should be fair market value on the unimproved footprint of the parcel upon which the CFC-funded facilities are built. • No "Facility (Building) Rent" on CFC-funded Improvements. Where CFCs are used to fully-fund facilities used by the RACS, there should be no "building rent" (or vertical per-square-foot rent) charged by Airports on these facilities. Simply put, because the Airport did not fund the facilities, they cannot charge rent on them. Charging facility rent would be "double dipping" --- facilities are built without any airport funding (funded through the RAC transactions) yet airport charges facility rent as if they did fund improvements (charging a return on an investment for investment they did not make). • No additional rent component (i.e., "Facility (Building) Rent", "Improvement Rent" or "Space Rent") can be charged here since CFC funds are used to construct the New RAC QTA, and CFC funds, both pay-go and future collections, will be pledged to the debt service on the Bond/Loan. QUESTION: Please confirm the RACS only "rent" obligation is "Ground Rent" (charged only on the RAC's unimproved, at-grade portion of the New RAC QTA Facility footprint). **ANSWER:** No, the rents, fees, etc. are established in the DRAFT Agreement included in the RFP. QUESTION: Will the City please strike this Section in its entirety and only charge Ground Rent for the unimproved 'as is' value of the New QTA Facility at $0.40-$0.51/square foot/annum? **ANSWER**: No, the rents, fees, etc. are established in the DRAFT Agreement included in the RFP. QUESTION: Will the City remove the "Facility Rent" language within the Concession and Lease Agreement within Exhibit D-1?
ANSWER: No, the rents, fees, etc. are established in the DRAFT Agreement included in the RFP.
21. CA, Article VIII, Section 8.1, Construction by City. QUESTION: Will the City please confirm whether RAC administrative office areas will be delivered as shell space only or as completed office space ready for occupancy? **ANSWER:** Refer to the response to Question 16. QUESTION: If RACs are required to independently fund and construct administrative office improvements, and the Airport subsequently reallocates or reassigns space during the term of the Agreement, what protections, reimbursement rights, or relocation assistance will be provided to the affected RAC regarding its investment in those improvements?
ANSWER: Refer to the response to Question 16.

22. CA, Article XV, Indemnification and Insurance. QUESTION: Will the City confirm that Respondents can satisfy the required liability limits through umbrella, excess, self-insured, or other equivalent coverage provided the required coverage limits are maintained?
ANSWER: Yes, Respondents can potentially satisfy the required liability limits through umbrella, excess, self-insured, or other equivalent coverage provided the required coverage limits are maintained. Please see Section 1.9.7 that indicates any deductibles or self-insured retentions must be declared to and approved by the City.
23. CA, Article XV, Section 15.3, Business Automobile/Umbrella Liability Coverage. QUESTION: Will the City please strike “Owned/leased autos, Non-owned autos, and Hired autos” from this section and replace with “Any auto”?
ANSWER: No Change in verbiage. Insurance coverage that applies to “Any Auto” will satisfy the City’s insurance requirements.
24. CA, Article XV, Section 15.5, Environmental Impairment (Pollution) Liability Coverage. QUESTION: Will the City please replace “$2,000,000” with “$1,000,000” next to “Annual Aggregate” in this section?
ANSWER: The City is requiring $2,000,000 in annual aggregate coverage, not $1,000,000.
25. CA, Article XV, Section 15.7, Coverage Requirements. QUESTION: Will the City please add the following to the end of this section, “where their interests may appear for liabilities arising in whole or in part by the conduct of the Respondent.”
ANSWER: No, the verbiage will remain as written.
26. CA, Article XV, Section 15.8, Certificates of Insurance. QUESTION: Will the City please strike “at least ten (10) days” from this section?
ANSWER: No, the verbiage will remain.
27. CA, Article XV, Section 15.9, Insurer Rating. QUESTION: Will the City please replace “B+X” with “A-VII” in this section?
ANSWER: No, the B+X rating will remain.

28. CA, Exhibit B-4: New QTA Facility Site Plan. QUESTION: Will the City please provide the latest set of architectural permit drawings in Adobe PDF and AutoCAD file formats for each of the individual Sites?

ANSWER: Yes, a PDF copy of the Issued for Construction Drawings will be included with this Addendum.

QUESTION: Will the City please provide the Base Building scope of work for the New QTA Facilities?

ANSWER: The "Base Building" scope of work is defined in the Issued for Construction Drawings that are included with this addendum.

QUESTION: Will the City identify the complete list of equipment that will be purchased and installed within each of the three (3) QTA premises, specifically for Sites A, B and C? **ANSWER:** • What is the number of fuel/vacuum positions for each Site? **ANSWER:** • What is the number of vehicle car wash bays for each Site? **ANSWER:** • What is the number of vehicle service/maintenance bays for each Site? **ANSWER:**• What is the size of the fuel tanks? **ANSWER:** • Manufacturer, Make and Model of the aforementioned equipment to be procured by the City?

ANSWER: The New QTA Facility remains under construction and the Issued for Construction Drawings referenced above and included with this Addendum contain a basis of design for all equipment and the specific facility details requested above.

QUESTION: Will the City identify the perimeter security for the New QTA Facility (i.e., razor wire, guardrail, jersey barriers, etc.)?

ANSWER: Guardrail and a 10-foot chain-like fence with barbed wire.

QUESTION: Will the City please confirm whether the individual QTA areas are separately metered for electrical, water, and sewer utilities? If these utilities aren't separately metered, how will the Airport handle the monthly billing allocations?

ANSWER: Yes, each site is individually metered for all utilities.

QUESTION: Will the City please confirm how New QTA Facility waste management services will be handled and how costs will be distributed (i.e., trash dumpsters, compactors, etc.)?

ANSWER: A dumpster site is included for each Building A, B, and C. Each respondent will be responsible for their own waste management services.

? 29. CA, Exhibit F-1: Special Purpose Survey is missing. QUESTION: Will the City please provide a draft of this Exhibit for review? 3+0. CA, Exhibit G-1: Responsibilities Checklist.

ANSWER: This will be provided once the construction of the New QTA Facility is completed.

QUESTION: Will the City please confirm the Airport is responsible for the new Phase I and Phase II for the New QTA Facility? If so, can the RACs be added as a reliant party?
ANSWER: Additional details or clarification are needed before this question can be answered.

Priceless Car Rental

The following questions seek clarification of the minimum qualifications, evaluation criteria, facility allocation provisions, and related terms of RFP-089-26-RR and its Attachment 1 Agreement so that prospective Respondents can accurately evaluate eligibility and prepare responsive proposals. A. Minimum Qualifications and Experience (Section 3.3; Tab 2) 1. Structure of the minimum experience requirement. Section 3.3 requires that a Respondent "must have operated rental car concessions at a minimum of three (3) on-airport locations at commercial-service airports within the preceding three (3) years." Please clarify whether this requires (a) simultaneous operation of three locations at some point during the three-year period; (b) three years of continuous operation at each of three locations; or (c) operation at any three locations at any points, cumulatively, during the three-year period.
ANSWER: Yes, Section 3.3 implies concurrent operation at three (3) commercial service airports in the preceding three (3) year period.
2. Whose experience qualifies. For purposes of Section 3.3, please clarify whether the qualifying experience must be that of the proposing legal entity itself, or whether the City will also recognize the experience of a parent or affiliated company, a franchisor or brand system, a predecessor-in-interest, or the principals and key management personnel of the Respondent. If only entity-level experience will be recognized, please explain how the requirement applies to franchisees and to newly formed operating entities whose principals hold substantial industry experience.
ANSWER: Qualification and experience will be considered across the brand or family of brands proposed in the Respondent's proposal insofar as the Respondent is legally affiliated with said brand or family of brands and the reference is for on-airport rental car operations at a commercial service airport.
3. Definitions of key terms. Please define "on-airport location" and "commercial-service airport" as used in Section 3.3. Specifically: (a) does a Respondent's existing or prior concession at Tallahassee International Airport count as one of the three locations; (b) do consolidated rental car facilities and on-airport but off-terminal operations qualify; and (c) does any FAA-designated commercial-service airport qualify regardless of enplanement level?

ANSWER: On-Airport and Off-Airport Rental Car Operators are defined in Section 1.1 of the Solicitation. (a) Yes. (b) No. (c) Any commercial service airport as defined by the FAA.
4. Credit for existing Airport concession experience. Please clarify whether operating under a rental car concession agreement issued by Tallahassee International Airport — including an off-airport rental car concession under which the operator serves Airport passengers and remits a percentage of gross receipts to the City — constitutes "operat[ing] rental car concessions" at an "on-airport location" for purposes of Section 3.3, or otherwise counts toward the minimum qualifications.
ANSWER: No.
5. Relationship between Section 3.3 and Tab 2. Tab 2 requires at least three references from the past three years demonstrating experience operating an on-airport rental car business, with a combined minimum of three years of such experience, while Section 3.3 requires operation at a minimum of three on-airport locations within the preceding three years. These standards appear to differ. Please clarify which standard governs responsiveness and how the two provisions are intended to be read together.
ANSWER: To clarify, Section 2.6.2 is deleted and replaced with the following: Refer to Section 3.3 for additional details on Minimum Qualifications and Experience. Respondent(s) shall provide at least three (3) references from the past three (3) years' demonstrating experience operating an on-airport rental car business at a commercial service airport. Each reference must include a contact name, company name, phone number, email address, and a brief description of the services provided. References should be from current or former airport clients, where available, for whom the Respondent has performed services comparable in scope, size, and complexity to those contemplated in this solicitation, and who can independently verify the Respondent's performance. Respondent(s) may also include letters of reference attesting to their successful establishment, operation, and financial performance in a commercial service airport environment.
6. Scope of Tab 2 references. Please clarify whether each of the three required references must itself relate to an on-airport operation at a commercial-service airport, or whether the following may be included: (a) the Airport or the City as a reference for a Respondent's existing Airport concession; (b) references from a franchisor or brand system reflecting operations at commercial-service airports; and (c) commercial references demonstrating rental car operating performance generally.

ANSWER: Refer to the preceding response.
7. Franchise-system resources for minimum qualifications. Section 3.3 requires a commitment to provide a comprehensive national and international reservation system. Please clarify whether a franchisee Respondent may satisfy this requirement, and other brand- and system-related requirements, through the national reservation platform and systems of its franchisor, or whether the proposing entity must own and operate such systems directly.
ANSWER: Respondents must demonstrate in their responses how these criteria will be satisfied and how they will maintain compliance with the requirements.
8. Basis and competitive impact of the revised minimum qualifications. Section 3.3 tightens the minimum qualifications from “5 years operating a rental car business at a commercial-service airport” (RFP-027-26-RR) to “operated rental car concessions at a minimum of three (3) on-airport locations at commercial-service airports within the preceding three (3) years.” Please explain the operational basis for this change and confirm whether the City evaluated its impact on the pool of eligible respondents, including smaller, regional, or ACDBE-eligible firms that may not currently operate at three separate on-airport locations.
ANSWER: Section 3.3 of the RFP establishes the minimum qualification requirements for Respondents and will be the basis of evaluation for the Selection Committee whether each Proposal meets the requirements of the RFP.
9. Vehicle age and mileage standard. Section 3.3 requires that Respondents offer for rental only vehicles that are “no more than two (2) years older than the current year model and/or have no more than sixty thousand (60,000) miles.” Please clarify: (a) whether satisfying either criterion is sufficient, as the phrase “and/or” suggests; (b) the point in time at which compliance is measured (upon fleet induction, at each rental, or on a recurring basis); and (c) whether any exceptions apply for value-segment brands or specialty vehicles. Please also explain how these standards have been validated for current concessions.
ANSWER: (a) Yes. (b) Respondents must demonstrate in their responses how these criteria will be satisfied and how they will maintain compliance with the requirements. (c) No.
B. Concession Counters, Space Allocation, and Facilities Question 10 — Reduction in number of awarded concessions and disposition of remaining space Section 3.1 reduces the number of in-terminal rental car concession counters to be awarded from five (5) under RFP-027-26-RR to three (3) under RFP-089-26-RR, while Section 3.2 confirms the Airport is currently served by four (4) existing on-site rental car agency brand families. Given this reduction, please clarify the

following: 1. How does the City intend to address the fact that four incumbent RAC brand families currently operate at the Airport when only three concession counters are being competitively awarded under this RFP?
ANSWER: It is the stated intention of this RFP to select up to three (3) respondents and for all available concession spaces, ready-return spaces, and QTA spaces to be filled as a result of this solicitation. The City reserves the right to review all options that may be available and take the necessary steps to fulfill the stated intention.
2. What is the disposition of the remaining in-terminal counter and office space during the term of the resulting agreements — will it be decommissioned, held vacant, offered for lease at a later date, or absorbed into the footprint of an awarded Respondent?
ANSWER: It is the stated intention of this RFP to select up to three (3) respondents and for all available concession spaces, ready-return spaces, and QTA spaces to be filled as a result of this solicitation. The City reserves the right to review all options that may be available and take the necessary steps to fulfill the stated intention.
3. May a Respondent not awarded one of the three counters serve Airport customers in any other on-airport capacity?
ANSWER: Respondents not selected may reach out to the City after the Cone of Silence has been lifted.
4. Is it anticipated that the number of rental car brands serving the Airport will be reduced from four to three, or that some of the existing entities will consolidate their operations as a result of this procurement? Please clarify the City's operational rationale for the reduction and confirm whether any analysis was conducted regarding its impact on consumer choice and competitive access at the Airport.
ANSWER: It is the stated intention of this RFP to select up to three (3) respondents and for all available concession spaces, ready-return spaces, and QTA spaces to be filled as a result of this solicitation. The City reserves the right to review all options that may be available and take the necessary steps to fulfill the stated intention.
11. Grandfathering clause. Section 3.5 (Initial Space Allocation) and Attachment 1, Article II §2.6.3 introduce a new “Grandfathering” provision permitting Respondents who currently occupy Exclusive-Use Areas under existing agreements to continue occupying that space, independent of their ranking under the RFP's competitive scoring criteria. Please clarify: (a) whether Grandfathered Premises are excluded from the competitive space-allocation process described

in Section 3.5, and (b) how this provision is consistent with Section 2.7's stated intent to award space based on evaluated proposal ranking
ANSWER: Response from duplicate question: Delete subsection entitled “Grandfathering” from Section 3.5 Initial Space Allocation and replace with the following: **Grandfathering.** The City may permit successful Respondent(s) who currently occupy certain Exclusive-Use Areas, as defined in the current rental car concession agreements, the continued use or “grandfathering” of said Exclusive-Use Areas. All determinations regarding “grandfathering” will be on a case-by-case basis and at the sole discretion of the Director of Aviation.
12. Priority access to vacant space. Section 3.1 (Intent) states that if any facility offered under this RFP becomes vacant during the Agreement term, the City will first offer that space to “the RACs selected through this RFP process,” in order of Market Share, before offering it to any other company. Please confirm whether this priority mechanism was present in the prior solicitation, and if not, what prompted its addition.
ANSWER: The prior solicitation was canceled by the City such that anything contained therein is immaterial to the response to the current solicitation.
13. Whether use of QTA facilities is required. Please clarify whether an awarded concessionaire is required to lease and use a Designated QTA Space, or whether a concessionaire may elect to perform some or all fueling, cleaning, maintenance, and fleet servicing at an off-airport facility. **ANSWER:** Yes, selected Respondents will be required to use on-airport facilities. If off-airport servicing is permitted, please clarify how QTA-related rents, fees, and space assignments apply to a concessionaire that does not require QTA capacity, and whether QTA capacity remains the basis for limiting the number of concession agreements as to such an operator.
ANSWER: See preceding response.
14. Multiple brands at a single counter. Please clarify whether a Respondent may operate multiple franchise brands from a single in-terminal counter, and, if so, how multiple brands operated by one Respondent are counted for purposes of facility allocation, the evaluation process, and the provision limiting in-terminal operations to the three concession counters.
ANSWER: Respondents may offer up to three brands and terminal counter/office space will be assigned as detailed in the RFP.

15. Off-Airport / non-tenant access to terminal facilities. Section 3.16 (Attachment 1, Article III) states that the City "reserves the right to sell in-terminal advertising and allow in-terminal courtesy telephones for off-airport (non-tenant) rental car companies, at the Director's sole discretion." This discretionary language does not appear in the corresponding provision of RFP-027-26-RR. Please clarify what standard or criteria will govern the Director's exercise of this discretion, and whether off-Airport/non-tenant operators will be provided written notice of the standard applied to requests for such access.

ANSWER: The prior solicitation was canceled by the City such that anything contained therein is immaterial to the response to the current solicitation.

16. Ready/Return space count discrepancy. Section 3.7 (Ready Return Spaces) states the Director will allocate "two hundred fifty-four (253) Ready Return Parking Spaces" — the written number and the numeral do not match. Please confirm the correct total number of Ready/Return Spaces being allocated under this RFP.

ANSWER: The total number of ready return spaces is 253.

C. Evaluation Criteria and Contract Term 17. Cost/Fee scoring weight reduced. Section 2.7.1's Technical Scoring Criteria Table reduces the maximum points allocated to the Cost/Fee Proposal from 30 (RFP-027-26-RR) to 25 (RFP-089-26-RR), while increasing points for References (15→25) and Experience/Past Performance (30→35), and eliminating scoring for Tab 1 – Executive Summary/General Information (10→0). Please explain the basis for this reweighting.

ANSWER: The Technical Scoring Criteria table in Section 2.7.1 was determined at the sole discretion of the City. Please see preceding response whereby the Technical Scoring Table in Section 2.7.1 is deleted and replaced with the following.

2.7.1 Technical Scoring Criteria Table

CRITERIA	EVALUATOR MAX SCORE	FACTOR	TECHNICAL SCORE MAXIMUM POINTS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL			
Tab 1 – Executive Summary/General Information	0	0	0
Tab 2 – References	10	2.5	25
Tab 3 – Experience/Past Performance	10	3.5	35
Tab 4 – Resumes	10	1.5	15
Tab 5 - Forms	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tab 6 - Cost/Fee Proposal	10	2.5	25
Total Maximum Points Allowed			**100**

18. Contract term reduction. Section 2.2 changes the Agreement term from a single twenty (20)-year basic period (RFP-027-26-RR) to a ten (10)-year initial term with two five (5)-year renewal options exercisable contingent on written notice. Please confirm whether renewal is automatic upon timely notice or subject to additional City discretion or re-evaluation, and if the latter, what criteria will apply. D. ACDBE Program and Nondiscrimination

ANSWER: Section 2.2 Contract Term from the RFP and Article I – Term from the Agreement describe the process for the contract renewal options.

ARTICLE I - TERM

1.1 **Initial Term.** The "Initial Term" of this Agreement shall be for a Ten (10)-year period commencing on the "Commencement Date" so written above.

1.2 **Renewal Options.** Provided Lessee is not in default under any term or provision contained in this Agreement beyond any applicable notice and cure period, the Lessee shall have two (2) five (5)-year options to renew the Term of this Agreement ("Renewal Options"). Notice of Lessee's desire to exercise these Renewal Options may be submitted to the Director or Aviation ("Director") or designee at least six (6) months prior to the then-current option period.

2.2 CONTRACT TERM

Initial Term. The "Initial Term" of the Agreement shall be for a Ten (10)-year period commencing on the Commencement Date of the Agreement, as defined therein.

Renewal Options. The Agreement shall carry two (2) options to renew, each for a period of five (5) years (collectively, the "Renewal Options"). The Renewal Options may be exercised by providing written notice to the Director or the Director's designee at least six (6) months prior to the expiration of the then-current option period.

19. ACDBE Program Exhibit removed from the Agreement. Section 1.4 of RFP-089-26-RR states that ACDBE contract goals are paused pursuant to DOT's October 3, 2025 Interim Final Rule. However, Attachment 1 (the Agreement) no longer includes an "Exhibit E-2, ACDBE Program" or the corresponding Article VII provision requiring Lessee compliance with the City's ACDBE Program, both of which were present in the prior solicitation, RFP-027-26-RR. DOT's guidance directs recipients to suspend goal-setting, not to eliminate the underlying ACDBE Program. Please confirm: (a) whether the City's FAA-approved ACDBE Program Plan still requires the provisions previously set out in Exhibit E-2,

ANSWER: USDOT's October 3, 2025 Interim Final Rule established that all solicitations advertised after the Rules publication date were to set ACDBE goals of 0%. Furthermore, the Rule

required the inclusion of all ACDBE contract provisions pursuant to 49 CFR Part 23. All required Federal contract provisions are included in Exhibit E-1. and (b) the legal basis for omitting that exhibit from the Agreement rather than retaining it with the numeric goal set to zero.
ANSWER: See response to proceeding question.
20. Removal of nondiscrimination and good-faith-effort language. Section 1.4 of RFP-027-26-RR previously stated that "it is the policy of the City to practice nondiscrimination in the award and performance of this contract" and that "the City encourages participation by all firms qualifying under this solicitation regardless of business size or ownership," and required Respondents to warrant good-faith efforts toward future ACDBE goals. This language does not appear in the corresponding section of RFP-089-26-RR. Since this language is not tied to numeric goal-setting, please clarify why it was removed and whether the City's nondiscrimination policy under 49 CFR Part 23 §23.9 still applies to this solicitation notwithstanding its absence from the RFP text.
ANSWER: USDOT's October 3, 2025 Interim Final Rule established that all solicitations advertised after the Rules publication date were to set ACDBE goals of 0%. Furthermore, the Rule required the inclusion of all ACDBE contract provisions pursuant to 49 CFR Part 23. All required Federal contract provisions are included in Exhibit E-1.
21. ACDBE program consistency of minimum qualifications. The concession agreement remains subject to 49 C.F.R. Part 23, including its nondiscrimination requirements. Please explain how the Section 3.3 requirement of operations at three on-airport locations is consistent with the City's continuing obligations under Part 23 to avoid unnecessary barriers to participation by small and disadvantaged concessionaires, and clarify whether the City will accept an alternative demonstration of operational capability (for example, comparable rental car operating experience together with demonstrated financial capacity).
ANSWER: USDOT's October 3, 2025 Interim Final Rule established that all solicitations advertised after the Rules publication date were to set ACDBE goals of 0%. Furthermore, the Rule required the inclusion of all ACDBE contract provisions pursuant to 49 CFR Part 23. All required Federal contract provisions are included in Exhibit E-1.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank

Sixt Rent a Car, LLC

Please see below question on behalf of Sixt Rent a Car, LLC. We look forward to receiving a response to this pertinent question. Thank you. 1. Section 4.12 Phased Ramp-Up of Fair Market Value Building Rent – New QTA Facility - Please remove this section from the concession agreement. It is standard practice for Concessionaires to not pay rent on facilities financed by CFCs during the term of the agreement or during the term of financing. This clause would create an inequitable double-recovery mechanism.
ANSWER: No, the rents, fees, etc. are established in the DRAFT Agreement included in the RFP.

2.1 SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

The proposed timeline for this solicitation is as follows. Dates and times are subject to change.

EVENT	DATE/TIME*
RFP Release Date	July 15, 2026
Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting (Hybrid) **Microsoft Teams meeting** **Join:** https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/251300492620451?p=ZcXGkUgr50HIFNsTso Meeting ID: 251 300 492 620 451 Passcode: 3qq92rA7 Need help? | System reference **Dial in by phone** +1 850-792-4991,,890977109# United States, Tallahassee Find a local number Phone conference ID: 890 977 109# **Join on a video conferencing device** Tenant key: talgov@m.webex.com Video ID: 114 861 361 2 More info	July 30, 2026 (9:00 a.m. ET)
Final Questions Due	August 6, 2026 by 10:00 a.m. ET
Answers to Questions received – (responded by the City as an Addendum if needed) on or about:	August 13, 2026
RFP Proposals Due Date/Time (Deadline):	**September 9, 2026 at 2:30 PM ET**

EVENT	DATE/TIME*
Scoring Meeting: **Physical Address:** **Tallahassee International Airport (Boeing Room, 2nd Floor)** **3300 Capital Circle SW, Suite 1** **Tallahassee, FL 32310** **Microsoft Teams meeting** **Join:** https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/24450019057243?p=wHeuYa1Bu5G6JINjwc Meeting ID: 244 500 190 572 43 Passcode: HR79nm7i Need help? | System reference **Dial in by phone** +1 850-792-4991,,500772466# United States, Tallahassee Find a local number Phone conference ID: 500 772 466# **Join on a video conferencing device** Tenant key: talgov@m.webex.com Video ID: 113 217 038 6 More info	**September 18, 2026** **10:00 a.m. ET**
*Final Commission Approval	On or about October 21, 2026
*Executed Agreement(s):	On or about November 2026

* Specific dates/times will be determined at each phase.

[END OF ADDENDUM #2]