



**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS  
MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES FOR WATER MASTER  
PLANNING AND HYDRAULIC MODELING**

**RFQ Q-11-002-MR**

**ADDENDUM #2 – 03:30 PM | February 25, 2011**

This addendum clarifies the page requirements for submission and answers submitted written questions.

**CLARIFICATIONS TO SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS**

Tabloid sized pages (11 inches X 17 inches) within a response will be considered two pages against the page limit count.

**END CLARIFICATIONS TO SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS**

**ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

1. It reads as if SAWS desires the Team Experience, Time Commitment and Project Manager Experience sections to have tabbed divider sheets. If that is the case will these sheets count toward the 10 page count?
  - a. **No**
  
2. Will SAWS provide a signature sheet form as stated on page 5 of the RFP?
  - a. **Section “IV. Submitting a Response,” sub-section “B”, item “2” requests one original with markings that clearly indicate that the document is an original. Please mark “ORIGINAL” on this document’s cover and on any page where a signature is required within the original. All required signature pages are included with the RFQ solicitation.**

3. It is requested that a CD be provided, do you prefer the content in PDF format?
  - a. **While a PDF is more convenient, it is not considered a requirement.**
  
4. If a cover sheet is provide will it count toward the 10 page limit?
  - a. **No**
  
5. Will there be a financial analysis of all the existing systems?
  - a. **We envision a financial analysis of alternatives, i.e. continue to operate a standalone system vs integrate into the main SAWS pressure system. The financial analysis should include any known condition issues on infrastructure such as pumps and tanks. Is it more economical to run the system as standalone knowing certain infrastructure has excess capacity but will need to be rehabilitated or replaced immediately? Or is it more economical to integrate into an adjacent system that would need additional pumping and storage capacity but has newer infrastructure? Operating cost should be considered as well. Should we move customers into a pressure zone that has lower energy costs but may have infrastructure issues (condition or capacity) or should we move the customers into the higher pressure zone (higher energy costs) but little infrastructure replacement?**

**When evaluating the alternatives ,consideration must be given to the impact fee value of infrastructure capacity used to support the new customers. Additionally, the firm will need to calculate the net cost savings gained by eliminating or delaying a previously planned capital improvement project if two or more pressure systems are integrated.**

6. Will modification be required on the current SAWS land use assumptions plans?
  - a. **No**
  
7. How large is SAWS available water model (ex. Pipes, nodes, etc.)?
  - a. **Approximately 320k total for nodes and pipes. It is an all pipes model.**

END ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

No other items, dates, or deadlines for this RFQ are changed.

END ADDENDUM #2