



REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Project 1: San Antonio River Outfall (SARO) Pipeline

Job No. 11-2509

Solicitation Number: Q-11-004-MF

Project 2: W_2 - Huebner Creek - Eckhert to Shadow Mist

Job No. 11-2512

Solicitation Number: Q-11-005-MR

Project 3: E_4 - Bulverde – Evans to Redland

Job No. 11-2505 (REMOVED)

Solicitation Number: Q-11-006-MF

**Project 4: C_5 - Culebra - Castroville to Laredo
and**

C_28 - Zarzamora Creek - San Gabriel to NW 23rd Street

Job No. 11-2502

Solicitation Number: Q-11-007-MR

ADDENDUM #2 – 12:50 AM | May 10, 2011

This addendum notifies respondents of a change in point of contact for all remaining projects, notifies respondents of multiple changes to the RFQ and addresses questions received before the associated deadline. All information contained within this Addendum are hereby made a part of the RFQ document.

CHANGE IN POINT OF CONTACT

The point of contact for all three projects as listed in Section III Communication, sub section C is now solely:

Marc Ripley
Contract Administration
San Antonio Water System
Customer Center Building
2800 U.S. Hwy 281 North, Suite 171

San Antonio, TX 78212
Email: mripley@saws.org
Phone: 210-233-3136
Fax to 210-233-4609

The point of contact for SMWB is not changed.

END CHANGE IN POINT OF CONTACT

PRE SUBMITTAL MEETING NOTES

Meeting announcements from the May 2, 2011 Pre-Submittal Meeting:

1. Per Addendum 1, the E-4 Project has been removed from the RFQ.
2. One addendum will be submitted for all projects. Block maps will be provided for each project.
3. A clarification of whether tabloid pages and double sided pages will be counted as their 8 ½ X 11" counterparts. For example, a double sided 11 X 17" page used for exhibits will be considered two pages. A single sided will be considered one page. This addendum clarifies the page count limitations
4. Question due dates and submission dates were reiterated. Questions are due by 4 pm on May 5th. Answers will be posted on May 10th by 4 pm.
5. Site visits can be arranged as necessary with selected consultants.

Meeting questions from the May 2, 2011 Pre-Submittal Meeting. Questions are as noted from the meeting to the best of our ability:

1. Is it possible to visit the head works at the old Salado WRC to see how this new pipeline can be incorporated into the existing head works structure?
 - a. No. Site visit may be scheduled once consultant is selected.
2. Can SAWS provide the Infoworks models for these projects prior to the due date for this RFQ?
 - a. Necessary hydraulic/flow information to check capacity of existing and or proposed mains will be provided by SAWS to selected consultant.
3. Could a better description of the project location and route be given?
 - a. Description and location provided in scope narrative of RFQ. Block maps will be posted with the Addendum.
4. For the SARO project, can you verify the pipe sizes?
 - a. Existing pipe size identified in RFQ narrative is a 48-inch main

5. For the SARO project, are there any known issues with the current pipe capacity?
 - a. Existing pipe has experienced multiple collapses and presence of heavy corrosion has been identified. A number of point repairs have been executed at or near some of the siphon areas.

6. For the SARO project, is there an implied task to review or do additional modeling?
 - a. No, but selected consultant will need to coordinate with planning staff at SAWS.

7. Is TWDB funding a possibility on these projects?
 - a. The scope requests that consultants' factor in the possibility for preparing associated efforts for developing documentation as a part of the scope of services within the SOQ submittals elaborating their approach.

8. Must a current certificate of professional liability insurance show CURRENT coverage for the three million dollar limits?
 - a. A letter of insurability from your agent or carrier stating that you can obtain and maintain the required insurance levels for the duration of a contract can be utilized in lieu of a certificate indicating current levels of coverage. When providing such a letter, please also include a copy of your current certificate.

9. Do resume pages count to the page limits?
 - a. Yes.

10. For water modeling, is INFO Works software a requirement for the consultant to have licensed and in use?
 - a. The selected consultant is not required to have a license for INFO Works.

11. Regarding SARO: Will there be a need for evaluation of the old infrastructure?
 - a. Consultants are expected to review existing maps and record drawings to ensure design accommodates any tie-in mains or services. They are to be functional and meet SAWS and TCEQ standards.

12. Has SAWS recently cleaned and televised the infrastructure lines?
 - a. There has been some televising. C-28 has capacity issues.

13. Must consultant teams have their own Right of Way and property acquisition teams?

- a. No, SAWS internal staff and current contractors will perform these duties. Selected consultant is expected to coordinate with SAWS staff for these functions. Consultant to obtain ROE and prepare plat and field notes for SAWS for easement acquisitions.
14. Are the SAWS timeline expectations to stage the beginning of design services or will they be commenced simultaneously?
- a. SAWS' intention is to present all design contracts to the board for award at the same time and to release notices to proceed within the same time-frame.
15. Are submitted W-9 forms considered a requested supporting document or shall they count toward the page limitations?
- a. No, required forms do not count towards the page limitations.
16. The Statements of Qualifications submittal instructions appear to ask for the same information in multiple areas. Are we to submit duplicate information with our package?
- a. No. This addendum clarifies these requirements.
17. Do divider pages and tabs count to the page count?
- a. No, these do not count to the page limitations. However do keep in mind that tab or divider pages with ancillary information or charts or graphs will be considered response pages within your document packages.
18. On the SARO project, are there historical property or archeological scope considerations that the selected consultant will have to coordinate or perform?
- a. SAWS is not aware of any historical properties or archeological resources along project route. However, Environmental and Archeological investigations may be required by selected consultant to identify areas of concern.
19. Has SAWS cleaned and TV'd lines?
- a. Portions of the SARO line have TV at the siphons. Any video(s) will be made available to the selected consultant.
20. Shall ROW Negotiations be part of the Team?
- a. No, SAWS Corporate Real Estate will negotiate and acquire the easements.
21. What is the timeline schedule for each of the jobs?

- a. All projects will start at the same time. Individual project timelines will be determined during scope and fee negotiations.

22. Will the forms be part of the 18 page limit?

- a. No. They are not included in the page count.

23. Are respondents required to have insurance at the levels requested in the RFQ before award? If not, how do we indicate compliance with the submission requirements of this RFQ?

- a. A letter of insurability from your agent or carrier stating that you can obtain and maintain the required insurance levels for the duration of a contract can be utilized in lieu of a certificate indicating current levels of coverage. When providing such a letter, please also include a copy of your current certificate.

24. Does the page count include dividers?

- a. No, these do not count to the page limitations. However do keep in mind that tab or divider pages with ancillary information or charts or graphs will be considered response pages within your document packages.

25. Who will manage historical properties along the SARO alignment?

- a. SAWS and the selected consultant will coordinate work involving any identified historical properties.

26. When is the deadline for the questions?

- a. Questions need to be submitted by 4 PM on May 5th. Answers will be posted by 4 p.m. on May 10th.

27. Will Block maps be available?

- a. Block maps will be provided and posted on the website.

28. Will illustrations on 11x17 paper count as 1 or 2 pages?

- a. For exhibits, 11 X 17 sheets will be counted as 1 page. Ensure sheets are folded neatly into SOQ submission.

END PRE SUBMITTAL MEETING NOTES

CHANGES TO RFQ

1. PAGE LIMITATIONS:

Section IV, Submitting a Response, sub-section B-6 Page Limits:

The maximum number of pages for a response in sections 1, 3, 4 and 5 have been increased from 18 pages to 30 pages. This limitation is not inclusive of required forms or the Project Approach. The Project Approach limit remains at 5 pages for each project response.

2. With regards to change 1; Section IV. Submitting a Response, Subsection B. Submission, Item 6. Please delete in its entirety and replace with:

Responses are limited to a maximum of 5 pages for each individual project approach section in your Statement of Qualifications. The remainder of your proposal is limited to 30 pages. These limits include exhibit and resume pages. SAWS will count pages per printed side. Therefore, a single side equals one page towards the limit with a double-sided page counting as two pages. Required forms do not count toward the page limit. Respondents must ensure that the font size utilized for the body of your submittal is at 11 point or larger.

3. Please note the addition of the pre-submittal sign-in sheet available from the website for this solicitation as additional information.
4. Please note the replacement of PAGE 28 of 61 of RFQ. Please see and use Attachment #1 to this Addendum #2 for the revised Project Submittal Identification Sheet. Use this form in lieu of the one provided as a part of the original RFQ document.
5. Please refer to Attachment #1 to this Addendum #2 for information regarding the Block Maps availability from the SAWS website for this solicitation. These block maps are hereby made a part of the this RFQ as additional information.

END CHANGES TO RFQ

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Answers include responses to questions submitted in writing before the due date. Questions may be previously answered in the Pre-Submittal Meeting Notes section of this Addendum 2.

QUESTION for Solicitations: Q-11-006-MF/Q-11-004-MF/Q-11-007-MR

1. Is there an Existing Condition Report of the Existing Pipeline? If not, can SAWS identify the types of repairs & general nature of failures & how are they repaired?
 - a. No, existing condition reports are not available for Projects 1, 2, or 4. In general existing mains become projects for replacement or rehabilitation based on age and or condition issues (failures). Additional information will be provided to selected consultant.
2. Do sub consultants need to complete the COI form and submit Proof of Insurability? Or is the Prime Consultant only responsible for completing a COI form and submitting Proof of Insurability?

- a. A letter of insurability from your agent or carrier stating that you can obtain and maintain the required insurance levels for the duration of a contract can be utilized in lieu of a certificate indicating current levels of coverage. When providing such a letter, please also include a copy of your current certificate.
3. On Page 19 of 61, Section IV, Paragraph B, Subparagraph 6, states: "Responses are limited to a maximum of 18 combined pages for criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 per proposal." Is this referring to Items 1, 3, 4 & 5 on Page 20, Paragraph C? The next sentence in Subparagraph 6 reads: "...5 pages per project...for criterion 2 – Project Approach." Project approach is covered in Item 6 on page 21. Verification of the page numbers where these criteria are located would be helpful.
 - a. Please see Section IV, Subsection C for a complete listing of required response items including criteria. Also, see the reference to this issue in "Changes to RFQ" preceding this Answers to Questions section.

Re: Contract Solicitation No. Q-11-004-7.

4. Is it possible to obtain copies of the following documents for the service area of the sewers to be designed under Project 2: W_2 - Huebner Creek - Eckhert to Shadow Mist?
 - Master Plan
 - Infiltration/Inflow Analysis and Sewer System Evaluation Reports
 - a. Selected consultant will be provided available information.
5. In Section IV - Submitting a Response of the RFQ, Article B.6 states: "Responses are limited to a maximum of 18 combined pages for criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 per proposal."
 - Are you referring to the Article E Evaluation Criteria Summary in Section II - Selection Process on page 16 of the April 18 RFQ? If so, the evaluation criteria are not numbered but are indicated by bullets. Should we replace the bullets by consecutive numbers (1, 2, 3,.....) in the same order as the order of the bullets? OR are there some other criteria to which you are referring to?
 - a. Please see answer to question three (3.)
6. Project 2: Huebner Creek (Solicitation No. Q-11-005-MR) and Project 4: Culebra and Zarzamora Creek (Solicitation No. Q-11-007-MR) Can a better description of the project locations and routes be given? Can the pipe sized be verified?
 - a. Project limits are defined in scope narratives for both projects. Existing pipe size(s) is cited in solicitation descriptions. Refer to block maps posted online for additional information.
7. Solicitations: Q-11-005-MR and Q-11-007-MR. Under "Experience and Qualifications: Provide a project chart detailing the firm(s) and the personnel who will be assigned to this Project by functional responsibility." Please clarify how this is different from the organization chart. Is it a project timeline by function? It seems redundant to have both a "project chart" as well as the Team Organization Chart.

- a. Provide one organizational chart that details the personnel that will be assigned to work on the project. The chart identifies their role/responsibility as well as their commitment time to the project. For example 100% or 30% etc.

Provide a timeline chart for example (MS Project) that outlines the project phases (with subtasks; milestones, etc) and time expected to complete the phases from the Preliminary through Construction phase.

Only one chart is required.

8. On page 21 of the RFQ under paragraphs 8(a) and 8(b) regarding Past Performance, these statements request that the "contract value" be included with the project descriptions for projects completed in the last 5 years. Does this mean "Design" contract value or "Construction" contract value?

- a. Provide construction value of project(s).

9. We understood from the pre-proposal meeting that there were maps for the projects. Will those be posted as an Addendum or separately?

- a. They are referenced in this addendum and available as a separate downloadable document as an attachment to the addendum from the saws website. See Attachment 2 to this addendum.

END ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

END ADDENDUM #2

Project Submittal Identification

This page shall be attached to the front of each proposal submitted to indicate each project for which your firm wishes to submit. For multiple project responses, please clearly indicate on the first page of the project approach section to which project it pertains.

Firm Name: _____

Check projects for which you are responding:

_____ Project 1: San Antonio River Outfall (SARO) Pipeline

_____ Project 2: W_2 - Huebner Creek - Eckhert to Shadow Mist

_____ Project 4: C_5 - Culebra to Castroville to Laredo and
C_28 - Zarzamora Creek - San Gabriel to NW 23rd Street

ATTACHMENT #2 to ADDENDUM #2

Block Maps:

The block maps are available at the SAWS website for these projects:

http://www.saws.org/business_center/ContractSol/Drill.cfm?id=192&View=Yes

They are titled:

Block Maps for SARO Project Q-11-004-MF

Block Maps for W-2 Project Q-11-005-MR

Block Maps for C-5 Project Q-11-007-MR