



**Recycled Water Infrastructure Upgrades and 2021 Engineering Work Order Contracts
Solicitation Number: PS-00103-FG**

**ADDENDUM 1
February 2, 2021**

To Respondent of Record:

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

- 1. Question: For the Project Understanding and Approach section, should Respondents focus on one project or provide an understanding/approach for all three projects?**

Response: Respondents can tailor the Statement of Qualifications (SOQs) toward any project or all. Please do not include generic responses that apply to the three projects. Respondents need to also comply with page limits as described in the Solicitation. SAWS will review the Respondent's qualifications as well as project approach for the selected project(s). Project Understanding and Approach section should identify the Respondent's preference(s).

- 2. Question: Would SAWS consider eliminating the statement on page 27 of the RFQ that requires "...PM shall have participated in at least two (2)..."? This requirement will prevent firms who have made recent hires, in order to support SAWS, from submitting.**

Response: No, this requirement will not be revised.

- 3. Question: What operational scenarios must the Leon/Clouse interconnect pipeline meet?**

Response: The operational scenarios will be discussed during the scope and fee negotiations with the selected Respondent. In general, the interconnect will need to provide for flow in both directions, provide ample capacity for the project needs, and provide service to future customers in the vicinity.

- 4. Question: Page 12 of the proposal mentions "design deliverables for each of the identified projects has been made available for review". Please indicate if these deliverables are available or will be made available.**

Response: Please see Section "Modifications to the RFQ."

- 5. Question: Similar to previous question – page 28 of the RFQ mentions "identify risk items from design documents provided by SAWS". What are these documents?**

Response: Please see Section "Modifications to the RFQ."

- 6. Question: For Brooks, is there a concern with the Riverside Golf Course Pump Station needing upgrades/improvements?**

Response: No, the RFQ is focused on Brooks Recycled Water Pump Station and its upgrades, as stated in the Project Charter.

7. Question: Can the proposal be tailored to more than one of the three projects?

Response: See response to Question 1.

8. Question: For Brooks, what is the anticipated future flow for the pump station?

Response: Future demand will be discussed during the scope and fee negotiations with the selected respondent. In general, the selected respondent will be tasked to evaluate this during the 30% design phase. They will need to understand current demands, current condition of existing infrastructure, and future demands to determine required improvements.

9. Question: Are there any identified wetlands along the Leon/Clouse pipeline?

Response: Currently there are no wetland identified. However, the selected respondent will be responsible for performing field exploration activities to verify as part of project implementation activities.

10. Question: For Brooks, has SAWS considered increasing the storage capacity at the site?

Response: Yes, SAWS has considered increasing storage capacity. There is limited available space at the facility. SAWS does not intend to acquire more land for expansion.

11. Question: If we tailor SOQ for WOC, how can we still be considered for other projects, vice versa?

Response: See response to Question 1.

12. Question: Has the Leon/Clouse pipeline route been coordinated with proposed dam improvements?

Response: Yes. Additionally, the respondent selected for this project will need to coordinate closely with the Consultant chosen for the dam improvement design. Coordination with ongoing and future projects is required for all SAWS projects.

13. Question: For Brooks, since SAWS has a potable water supply connection, does the pump station have an ability to be taken out of service?

Response:

- *The Brooks Recycled Water (RW) Tank and Pump Station (PS) has a Potable Water (PW) backup to supplement the tank volume, when RW is not available from the RW distribution system. However, this is not the normal mode of operation. It is meant to be an emergency backup. Switching water sources requires significant coordination with customers.*
- *The PW supplement cannot keep up with peak (Irrigation Season) demand.*
- *The PW supplement does not tie directly into the RW distribution system, therefore the RW PS is required to distribute the supplemental PW supply.*
- *The Brooks RW Customers vary with regards to the type of use for RW.*
- *Brooks RW customers for HVAC, have a recommended PW backup connection at their location.*
- *Brooks RW customers for (Landscape) irrigation, may not necessarily have PW backup.*
- *The Riverside Golf Course has a manual potable water backup that would require considerable coordination to maintain water levels at the pond (during Irrigation Season).*
- *Irrigation Season generally runs from March through September.*

14. Question: Would SAWS consider pipe materials other than HDPE for Leon/Clouse pipeline?

Response: SAWS does not have a preference or endorse a certain pipe material. It is up to the Respondent to provide the cost benefit analysis in the 30% PER submittal, as outlined in the RFQ's scope.

15. Question: What does SAWS consider key personnel and key subconsultants from your perspective?

Response: Key Personnel shall be selected by the Respondent based on his/her understanding of the selected project requirements. Key personnel are often the leads critical disciplines required for a project, for example: structural, hydraulics, geotechnical, QA/QC, etc. for the project. Key Personnel may not always be the same people for all projects. Each project has unique technical and non-technical challenges requiring different skills and expertise. A key subconsultant is one that brings unique expertise and qualifications to the team and will be responsible for performing critical work on the project.

16. Question: Will SAWS consider qualifications or hiring specific specialized consultants for specific parts of projects, like electrical, process automation, studies? Or, is it required to provide qualifications for the entire project and partner with others?

Response: SAWS will not award contracts to specialized consultants choosing to work on specific parts of the projects. The contracts will be awarded to the Respondents that follow the requirements outlined in Attachment II: Evaluation Criteria Details and Requirements.

17. Question: In regards to our project approach, are we to select one of the three projects listed (Brooks Recycled Water, Leon creek or Work Order Contracts)?

Response: See response to Question 1.

18. Question: During the presubmittal meeting, a question was asked regarding identified wetlands and easements along the Leon/Clouse pipeline project. It was mentioned that “we [SAWS] put “TBD”(?) in the area specific for the tank and the station because that’s something we would discuss – where would be the best place to put that mid-point between the two tanks”. We take this to mean that the location for the ground storage tank is to be determined. Please confirm whether this is the case.

Response: Yes, that is the case. The location of the tank and booster station is to be determined during the 30% design phase.

19. Question: During the presubmittal meeting, it was mentioned that there is some land that may impact the Leon/Clouse pipeline project that is not currently owned by SAWS, but will be by time of design. Please specify which land this is.

Response: Selected respondent will have to identify required easements and land acquisition needs for the project, just like they do for any pipeline project. Respondent will work with SAWS to ensure required easements are obtained prior to advertisement of the construction solicitation.

20. Question: Could you please clarify whether or not firms should structure their approach around all three projects detailed in the RFQ, or can firms structure it around one specific project?

Response: See response to Question 1.

21. Question: The Similar and Past Performance section of the RFQ and OPCC Table are based around a traditional design, bid, build project delivery. May design build projects be submitted also?

Response: Design Build projects should not be listed.

22. Question: Will there be a separate selection for Treatment Facilities Engineering Work Order Contract and Operations Support Contract? If so, do we select one to write the project approach or project approach to cover both?

Response: Yes, the intent is to select a respondent for the Treatment Facilities Engineering Work Order Contract and another respondent for the Operations Support Work Order Contract. With regards to selection of projects to tailor RFQ responses, see response to Question 1.

23. Question: Under Operations support, it says D&C facilities, assuming does not include any pipelines? Just wanted to confirm? Should we show any experience on pipelines?

Response: The main focus of the work order contract will be for small Treatment or Production facility work, to include, but not limited to engineering analysis, specification writing, cost estimating, and shop drawings for equipment. Could include demolition of facilities at Production or Treatment sites. It may include engineering analysis on water main breaks, causes of water main breaks, hydraulic analysis, surge analysis on pressurized pipe or facilities and equipment. It may include small design projects for pipeline projects, new or replacement.

24. Question: For operations support, do we need to have a current licensed operator?

Response: No this is not a requirement.

25. Question: RFQ says forms will not be counted towards page limit. Are Evaluation Criteria fillable Forms, Attachment III included in the 25 page count? Counted only 15 pages without the fillable forms, with fillable forms 22 pages, what can we use for additional pages? Can these pages used towards other sections, resumes or project approach?

Response: In addition to "See Clarification to the RFQ Section Below," The following pages are to make up the SOQ:

- *Cover Letter - 1*
- *Organizational Chart – 1*
- *Resumes – 5*
- *Describe Team Composition – 1 page (Not a fillable form)*
- *Team Composition Form – 1*
- *Table Matrix of Availability Form – 1*
- *Project Sheets – 4*
- *Cost Information Form – 1*
- *Detailed Approach – 5*
- *Approach Responses – 2*
- *QA/QC and Risk Management – 2*

Responses are limited to a maximum of 24 pages per proposal for the specified items above. Respondents cannot submit responses to evaluation criteria that exceed the page limit specified in the Solicitation for that criteria (e.g., five 1-page resumes for Key Personnel).

26. Question: On Attachment III Similar Project Experience it says Respondent minimum 2 projects, key subconsultant maximum of 1 project, so basically respondent has to provide 3 minimum projects?

Response: No, Respondents are required to provide a total of four (4) similar and relevant projects completed within the last ten (10) years in response to this section of the Solicitation. The proposed PM shall be an employee of the Respondent, and the Respondent will outline Key Personnel as requested in Attachment II “Team Experience and Qualifications” section. The Subconsultants should be from a different firm than the Respondent, and the Respondent should list Key Personnel based on the response to Question 15. Respondents can only include a maximum of one (1) of the four (4) similar and relevant projects from a Key Subconsultant. It is important to SAWS that the majority of the projects listed are from the Respondent not Key Subconsultants.

27. Question: Per page 31 of the RFQ, should all key personnel have participated in two of the four projects listed? Can key personnel have participated in one of the four projects?

Response: 30 points is allocated for Team Experience and Qualifications, as outlined in Attachment II. “Similar Projects and Past Performance” section of Attachment II, states that the proposed PM shall have participated in at least two (2) of the four (4) projects. Other Key Personnel shall have participated in at least two (2) of the four (4) projects. Not all proposed Key Personnel shall have participated in all four (4) projects.

28. Question: What will need to be done with the existing 48-inch RCP coming from Leon Creek WRC to the lake? The exhibit and project scope call for it to be replaced by the new 30-inch HDPE pipe, but the project scope also states that it is in good condition and does not directly call for removal/abandonment.

Response: The intent is for the existing 48-inch line to serve as host for the new 30-inch slipline pipeline, The Respondent is expected to provide alternative alignment options in the 30% design phase submittal, as outlined in the RFQ’s scope.

29. Question: Are any of the proposed pipelines going to connect to the existing 48-inch RCP pipe?

Response: No.

30. Question: Is SAWS performing the easement acquisitions or is that left to the Consultant?

Response: The respondent will have to support SAWS during the easement acquisition process, just like it is done for all other SAWS pipeline projects. Respondent will work with SAWS Corporate Real Estate in helping fulfill the scope outlined in the RFQ.

CLARIFICATION TO THE RFQ

1. Remove and replace Section IV. Submitting a Response, B. Submission, #3 with the following:

3. Responses are limited to a maximum of 24 pages per proposal. Required forms do not count toward the page limit. Required forms are the Submittal Response Checklist, Respondent Questionnaire, W-9 form, Insurance requirements, Good Faith Effort Plan, SCTRCA Certificates, the Conflict of Interest Questionnaire **and Project References**. The cover page and tabs do not count towards the page limit. Number each page starting with the cover letter, including text charts and graphic images.

MODIFICATIONS TO THE RFQ

1. Remove the Conflict of Interest Questionnaire and replace with the updated attached Conflict of Interest Questionnaire (Rev. 1/1/2021).
2. Completely remove paragraph 3 and 4 from Section I. Project Information, E. Projects. Replace with the following section:

E. Projects

1. *The following projects will be awarded as part of this solicitation:*
 - *Brooks Recycled Water Pump Station Upgrades Project*
 - *Leon Creek WRC to Steven M. Clouse WRC Recycled Water Interconnect - Phase 1*
 - *2021 Engineering Work Order Contracts*
 2. *Project charters and maps have been provided to Respondents and may be found as Attachment I to this RFQ. Each project charter provides a detailed description of the project, the project schedule, and cost forecast.*
3. Completely remove bullet point #2 from Attachment II - Evaluation Criteria Details and Requirements, Project Understanding and Approach, Section 2. Replace with the following section:

Project Understanding and Approach:

- 2) *Provide responses to the following:*
 - *Identify design concepts in need of additional definition or refinement and describe your proposed approach for addressing those items during the initial phase of the project.*
 - *Describe your approach for coordinating with regulatory and permitting agencies to ensure buy-in and approval.*
 - *Describe your team's familiarity with SAWS facilities and infrastructure.*
 - *Describe Respondent's approach to becoming familiar with local and regional market conditions influencing the design and construction decisions that will affect the cost.*
 - *Understanding of Project related issues and difficulties (design and construction), and solutions proposed.*
 - *Understanding of coordination requirements with the involved entities, responsiveness and follow through.*
 - *Team approach to preparing deliverables to meet deadlines associated with fast-track SAWS requests without compromising the quality of deliverables and Project schedule. Discuss Respondent's schedule recovery approach relative to schedule maintenance.*

END OF ADDENDUM 1

This Addendum is eight (8) pages in its entirety, with one (1) attachment.

Attachments: Conflict of Interest Questionnaire (2 pages)

CONFLICT OF INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE
For vendor doing business with local governmental entity

FORM CIQ

This questionnaire reflects changes made to the law by H.B. 23, 84th Leg., Regular Session.

This questionnaire is being filed in accordance with Chapter 176, Local Government Code, by a vendor who has a business relationship as defined by Section 176.001(1-a) with a local governmental entity and the vendor meets requirements under Section 176.006(a).

By law this questionnaire must be filed with the records administrator of the local governmental entity not later than the 7th business day after the date the vendor becomes aware of facts that require the statement to be filed. See Section 176.006(a-1), Local Government Code.

A vendor commits an offense if the vendor knowingly violates Section 176.006, Local Government Code. An offense under this section is a misdemeanor.

OFFICE USE ONLY

Date Received

1 Name of vendor who has a business relationship with local governmental entity.

2 **Check this box if you are filing an update to a previously filed questionnaire.** (The law requires that you file an updated completed questionnaire with the appropriate filing authority not later than the 7th business day after the date on which you became aware that the originally filed questionnaire was incomplete or inaccurate.)

3 Name of local government officer about whom the information is being disclosed.

Name of Officer

4 Describe each employment or other business relationship with the local government officer, or a family member of the officer, as described by Section 176.003(a)(2)(A). Also describe any family relationship with the local government officer. Complete subparts A and B for each employment or business relationship described. Attach additional pages to this Form CIQ as necessary.

A. Is the local government officer or a family member of the officer receiving or likely to receive taxable income, other than investment income, from the vendor?

Yes No

B. Is the vendor receiving or likely to receive taxable income, other than investment income, from or at the direction of the local government officer or a family member of the officer AND the taxable income is not received from the local governmental entity?

Yes No

5 Describe each employment or business relationship that the vendor named in Section 1 maintains with a corporation or other business entity with respect to which the local government officer serves as an officer or director, or holds an ownership interest of one percent or more.

6 Check this box if the vendor has given the local government officer or a family member of the officer one or more gifts as described in Section 176.003(a)(2)(B), excluding gifts described in Section 176.003(a-1).

7

Signature of vendor doing business with the governmental entity

Date

CONFLICT OF INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE

For vendor doing business with local governmental entity

A complete copy of Chapter 176 of the Local Government Code may be found at <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/LG/htm/LG.176.htm>. For easy reference, below are some of the sections cited on this form.

Local Government Code § 176.001(1-a): "Business relationship" means a connection between two or more parties based on commercial activity of one of the parties. The term does not include a connection based on:

- (A) a transaction that is subject to rate or fee regulation by a federal, state, or local governmental entity or an agency of a federal, state, or local governmental entity;
- (B) a transaction conducted at a price and subject to terms available to the public; or
- (C) a purchase or lease of goods or services from a person that is chartered by a state or federal agency and that is subject to regular examination by, and reporting to, that agency.

Local Government Code § 176.003(a)(2)(A) and (B):

(a) A local government officer shall file a conflicts disclosure statement with respect to a vendor if:

(2) the vendor:

(A) has an employment or other business relationship with the local government officer or a family member of the officer that results in the officer or family member receiving taxable income, other than investment income, that exceeds \$2,500 during the 12-month period preceding the date that the officer becomes aware that

(i) a contract between the local governmental entity and vendor has been executed;
or

(ii) the local governmental entity is considering entering into a contract with the vendor;

(B) has given to the local government officer or a family member of the officer one or more gifts that have an aggregate value of more than \$100 in the 12-month period preceding the date the officer becomes aware that:

(i) a contract between the local governmental entity and vendor has been executed; or

(ii) the local governmental entity is considering entering into a contract with the vendor.

Local Government Code § 176.006(a) and (a-1)

(a) A vendor shall file a completed conflict of interest questionnaire if the vendor has a business relationship with a local governmental entity and:

(1) has an employment or other business relationship with a local government officer of that local governmental entity, or a family member of the officer, described by Section 176.003(a)(2)(A);

(2) has given a local government officer of that local governmental entity, or a family member of the officer, one or more gifts with the aggregate value specified by Section 176.003(a)(2)(B), excluding any gift described by Section 176.003(a-1); or

(3) has a family relationship with a local government officer of that local governmental entity.

(a-1) The completed conflict of interest questionnaire must be filed with the appropriate records administrator not later than the seventh business day after the later of:

(1) the date that the vendor:

(A) begins discussions or negotiations to enter into a contract with the local governmental entity; or

(B) submits to the local governmental entity an application, response to a request for proposals or bids, correspondence, or another writing related to a potential contract with the local governmental entity; or

(2) the date the vendor becomes aware:

(A) of an employment or other business relationship with a local government officer, or a family member of the officer, described by Subsection (a);

(B) that the vendor has given one or more gifts described by Subsection (a); or

(C) of a family relationship with a local government officer.