



2024 Water and Sewer Unspecified Engineering Work Order Services (RFQ)  
Solicitation Number: PS-00167

**ADDENDUM 1**  
**February 16, 2024**

To Respondent of Record:

**RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS**

1. **Question:** I wanted to inquire if the RFQ will be for multiple selections or not?

*Response: SAWS may award up to two (2) contracts totaling \$1.5 million.*

2. **Question:** RFQ Attachment I Evaluation Criteria Summary Table, Similar Projects and Past Performance 2) Using the table within the Evaluation Criteria form, provide information for the three (3) completed projects submitted in section 1) of this criteria, as well as three (3) additional projects, as it relates to the accuracy of the Opinions of Probable Construction Cost (OPCC) and change orders, comparing the 100% design phase estimate to approved construction awards. RFQ Attachment IV Evaluation Criteria Forms: Similar Projects and Past Performance, OPCC Table states “Using the table below, provide project cost information for the three (3) completed projects submitted in Similar Projects and Past Performance section, item (2) of the Attachment I Evaluation Criteria Details and Requirements, as it relates to the accuracy of the OPCC, comparing the Engineer’s 100% design phase estimate to approved construction contract awards.”
- a. Please clarify if we are to provide only the information for three completed projects submitted in section 1).
  - b. Please clarify if we are to provide this information for three completed projects submitted in section 1) and three additional projects; for a total of six projects.

*Response:*

- a. *The respondent should provide completed evaluation criteria form (Attachment III) for five (5) relevant projects. A minimum of three (3) of the five projects identified will need to have been performed by the Respondent. For at least three (3) of the projects completed by the respondent, please identify the key personnel and their roles and responsibilities. Please make additional copies of the form as needed.*
- b. *Attachment IV Evaluation Criteria Forms: Similar Projects and Past Performance, OPCC Table should be completed by utilizing the three (3) projects completed by the respondent (Attachment III) and three (3) additional projects, for a total of six (6) projects. Make additional copies of the form as needed. Please see below Changes to the RFQ to correct wording on Attachment IV Similar Projects and Past Performance, OPCC Table.*

3. **Question:** Do all subconsultants need to provide a Litigation Disclosure form for the SOQ submittal?

*Response: Litigation disclosure should be completed for the Respondent and all subconsultants.*

4. **Question:** Do all 5 projects need to be completed by the Prime firm?

*Response: Assuming the question is referring to Attachment III Evaluation Criteria Forms: Similar Projects and Past Performance, three (3) of the five projects need to be completed by the Respondent.*

5. **Question:** How many firms do you anticipate being selected for this award?

*Response: Please see response provided in Question 1.*

6. **Question:** What is the length of the contract for the selected firm(s)?

*Response: The term of this Contract is 2 years or upon expenditure of all funds, whichever occurs first. Any Work Order authorized in writing through a notice to proceed prior to contract expiration date shall remain in effect until the completion of the Work Order.*

7. **Question:** Page 21, Evaluation Criteria Summary Table, Similar Projects and Past Performance, Item 1 Complete the Project table provided within the Evaluation Criteria forms identify five (5) relevant projects, of similar size and scope to the Scope of Services & Additional Requirements identified within this RFQ that were completed within the past five (5) years. Identify key personnel, who are part of the proposed team, and their roles and responsibilities for at least three (3) of the five (5) projects. Pages 26-28, Attachment III - Similar Projects and Past Performance Provide detailed information for the five (5) completed relevant projects in the last five (5) years in which Respondent has performed services similar to those sought in this RFQ. Should there be a total of three or five projects included? If five projects should be included, should we create two additional pages for Attachment III?

*Response: See response to Question 2(a)*

8. **Question:** Page 22, Evaluation Criteria Summary Table, Similar Projects and Past Performance, Item 2. Using the table within the Evaluation Criteria form, provide information for the three (3) completed projects submitted in section 1) of this criteria, as well as three (3) additional projects, as it relates to the accuracy of the Opinions of Probable Construction Cost (OPCC) and change orders, comparing the 100% design phase estimate to approved construction awards. Page 29, Attachment IV – Opinion of Probable Construction Cost (OPCC) Table Using the table below, provide project cost information for the three (3) completed projects submitted in Similar Projects and Past Performance section, item (2) of the Attachment I Evaluation Criteria Details and Requirements, as it relates to the accuracy of the OPCC, comparing the Engineer’s 100% design phase estimate to approved construction contract awards. Should the OPCC form include a total of three projects or six?

*Response: See response to Question 2(b).*

9. **Question:** On page 6 of the RFQ, the items f. and g. in number 7. of section C. Additional Requirements, are the scopes of services, CCTV survey & Private Plumber Services, to be obtained after the contract is awarded or does SAWS want to see those included in our submittal?

*Response: Yes, please include CCTV survey and Private Plumber Services in submittals, under scope of services.*

10. **Question:** Does the table of contents count toward the page limit?

*Response: No, the table of contents does not count towards the page limit.*

11. **Question:** On the OPCC table provided, are the respondents to show only three (3) of the five (5) requested projects? In the presubmittal conference, SAWS also identified that they want to see OPCC data for three (3) additional projects. Would that mean respondents are to show data for eight (8) total projects? Are we allowed to edit the form to show the 8 since it only allows data for 3 projects to be shown?

*Response: See response to Question 2(b).*

12. **Question:** Can SAWS confirm that they want the responding firms to submit five (5) projects? There were only 3 project sheets in RFQ and criteria evaluation forms.

*Response: See response to Question 2(a).*

13. **Question:** Can SAWS confirm that they want Respondents to include firms that have not been a prime with SAWS in the past 5 years on the team for Sewer Design Services as identified in the Evaluation Criteria Summary Table SMWB Participation section?

*Response: This provision was from a prior solicitation and will be removed via an addendum. SMWB participation will be scored on an all-or-nothing basis for meeting (or not meeting) the mandatory SMWB goal. Respondents that meet the mandatory SMWB goal will earn fifteen (15) points, Respondents that do not meet the mandatory SMWB goal will earn zero (0) points. Please see below Changes to the RFQ.*

14. **Question:** Please clarify if Form 1295 is due at the time of submission or at the time of selection.

*Response: The 1295 form is to be provided at time of selection and receipt of the Selection Letter.*

15. **Question:** Will a cover letter be counted against the page limits?

*Response: No, the cover letter will not be counted against the page limits. See Section IV. B. 3.*

16. **Question:** Can our project examples include ongoing projects?

*Response: No, referenced projects should be completed within the past five (5) years.*

17. **Question:** Page 11 of the RFQ, Section B.3. mentions that we should number each page starting with the cover letter. Are there any page restrictions or limitations for the cover letter?

*Response: See response to Question 15.*

18. **Question:** During the pre-solicitation presentation, a strong emphasis was placed on written project approaches that were not generic or “cookie-cutter”. Other than describing the projects as “small diameter” in the RFQ, very little project description has been provided. It is difficult to write a detailed approach to an unspecified project with such little scope provided, particularly in regard to things like location, length, permitting jurisdictions, site condition, etc. Can SAWS

provide a scope for a typical project to support the level of detail they expect to see in our project approach?

*Response: At this time projects are not developed for the contract(s). Projects that include similar design scope such as small diameter water and/or sewer main by using trenchless or open cut installation methods, coordination with governmental and non-governmental agencies, etc. or a similar design format can be listed.*

19. **Question:** Please confirm the number of sample projects we need to include and confirm the number of additional projects to include on the OPCC table.

*Response: See response to Question 2(b).*

20. **Question:** Attachment 1 Evaluation Criteria Summary Table Under Similar Projects and Past Performance, the RFQ reads, Identify key personnel, who are part of the proposed team, and their roles and responsibilities for at least three (3) of the five (5) projects. Does this mean that each key person needs to link to at least 3 projects or that each of the prime's key projects needs to link to at least 3 key people?

*Response: Identify the Key Personnel who contributed to the three projects completed by the respondent and provide corresponding roles and responsibilities.*

21. **Question:** Similar Projects and Past Performance 2) States: Using the table within the Evaluation Criteria form, provide information for the three (3) completed projects submitted in section 1) of this criteria, as well as three (3) additional projects, as it relates to the accuracy of the Opinions of Probable Construction Cost (OPCC) and change orders, comparing the 100% design phase estimate to approved construction awards. While Similar Projects and Past Performance 1) States: Complete the Project table provided within the Evaluation Criteria forms identify five (5) relevant projects of similar size and scope to the Scope of Services & Additional Requirements identified within this RFQ that were completed within the past five (5) years.

- a. Does SAWS want us to provide information for the 5 completed projects submitted in Section 1 plus an additional 1 project, total of 6 for OPCC?
- b. Or are we supposed to provide only 3 projects in Section 1 and 3 additional projects for OPCC?

*Response:*

- a. *See response to Question 2(b).*
- b. *See response to Question 2.*

22. **Question:** Just for clarification: on the GFEP, when we're assigning percentages to our subconsultants, in regard to the subconsultant that hasn't worked with SAWS as a prime consultant in the past 5 years, does SAWS want to see that percentage at 10% or since the proposal is split into water and sewer (50/50) and 10% of the 50% of sewer is 5%, are they wanting to see 5%?

*Response: This provision was from a prior solicitation and will be removed via an addendum. SMWB participation will be scored on an all-or-nothing basis for meeting (or not meeting) the mandatory SMWB goal. Respondents that meet the mandatory SMWB goal will earn fifteen (15) points, Respondents that do not meet the mandatory SMWB goal will earn zero (0) points. Please see below Changes to the RFQ.*

**CHANGES TO THE RFQ**

- Attachment I, Evaluation Criteria Summary Table, Page 24. Remove the Small, Minority, Women Owned Business section ONLY and replace as follows: (See Clarifications #1)

<b>Small, Minority, and Woman, owned (SMWB) Business Participation</b>	<b>15 pts</b>	Complete Exhibit B indicating Respondent’s commitment to SAWS’ SMWB policy, which will be based on meeting or exceeding the minimum SMWB goal of 25%. All sub-consultants should be included on this form, regardless of their SMWB status (both SMWB and non-SMWB).	<b>Exhibit B</b>	✓ Ensure sub-consultants listed on the org chart are included on the GFEP
--	---------------	--	------------------	---

See Clarifications #1.

- Attachment IV, Evaluation Criteria Forms: Similar Projects and Past Performance, Opinion of Probable Construction Cost (OPCC) Table, Page 29. Remove the instructions on the top of the form and replace as follows: (See Clarifications #2)

*Using the table below, provide project cost information for the six (6) completed projects submitted in Similar Projects and Past Performance section, item (2) of the Attachment I Evaluation Criteria Details and Requirements, as it relates to the accuracy of the OPCC, comparing the Engineer’s 100% design phase estimate to approved construction contract awards.*

**CLARIFICATIONS**

- Revised Evaluation Criteria forms have been removed and replaced on the SAWS website to capture the revised language for Small, Minority, Women Owned Business (SMWB).

[https://apps.saws.org/Business\\_Center/Contractsol/Drill.cfm?id=4316&View=Yes](https://apps.saws.org/Business_Center/Contractsol/Drill.cfm?id=4316&View=Yes)

- Revised Evaluation Criteria forms have been removed and replaced on the SAWS website to capture the revised language for Attachment IV- Opinion of Probable Construction Cost (OPCC) Table.

[https://apps.saws.org/Business\\_Center/Contractsol/Drill.cfm?id=4316&View=Yes](https://apps.saws.org/Business_Center/Contractsol/Drill.cfm?id=4316&View=Yes)

**END OF ADDENDUM**

This Addendum is five (5) page(s) in its entirety with no attachments.