



REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

2019 Sanitary Sewer Overflow and Reduction Program (SSORP) Engineering Design Services Package 2

Solicitation No.: PS-00080-SM

Addendum 1 | August 27, 2019

CHANGES TO THE RFQ

1. Page 3, Section D. 2. 60% Design Phase e. that reads:

e. Review the survey data and deliverables prepared in accordance with the guidelines listed below to ensure the scope of work prepared for the Owner clearly identifies the Category or Categories of service to be performed based on the Project scope. Work products shall conform to the tolerances associated with the category of service provided. The latest version of the following documents shall be used as survey references and guidelines:

- Texas Board of Professional Engineers (TBPE) Practices Act and General Rules, Procedures and Practices
- Texas Society of Professional Surveyors (TSPS) Manual of Practice for Land Surveying in the State of Texas
- City of San Antonio Design Guidance Manual – Section 3 Surveying and Mapping and applicable appendices.

Is amended to read:

e. Review the survey data and deliverables prepared in accordance with the guidelines listed below to ensure the scope of work prepared for the Owner clearly identifies the Category or Categories of service to be performed based on the Project scope. Work products shall conform to the tolerances associated with the category of service provided. The latest version of the following documents shall be used as survey references and guidelines:

- i. Texas Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors (TBPELS) Practices Act and General Rules, Procedures and Practices
- ii. Texas Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors (TBPELS) Manual of Practice for Land Surveying in the State of Texas
- iii. City of San Antonio Design Guidance Manual – Section 3 Surveying and Mapping and applicable appendices. (Survey Task Management - See Attachment H For additional information).

2. Page 11, Section II. Selection Process, C. Evaluation Criteria Summary Table, Project Approach Description that reads:

- 1) Describe the team's approach to complete the project, to include managing risk between design related issues and constructability and overall project budget.
 - Respondent should select one (1) of the projects identified within this RFQ and in answering the above address the unique circumstances for that specific project as appropriate based on Respondent's review of the project matrix, charter and map provided.
- 2) Describe Respondent's team's approach to preparing deliverables to meet deadlines associated with fast track schedules without compromise to quality. Include schedule risks and mitigation measures, schedule recovery approach and other issues relative to schedule maintenance on similar projects.
- 3) Describe Respondent's team's approach to preparing deliverables without compromise to quality. Include schedule risks and mitigation measures, schedule recovery approach and other issues relative to schedule maintenance on similar projects.

Is amended to read:

- 1) Describe the team's approach to complete the project, to include managing risk between design related issues and constructability and overall project budget.
 - Respondent should select one (1) of the projects identified within this RFQ and in answering the above address the unique circumstances for that specific project as appropriate based on Respondent's review of the project matrix, charter and map provided.
- 2) Identify Respondent's team's suggested alternative innovative approaches to accomplishing the scope of services identified within this RFQ that would result in a more successful and timely completion of the Project.
- 3) Describe Respondent's team's approach to preparing deliverables to meet deadlines associated with fast track schedules without compromise to quality. Include schedule risks and mitigation measures, schedule recovery approach and other issues relative to schedule maintenance on similar projects.

3. Page 17, Section V. Exhibit B, Subsection 1, Letters a and b, that reads:

- a) M/WBE Scoring Method: Up to 10 Points (By percentage) 40.00% M/WBE Goal
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 1% and 7.99%: 2 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 8% and 14.99%: 4 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 15% and 21.99%: 6 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 22% and 28.99%: 8 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 29% and 34.99%: 10 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 35% and 39.99%: 12 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage meeting or exceeding 40.00%: 15 Points
- b) Utilization of a local SMWB-certified Engineering Firm that has not worked with SAWS before as a prime consultant, for 10% of Sewer Design Services: 5 Points

Is amended to read:

- a) M/WBE Scoring Method: Up to 10 Points (By percentage) **40.00% M/WBE Goal**
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 1% and 9.99%: 2 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 10% and 19.99%: 4 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 20% and 29.99%: 6 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage between 30% and 39.99%: 8 Points
 - M/WBE Participation Percentage meeting or exceeding 40.00%: 10 Points

- b) Utilization of a local SMWB-certified Engineering Firm that has not worked with SAWS before as a prime consultant, for 10% of Sewer Design Services: **5 Points**

END CHANGES TO THE RFQ

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Can you confirm how many contracts will be awarded as a result of this solicitation??

Response: SAWS anticipates awarding 8 contracts as a result of this solicitation.

2. Can you please clarify what questions are to be addressed in the Project Approach section?

- 1) Describe the team's approach to complete the project, to include managing risk between design related issues and constructability and overall project budget.
 - a) Respondent should select one (1) of the projects identified within this RFQ and in answering the above address the unique circumstances for that specific project as appropriate based on Respondent's review of the project matrix, charter and map provided.
- 2) Describe Respondent's team's approach to preparing deliverables to meet deadlines associated with fast track schedules without compromise to quality. Include schedule risks and mitigation measures, schedule recovery approach and other issues relative to schedule maintenance on similar projects.
- 3) Describe Respondent's team's approach to preparing deliverables without compromise to quality. Include schedule risks and mitigation measures, schedule recovery approach and other issues relative to schedule maintenance on similar projects.

However, questions 2 and 3 in the pre-submittal meeting presentation are different (and differ slightly from past RFQs):

- 1) Same as above
- 2) Identify team's suggested alternative innovative approaches to accomplishing the scope of services identified
- 3) Describe team's approach to preparing deliverables to meet deadlines
 - b) Include schedule risks and mitigation measures, schedule recovery approach and other issues relative to schedule maintenance on similar projects

Any clarification as to what we should address in our narrative would be helpful!

Response: This section has been revised to clarify this difference. Please reference the revised Section II. Selection Process, C. Evaluation Criteria Summary Table, Project Approach Description, #2 in the Changes to the RFQ section of this Addendum.

3. We are submitting a proposal for this RFQ, and we have a question regarding the page numbering. The page limit for each section is delineated in the Evaluation Criteria table. The combined number of the pages per section equals 17, which doesn't leave any pages left for the cover letter. We assumed the cover letter counts toward the page limit because the RFQ instructs respondents to begin page numbering with the cover letter. Could you clarify whether the cover letter counts toward the page limit or could the page limit be increased?

Response: The cover page does not count towards the page limit.

4. On page 11 of the RFQ, under the Project Approach section, Questions 2 and 3 appear to be the same question, although slightly different. Is this intentional or should one of those questions be something different?

Response: See response to question number 2.

5. Regarding the referenced solicitation we have the following question:

For the Project Approach section, what is the main difference SAWS is expecting to be addressed between items 2) and 3), as they are asking for very similar items.

Response: See response to question number 2.

6. As a prime, do we need to include original signatures for the subconsultant forms or will a printed copy (from PDF) suffice?

Response: No sub-consultant signatures are required for the respondents.

7. What forms do you require from subconsultants?

Response: None.

8. In regards to Sol. No. PS-00080-SM SSORP Engineering Design Services Package 2: Does SAWS require an original (wet) signature on the Conflict of Interest (COI) forms *from the subconsultants* on our team? Or alternatively, would an original signature on the COI *from us (as the prime consultant)* be sufficient?

Response: A wet signature is required for the Conflict of Interest (COI) form and should be submitted by Respondent (prime consultant) as part of the original proposal. The copies of the proposal do not required wet signatures for the COI or any of the other documents. Sub-consultant signatures are not required for the COI or any of the other required documents.

9. We have the following question in regards to the 2019 SSORP Engineering Design Services Package 2 RFQ.

Is a Form 1295 Disclosure of Interested Parties required to be included with a respondent's submittal?

Response: No, each of the selected firms will be required to submit 1295 Disclosure of Interested Parties Form with the signed contract.

10. During the pre-submittal meeting, the following question was asked. How is the SMWVB calculated? Is it calculated based on the percentage of the Sewer Design Services or is it calculated based on the percentage of Total Design Services? Please clarify.

Response: The SMWB points are calculated in two ways, explained below. All firms, whether SMWB or Non-SMWB, are eligible to earn up to 15 SMWB points. SMWBs must be local, must have Small Business Enterprise certification, and must be certified by the South Central Texas Regional Certification Agency or the Texas Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) Program to be eligible for points.

1. The ten possible SMWB points featured below are calculated based on Minority or Woman-owned Business Enterprise (M/WBE) participation for total design services and support services:

M/WBE Scoring Method: Up to 10 Points (By percentage) 40.00% M/WBE Goal

- M/WBE Participation Percentage between 1% and 9.99%: 2 Points*
- M/WBE Participation Percentage between 10% and 19.99%: 4 Points*
- M/WBE Participation Percentage between 20% and 29.99%: 6 Points*
- M/WBE Participation Percentage between 30% and 39.99%: 8 Points*
- M/WBE Participation Percentage meeting or exceeding 40.00%: 10 Points*

2. The five points below are based on the percentage of Sewer Design Services:
- *Utilization of a local SMWB-certified Engineering Firm that has not worked with SAWS before as a prime consultant, for 10% of Sewer Design Services: 5 Points*

END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

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

END ADDENDUM 1
