

# **Tacoma Water**

ADDENDUM NO. 1 DATE: August 19, 2024

**REVISIONS TO:** 

Request for Qualifications Specification No. TW24-0108F Canyonfalls Creek Pump Station

## **NOTICE TO ALL Proposers:**

This addendum is issued to clarify, revise, add to or delete from, the original specification documents for the above project. This addendum, as integrated with the original specification documents, shall form the specification documents. The noted revisions shall take precedence over previously issued specification documents and shall become part of this contract. Pursuant to Section 6.1 of the specification, similar questions have been grouped together to provide a single answer.

### **REVISIONS TO THE SUBMITTAL DEADLINE:**

The submittal deadline has been extended to 11:00 a.m., Pacific Time, Tuesday, September 17, 2024. The remaining schedule dates have been revised as follows:

Step 1 – RFQ Phase	
July 24, 2024	
July 31, 2024 at 9:00 AM PDT	
September 5th, 2024 at 3:00 PM PDT	
September 12th, 2024	
September 17, 2024 at 11:00 AM PDT	
September 18-24, 2024	
September 27, 2024	
Step 2 – RFP Phase	
October 7, 2024	
Week of October 14, 2024	
October 25, 2024 at 3:00 PM PDT	
November 1, 2024	
November 19, 2024 at 11:00 AM PDT	
November 19 – December 10, 2024	
Week of December 2, 2024	
Week of December 13, 2024	
December 2024 - January 2025	
March 2025	



# City of Tacoma

Key Milestones	Target Date(s)
Project Execution	
Phase 1 - Pre-GMP Design (0-60% Design)	March - December 2025
Validation Period (0-30% Design)	March - June 2025
Design Development (30-60% Design)	June - November 2025
Negotiate GMP Amendment	November – December 2025
Tacoma Public Utilities Board Approval and GMP Amendment Executed (on or before)	January 2026
Phase 2 - Final Design, Permitting, Bidding	December 2025 - September 2027
<u>&amp; Construction</u>	
Phase 2 Design (60-100% Design)	December 2025 - May 2026
Construction	February 2026 - September 2027
Substantial Completion	September 2027

## **REVISIONS TO THE GENERAL INFORMATION AND REQUIREMENTS:**

### **Revision #1**

Remove from Section 3.5 SOQ Evaluation Criteria -

Under Forms, Bullet #5 Identification of Projects Table.

## Revision #2

Revise Section 3.7.2 DB Team Qualifications and Past Performance References -

Total construction contract value, listed by year, of projects completed in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho for 2022 and 2023.

### Revision #3

Revise Section 3.7.2 DB Team Qualifications and Past Performance References -

Total construction contract value of projects in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho completed and in progress for 2024.

# Revision #4

Revise Section 3.7.2 DB Team Qualifications and Past Performance References –

Total construction contract value of projects in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho that will be in progress and/or anticipated to begin construction in 2025, including this project which would begin construction in 2025 - 2026.



#### Revision #5

Revise Section 3.11 Identification of Projects Table –

The Proposer must submit the Identification of Projects Table located in Attachment E for this section of the SOQ Evaluation Criteria. Proposers are required to use the form provided and not submit the information using their own form. The purpose of the Identification of Projects Table is to provide evaluators with sufficient information to determine whether projects cited are Projects of Similar Scope and Complexity; therefore, Proposers are required to submit the information below for every project mentioned in the SOQ narrative (i.e., excluding resumes and other attachments). Failure to submit the required information will not render an SOQ non-responsive, but it could have a negative impact on a Proposer's score.

The Identification of Projects Table may be submitted on 8.5" x 14" paper and will not count towards the maximum page limit. Responses should be brief; evaluators will refer to the SOQ narrative for detailed project information. The Proposer is responsible for ensuring that contact information contained in their Identification of Projects Table is correct. The inability to contact a reference may have a detrimental impact on the evaluating qualifications. The Owner reserves the right to contact any person listed in the Identification of Projects Table or any other person with knowledge regarding any Project in which any DB Team Member or Key Team Member participated. The identification of projects will not be evaluated separately. Rather, the projects will be evaluated in the context of the criteria set forth in Section 3.7.

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

1. Question: Is the project subject to any PLA's (Union Project Labor agreements)?

Answer: No.

2. Question: In Sections 3.4 (item 3) makes mention that higher preference will be given to Contractors with PDB and/or GC/CM delivery and/or projects delivered in Washington State. While this language does say "and/or", Section 3.8 of the RFQ seems to contradict this.

Answer: It is not the City's intent to give significant preference to firms that have alternate delivery experience in Washington State. The City will consider all factors listed in the RFQ, with alternate delivery experience in Washington State considered as one component of one qualification criterion. It is not the City's intent to disqualify firms that only have projects of similar scope and complexity outside of Washington State.

3. Question: RFQ – Attachment F – Draft Contract (pages 44 – 101 of 144) How does City of Tacoma want the Design Builder to comment on the DBIA Contract?

Answer: Comments on the Draft Contract will be accepted at the proposal stage. Further direction will be provided with the RFP.



## City of Tacoma

4. Question: RFQ section 3.7, DB Team Qualifications and Past Performance References - 35 points item #5 on page 16 of 144, and RFQ section 3.11, Identification of Projects Table - Pass/Fail on page 19 of 144: The project profiles in section 3.7 #5 include everything required for the Identification of Projects Table (Attachment E). Do the 3 to 5 projects listed within the SOQ that are presented in section 3.7 #5 need to also be listed in Attachment E (Identification of Projects Table - section 3.11)?

Answer: Yes, it is the City's intent to require the basic project information be provided in tabular format in addition to the SOQ narrative. This requirement has been revised to provide additional flexibility.

5. Question: RFQ section 3.2, SOQ General Requirements item #1 on page 11 of 144 and RFQ section 3.5, SOQ Evaluation Criteria Table on page 15 of 144: #1 in section 3.2 references to organize the SOQ content per Section 3.5. The table in section 3.5 lists SOQ Section No. 3.11 (Identification of Projects Table) directly after section 3.10, but again as a required form below SOQ Section No 3.11. Two questions in regards to this: 1) Would you like Attachment E (Identification of Projects Table) directly after Section 3.10 of the proposal, or as an attached form? 2) Do the pages of Attachment E (Identification of Projects Table), if placed directly after Section 3.10, count towards the page count?

Answer: Identification of Projects Table should be included after Section 3.10, but it is considered a form and the number of pages do not count towards the maximum SOQ page count.

6. Question: It is our understanding that Brown & Caldwell is assisting with the procurement process for Canyonfalls Creek Pump Station and is also the program manager for the planned P1 transmission improvements. Is Brown & Caldwell building a hydraulic model of P1 that will be used as the basis for hydraulic design criteria? Or should it be assumed that the design-build team will build a hydraulic model to determine system curves for the various pumping scenarios?

Answer: The City's intent is to have Brown and Caldwell maintain the hydraulic model for Pipeline 1. This includes transient analysis and surge mitigation identification. The design-build team will be responsible for the hydraulic design of the pump station within the given boundary conditions identified in the System Curves Memorandum provided with the RFQ. It is acknowledged that coordination between the Brown and Caldwell model and the design-build team's analysis will be necessary, and such coordination will be led by the City.

7. Question: RFQ section 6.11, Eligibility/Disallowed Firms on page 23 of 144: Delve Underground is prohibited from joining any Proposer's team. Can clarity be provided as to what role they have on the project and whether or not the Design-Build team needs to include additional geotechnical analysis or recommendations for this project?

Answer: Delve Underground has been retained by Brown and Caldwell under the overall P1 Pressurization Program Owner's Advisor's services. Delve will primarily be providing geotechnical support for the program, however as a part of a larger scope of work they will be performing a single geotechnical exploration at the Canyonfalls Creek Pump Station site. This exploration is anticipated to be a 50ft auger. The results will be provided to the selected design-build team; however, interpretation of the exploration results will not be completed by Delve. The design-build team will be expected to make their own interpretation of the information provided by Delve and perform any additional geotechnical investigations required for design of the project.



# City of Tacoma

NOTE: Acknowledge receipt of this addendum by initialing the corresponding space as indicated on the signature page. Vendors who have already submitted their bid/proposal may contact the Purchasing Division at 253-502-8468 and request return of their bid/proposal for acknowledgment and re-submittal. Or, a letter acknowledging receipt of this addendum may be submitted in an envelope marked Request for Bids Qualifications No. TW24-0108F Addendum No. 1. The City reserves the right to reject any and all bids, including, in certain circumstances, for failure to appropriately acknowledge this addendum.

cc: Alicia Flatt, Tacoma Water