RFP #20-003 POTOMAC INTERCEPTOR (PI) FLOW ANALYSIS

Addendum #2

Date 10/24/2019

PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING

A Pre-Submission Conference was held for potential Proposers(s) to meet at the COG offices on Thursday, October 11, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. EDT.

Sign-in sheet was circulated and email responses from those on the phone are attached (see Attachment A).

Introductions were made to open the meeting at 10:03 AM.

Rick Konrad discussed the new electronic submission system. All proposals must be submitted through this system. Late submissions are not allowed.

Nassar Ameen did a brief review of the project scope and background.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. The RFP did not establish a page limit for Section 3 in total only to the individual resume length. Please clarify if there a desired number of pages for the section and for the number of resumes included. Please clarify.

Section 3 (Qualifications of the firm and key personnel) should not exceed 15 pages. Resumes are not included in the page limitation.

2. The RFP did not establish a page limit for Section 4 in total or to the length of reference letters. Please clarify If a limit is desired.

Information to be provided with the references is defined in Attachment C. The maximum number of references to be provided is five; there is no limit to the number of pages for each reference.

3. Where should the proposer put the forms such as the debarment form and the Certificate of Insurance?

Attachment B - Certification regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters should be included with the Cost Proposal after the RFP response form.

4. Where in the proposal should project descriptions be included?

Project descriptions should be included in Section 3 (Qualifications of the firm and key personnel).

5. Is there any back up documentation to the 2010 presentation that could be provided?

No back up documentation for the 2010 presentation can be provided

RFP #20-003 POTOMAC INTERCEPTOR (PI) FLOW ANALYSIS

6. What version of InfoWorks is the existing model built in? CS/ICM?

InfoWorks 9.5.1

7. Will the model be used to revisit the 2012 IMA if the model flow parameters are significantly adjusted based on available meter data?

The model, in conjunction with other studies and analyses, will inform the long-term planning efforts described in IMA Section 7 and Operating Agreement #4.

8. Will the available/recent flow meter data sites be the same as the flow meter sites used to build the 2003 Metcalf & Eddy Model?

Additional information regarding flow meter data sites can be found in the June 2017 "Blue Plains Service Area Billing Meter Assessment Study, Contract No. 16-016, Final Report" prepared by RJN Group. The scope of work for this contract does not include the installation of additional meters.

Please see ZIP file for the Billing Meter Assessment Study files on the bid portal.

9. Will MWCOG or one of the Blue Plains Users take ownership of the model at the conclusion of the project?

The deliverables identified in the RFP do not include an updated model.

- 10. Please note that Attachment A-Terms and Conditions includes 2 sections for Insurance requirements: Section X on page 20 and Section XX on page 26.
 - a. Please clarify if proof on insurance is necessary to be included with the proposal or later prior to Contract signature.

At the time of submission of the proposal. This confirms the organizations insurability prior to evaluation of the submissions.

b. If so, should it be included at the end of the Cost proposal?

Yes. At the end of the submission would be ideal.

11. DBE Points?

See chart provided on page 15. The contractor or sub-contractor must be a <u>DBE</u> to receive these points. No other designation will receive credit.

12. Exhibit B backup documentation?

No back up documentation for the 2010 presentation can be provided

RFP #20-003 POTOMAC INTERCEPTOR (PI) FLOW ANALYSIS

13. Page 5, Section III.D.2.a (Summary Report): This section states that the report should recommend options, "...including planning level cost estimates (capital and life cycle) and benefits..." to address any capacity issues identified. This implies that alternatives would need to be modeled in order to identify sizes (for costing) and any benefits.

Alternatives will not be modeled in detail or scored as part of this scope. The consultant will be recommending alternative solutions (along with planning level cost-estimates); however, establishing a framework for evaluating the universe of alternatives and any associated ranking of alternatives or development of potential portfolios would be included in a subsequent scope of work.

14. Page 6, Section III.D.2.d: "Evaluation of alternatives is outside the scope of work for this project."

See answer to Question 13.

15. Please confirm that the modeling platform will be in Infoworks. Prior modeling efforts have been in other platforms.

Yes, Infoworks 9.5.1 will be the modeling platform.

16. Does the 11-point font requirement apply to tables?

10-point font requirement will apply to tables.

17. On page 10 of the RFQ it states:

"Section 4. References of the Contractor and any Subcontractor(s) - 1. The proposed Contractor and any Subcontractor shall provide not less than three (3) and not more than five (5) references who COG may contact regarding similar work performed. Offerors may provide letters of reference from previous relevant clients...."

Does this mean we need to include attachment C (the references form) for each of the subconsultants also? When I read it I take it to mean B&V needs 3-5 references and each sub needs to provide 3-5 references.

References are <u>not</u> needed for the subs. Only the proposer. COG may request further references from the subs during the evaluation phase.

18. Will there be and Addendum #2

No further Addendums are planned. This is Addendum #2.

Addendum #1 was to reschedule the proposal meeting.

19. Please indicate if the upset limit of \$200,000 is firm and fixed for the base scope or if COG intended this as an indicative level of effort?

COG has a total of \$200,000 budgeted for the scope of this study.

20. The period of performance indicates the contract may be extended for up to three (3) oneyear option periods. Will the upset limit for each option period be \$200,000 per year, or \$50,000 per year?

The budget of \$200,000 will be for the entire scope of this study. An additional \$50,000 is available for any additional work that is needed to be completed during this study.