

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #2024-06
CAMPUS WATER BOOSTING STATION – DESIGN SERVICES
RESPONSE TO CLARIFYING QUESTIONS I
September 25, 2024

Note that these are questions submitted by interested firms to this solicitation. The below answers are for clarification purposes only and in no way alter or amend the solicitation as published.

1. **QUESTION:** Both the background information (question 1) and reference question (question 5) ask for references. Should these be the same references listed twice, or different references? Our interpretation is question 1 is looking for water system references, and question 5 is looking for pump station specific references. Is that correct? If not, please provide some more guidance on which references you would like us to include at these locations.

ANSWER: References can be the same but should be listed where requested.

2. **QUESTION:** Is the fire flow testing meant to be completed only 10 days after the contract is awarded?

ANSWER: Firms should include a proposed schedule of services.

3. **QUESTION:** The order of the scope of work is non-traditional and there are some inconsistencies. Would OIT accept a reprioritized list of tasks based on our experience with similar projects?

Here are a few of the inconsistencies:

- i. Parts of priority 3 need to be completed before priority 1 so we can confirm exactly how large to build the pump station (we already have the preliminary determination, but it needs to be finalized). We need to calculate the demands from task 3 before task 1 is finalized. The report can be provided later to save time and further expedite task 1.
- ii. The fire flow testing is priority 4, but it is due only 10 days after contract award. It will be impossible to do tasks 1-3 before priority 4 based on time. The information from task 4 is also required to complete Priority 3.
- iii. Priority 5 sounds like it would happen after everything else is completed since it is for on-going services.

ANSWER: Firms should include a proposed schedule that clearly outlines all required scope elements.

4. **QUESTION:** How would you like us to account for task 5 on-going water pressure testing and consulting services as subject matter expert in the costs? As of right now, the scope has not defined the testing frequency (i.e. once a year for 3 years?).

ANSWER: The university will be looking to the successful proposer to suggest testing frequency, based on their subject matter expertise.

5. **QUESTION:** There are two sets of sub tasks for task 1 priority 1 Booster Pump Station. Which set would you like us to use? There is one set (12 sub tasks) listed in the original proposal and addendum 2 under scope of work. However, addendum 1 and a different part of addendum 2 list 8 different subtasks. The 8 and 12 subtasks accomplish the same objective with different ways of breaking up the tasks.

ANSWER: Firm's proposed schedule should outline all required tasks.

6. **QUESTION:** Does question 4 Quality of Proposal need to be rephrased and answered specifically as currently written, or is the intent to demonstrate that through the quality of the proposal without answering the question.

ANSWER: The proposal quality is based on content, format, and message to ensure compliance and completeness.

End of Response to Clarifying Questions I