The following is additional information regarding Request for Proposal #SPU - 3777, titled “Flow Monitoring Services, Temporary Sites” released on 6/28/17. **The due date and time for responses has changed to 8/16/17 @4:00PM (Pacific).**  This addendum includes both questions from prospective proposers and the City’s answers, and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a proposal.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item # | Date Received | Date Answered | Vendor’s Question | City’s Answer | RFP Revisions |
| 1 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | In Section 3 of the RFP, Minimum Qualifications, Items i-vii do not apply to all the Specifications listed in Section 5 or Technical Response B. Were these intended to be “where applicable”? If so, please clarify to which specifications these would apply. Where Items i-vii do not apply, are there other minimum qualifications that would need to be met? | The Minimum Qualifications are not applicable to most of the work in this solicitation. The City has decided to reduce the Minimum qualifications to just item i. | Item 3. Minimum Qualifications on page 3 will now read:  *The following are minimum qualifications and licensing requirements that the Vendors must meet to be eligible to submit a RFP response. Responses must clearly show compliance to these minimum qualifications. Those that are not clearly responsive to these minimum qualifications shall be rejected by the City without further consideration:*   1. *The vendors must have at least 3 years of experience working as a vendor on any of the related tasks listed in the attached Environmental Monitoring Services Bid Items and reported to their clients and/or a regulatory authority*.   Also, the mandatory submittal, item 3 found on page 20 is revised as follows: |
| 2 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Also in Section 3, please clarify what is meant by the paragraph about vendors and authorized distributors. This does not apply at all to the type of work conducted by my firm, and therefore we would not meet this minimum qualification. | If you are proposing on an element of scope which does not require you to be an authorized dealer, or you will not be providing equipment to the City, disregard that section. |  |
| 3 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Regarding Section 5, Specifications and Scope of Work, these 63 items do not all match up with what is listed in Technical Response B. How are we to indicate which services – or specifications – we are submitting on - are we to follow Tech Response B or the list in Section 5? | Section 5 is informational only, Please indicate which services or specifications you are proposing by using Tech Response B. |  |
| 4 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Regarding Technical Response A:  Is this form to be completed once for a firm’s entire submittal? Or do we need to submit one of these forms for every specification, or perhaps for every Technical Response 2 tab, on which we submit? | One form per firm’s entire submittal. If some questions in Form A are not applicable to the services your firm is submitted on, it is acceptable to respond to those questions with ‘NA’. Your firm will not be penalized for items marked as ‘Not Applicable”. |  |
| 5 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Regarding Technical Response A:  Because Technical Response A is scored, if we mark items as Not Applicable, how is that scored? Does each line item carry a different number of points? | The 55 available points in Technical Response A – Specification / Technical Approach - will be distributed against the applicable questions answered per firm. Firms will not be penalized for questions that are not applicable to the scope which they proposing to perform. |  |
| 6 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Regarding Technical Response A:  Regarding the required 2 project examples, is that for each Tab category (per Tech Response B) or per Specification? If the latter, it may be hard to meet the 6-page requirement. Also there is conflicting guidance as to how old the projects should be. Please advise. | One form per firm’s entire submittal. If some questions in Form A are not applicable to the services your firm is submitted on, it is acceptable to respond to those questions with ‘NA’. Your firm will not be penalized for items marked as ‘Not Applicable” in those circumstances.  Provide the most representative example regardless of when it took place. |  |
| 7 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Regarding Technical Response A:  Regarding resumes for Key Staff, do these count toward the 6-page limit? If so, are biosketch paragraphs acceptable? Again, full resumes, even 1-pagers, would make meeting the 6-page requirement difficult. | Resumes and Org Chart do not count toward the 6 page limit. |  |
| 8 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Regarding Technical Response A:  Regarding environmental monitoring equipment and “providing an example of testing documentation,” is this “where applicable”? In our work we aren’t required to submit testing documentation. Please advise how to meet this requirement when our equipment consists of a GPS or similar type of equipment that does not have testing documentation protocols. | This requirement is only applicable to instrumentation that is typically calibrated or tested by the user (e.g. Level/Pressure Transducer) |  |
| 9 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Regarding Technical Response A:  Are the following items intended to be “where applicable,” and if so, do we need to state “not applicable” where appropriate to be considered responsive?  The item regarding scheduling maintenance  The item regarding calibrating and maintaining equipment, and data loss prevention  The item regarding safety training, traffic control, confined space, etc. | Please see the response in item #4. |  |
| 10 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Regarding Technical Response A:  Regarding identifying and managing significant risks “in successfully completing the scope of work,” this would be difficult to answer given there is no scope of work as yet – the scope of work would come with each task order. Please advise how to respond to this item. | Your response should correspond to the body or bodies of work that you are applying for in Technical Response B. |  |
| 11 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | Regarding Technical Response B:  Is there a page limit for Technical Response B? Printing out all the tabs with no information added yielded 42 pages. Do you want to specify a character limit for each line item? A page limit for each tab? Please advise. | There is no character or page limit and please submit only tabs that you are responding to. |  |
| 12 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | The RFP states that we are to sequentially number each page of our submittal. This will be difficult considering there are many separate forms in separate files that we will have to compile, especially for Technical Response B. Please advise how we can best meet this requirement. | This applies to only Technical Response A. |  |
| 13 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | In Item 1 under Submittal Requirements it also says the format should follow “that requested in the RFP”. By that do you mean we should organize the proposal according to Section 7, Offer Sheet and Mandatory Submittals? | Yes, Organize according to Section 7. |  |
| 14 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | The Submittal Requirements section also specifies “hard copy submittal” but also asks for an electronic CD, and that “If a CD, fax or e-mail version is delivered to the City, the hard copy will be the only official version accepted by the City.” These seem like conflicting statements. | An original and 4 copies of the response are required in paper format. Also, a CD or USB electronic version is required. The version of the response that is the original should be clearly marked and will be the official version in the event there are inconsistencies between electronic versions or other copies. |  |
| 15 | 7/13/17 | 7/31//17 | When is the open date scheduled? On page 17 the RFP states that “prior to the submittal closing date and time, a Vendor may changes its proposal…” However, at the Pre-Proposal Conference on July 11, it was stated that changes could be made up until the “open date,” meaning the date on which the sealed proposals will be opened for review, which was stated would be later than the closing date and is not listed in the RFP. | Once the sealed proposal due date has passed, the proposer can no longer make changes to the proposal. |  |
| 16 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | Is it preferable that a team include a WMBE subcontractor? Will a Contractor receive a higher score if teamed with a WMBE subcontractor? | Proposals will be evaluated on the criteria spelled out in step 2 and step 3 of 8. Evaluation Process. There is no scoring element that is attributed to utilization of a WMBE subcontractor. |  |
| 17 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | Section 3. Item iv., states: “The vendors must be able to support the a web-based system to view data in near-real time.” What is meant by “support”? Is this an existing web-based system? If so, what is the software package? If the contractor will need to provide the web-based system, what are the system requirements? | This only applies to flow data and the vendor can use their own system or post to the City’s system. The objective to be met is that the City will have access to data in near-real time. |  |
| 18 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | Section 3, paragraph 2 states: “The Vendor(s), if other than the manufacturer, shall provide a current, dated, and signed authorization from the manufacturer that the Vendor(s) is an authorized distributor, dealer or service representative and is authorized to sell the manufacturer's products”. Will this be needed if products are purchased by the contractor on behalf of the City? Since it is not known what specific equipment or supplies will be needed, can Contractor obtain authorization on an as-needed basis following contract award? | Please see the response provided in answer #2. |  |
| 19 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | Can Contractor use a third-party certified technician to repair intrinsically safe equipment? | Yes, If the third party certified technician is an authorized by vendor then it is OK. |  |
| 20 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | Section 3 also states “Wireless communications services and equipment shall be a vendor responsibility.” Will City reimburse the Contractor for these direct costs? | Yes, we will reimburse as direct cost or the City may request it’s own wireless provider depending on the project manager’s prerogative. |  |
| 21 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | “All vendor service work shall be performed within the City of Seattle operational area (essentially within City limits.)” Can we assume this is only referring to service work at SPU facilities, but that other tasks can occur at Contractor and other third-party locations outside of the City? | Yes. |  |
| 22 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | For the Bid Offer Sheet, can multiple hourly rates (or a range of rates) be provided for the items that cover a range of labor categories? | Jason, Can you clarify?  You cannot have a range but you can add additional job classifications |  |
| 23 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | If required for an individual project, can additional staff labor categories be added to the four staff labor categories included on the Bid Offer Sheet? | Jason, Can you clarify? You can have additional categories as long as it has been submitted with offer sheet. |  |
| 24 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | Third item under Specification/Technical Approach in Technical Response A seems to be missing a word: “Describe what is included in site \_\_, configuration, and other necessary information associated with a monitoring site, and how this information will be documented and maintained for clients.” | Thank you for catching this. The missing word is “Investigation”. | Describe what is included in site investigation, configuration, and other necessary information associated with a monitoring site, and how this information will be documented and maintained for clients. |
| 25 | 7/24/17 | 7/31//17 | Part of this submittal is a large spreadsheet “Technical Response B”. Is it ok to print this on 11 x 17 for readability? If not, what does the City prefer? | Yes, that is acceptable. |  |
| 26 | 7/26/17 | 7/31//17 | Our firm was newly incorporated 3.5 years ago.  While the founding principals, as well as the key technical staff identified in our proposal, each have in excess of 20 years of relevant experience, our firm, as a corporate entity cannot document at least 3 years of experience working as a primary vendor on any of the related tasks listed in the Environmental Monitoring Services outlined in the RFP.  Will this disqualify our firm from being a successful bidder? | Please see the response in item #1. The City will consider the experience of the founding principals and the key technical staff as equivalent experience to a firm. |  |
| 27 | 7/26/17 | 7/31//17 | If we are only interested and qualified for two items (#55 and 56) under the Specifications and Scope of Work, how do we successfully complete the minimum qualifications when many of the items are not relevant to the scope we are applying for? Will our proposal be considered and if so what is the recommended response to these sections, “not applicable?” | Please see the response in item #4. |  |