



City of Tacoma
Environmental Services Department – Science & Engineering

Jefferson & Hood Street Surface Water Interceptor Project
Specification No. ES17-0269F

QUESTIONS and ANSWERS No. 2

Short-listed firms had the opportunity to submit final comments and questions on the Request for Proposals (RFP) by November 21, 2017. The answers to the questions received are listed below and posted to the City's Project website at www.govme.org/es/jefferson/rfp.html. This information IS NOT considered an addendum; responses to questions requiring an addendum are addressed in Addendum 4 to the RFP. Respondents should consider this information when submitting their proposals.

Question 1: Regarding mitigation actions set by the EIS documents, has the City developed a complete list of expected mitigations from the SEPA/EIS process?

Answer 1: Except for requirements associated with "complete streets", this issue was addressed in RFP Addendum 3, Item 5 under "MODIFICATIONS TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (Volume I of II)". Information regarding complete streets requirements are included in RFP Addendum 4.

Question 2: Potholing is required as part of the Utility Verification Process. The number of Utilities in the vicinity of the work are not known at this time. Please consider establishing a baseline number of potholes to be included in Stage 1.

Answer 2: See RFP Addendum 4.

Question 3: Does the City have a location where the drill cuttings/waste soil from environmental and geotechnical drilling can be stored before the material is analyzed and the waste soil can be properly profiled and disposed? Soil will be containerized in 55-gallon drums; based on the number of soil borings and depths, there may be 40-50+ drums of waste generated. Similarly, purge water will be generated during groundwater sampling activities (Subtask 3.2) and containerized; this waste will also require temporary storage during waste profiling prior to disposal.

Answer 3: See RFP Addendum 4.

Question 4: Subtask 3.2 requires soil sample collection at 2.5 feet intervals, with samples to be submitted for laboratory analysis of multiple parameters identified under Subtask 3.5. For deeper borings, this sampling interval may result in laboratory analysis of 6 to 8 soil samples for a single boring. Sample collection, handling and laboratory analysis of this many samples could be significant. Does the City require that all samples collected be 1) submitted to the laboratory for analysis and 2) be submitted for analysis of the full list of chemicals? Or, can available investigation data be used to select applicable laboratory analyses (rather than all) depending on boring location and field screening techniques being used to select some number of samples per boring for analysis?

- Answer 4: RFP Addendum 3 identifies the assumed number of samples to be submitted for testing. See RFP Addendum 4 regarding the selection of samples for analysis.
- Question 5: Designs for utility relocations is not included in the tasks identified in Subtask 13.2. If designs for utility relocations is intended to be included during Stage 1, please provide direction on how the costs for these designs can be budgeted. (i.e. number of relocations, etc.)**
- Answer 5: See RFP Addendum 3, Items 7 (11) 2 and 7 (13) 2 under “MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRAFT DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACT (Volume II of II)”.
- Question 6: Who is responsible for paying for 3rd parties (WSDOT, BNSF, Sound Transit) and the Utility Companies to attend meetings and/or review design packages?**
- Answer 6: See RFP Addendum 3, Item 8(1), revisions to Table A3-1 (added footnote), under “MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRAFT DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACT (Volume II of II)”.
- Question 7: (Appendix 3, Section 3.1) Consider deleting 2nd paragraph in its entirety.**
- Answer: 7: The City has considered this but has not made the requested change.
- Question 8: Has the City received any feedback from regulatory agencies and Tribes regarding the initial JARPA submittal? Is there anything you can share to help us plan?**
- Answer 8: See RFP Addendum 3, Item 6 under “MODIFICATIONS TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (Volume I of II)”.
- Question 9: Who is responsible for drafting and executing utility agreements? What can the Progressive Design-Builder rely on as to the cooperation of the utility companies?**
- Answer 9: See RFP Addendum 4.
- Question 10: (Appendix 8, Section 8.5) In order to calculate the fee as a percentage of the contract value, this requires the estimated general conditions costs to be divided by the estimated project value. The City provided a range for the contract value. Please consider providing a single value (such as \$13,000,000) that the proposers are to use to calculate the percentage so they are evaluated equally.**
- Answer 10: The City has considered this but has not made the requested change.
- Question 11: (Appendix 8, Section 8.6) In order to calculate the fee as a percentage of the contract value, this requires the estimated general conditions costs to be divided by the estimated project value. The City provided a range for the contract value. Please consider providing a single value (such as \$13,000,000) that the proposers are to use to calculate the percentage so they are evaluated equally.**
- Answer 11: The City has considered this but has not made the requested change.

Question 12: (Appendix 8, Attachment 8A, Section 2) Consider removing small tools, tool shed and consumables as this is considered direct costs associated with installing the Work.

Answer 12: The City has considered this but has not made the requested change.

Question 13: (Appendix 8, Attachment 8A, Section 3) Consider removing Site Erosion Control and Street Cleaning as these are consider Direct Costs.

Answer 13: See RFP Addendum 4.

Question 14: (Appendix 8, Attachment 8A, Section 3) Consider removing Temporary Weather Protection as it is near impossible to price at this time.

Answer 14: See RFP Addendum 4.

Question 15: (Appendix 8, Attachment 8A, Section 3) Consider removing Traffic Control Equipment Rental and Fencing, Barricades, Partitions, Protected Walkways and Other Measures Used for Traffic Control On-site as these are considered direct costs of doing the work (IE, if we have to take a lane closure and set up traffic control to install pipe in the street, this is direct costs).

Answer 15: See RFP Addendum 4.

Question 16: Estimated flow at outfall – To help our team determine outfall size and shoreline armoring needs, the City's estimated flow is requested. This will allow our team to determine if the currently used rip rap for the Thea Foss shoreline and a flow spreading outlet structure is appropriate or if a different approach will be necessary.

Answer 16: See RFP Addendum 4.