

“Request for Proposals” - Hospital Tank Replacement Engineering RFP #15/32/P

March 19, 2015

Addendum No. 3 – To address questions regarding the Hospital Tank RFP and to issue a revised ‘Evaluation Criteria Form’

The answers to the RFP questions from 3/18/15 are below and the revised Evaluation Criteria Form is attached:

1. The RFP asks the engineer to perform an evaluation of the two options for replacement of the tank: a 4 MG divided pre-stressed concrete tank or two 2 MG pre-stressed circular concrete tanks. A PER for the project was prepared in June 2013 that evaluated these two options and recommended the 4 MG divided pre-stressed concrete tank. What is the purpose of the additional evaluations?
*We would like any engineering firm who wishes to propose on this project to take a fresh look at the design constraints and specific design criteria in order to provide us **their** best recommendations. Providing the previous reports was **NOT** intended to allow proposing engineering firms to pick up where others had left off. We expect 100% effort from any firm wishing to propose on this project.*
2. The RFP Scope of Work, Part II.2., requires preliminary design to a 30% stage and construction cost estimates to present at three Public Meetings, followed by the preparation of a Conceptual Design Report. Is it the intent of the Owner that both tank options be designed to a 30% level prior to design concept selection?
As the RFP states, it is intended that a 30% conceptual design be presented to the public for each option being considered. Given the high profile location of the tank(s), public acceptance will be crucial to moving the project forward into construction.
3. The June 2013 PER recommended construction of a temporary bolted steel 1 MG tank to provide storage and water pressure while the existing tank is being demolished and the replacement tank constructed. Does the City require design and construction of a temporary tank as part of this project?
As stated in the answer to question number 1, we are not looking for an engineering firm to pick up where other engineering firms left off in their study of the subject tank. Having said that, we are not expecting a temporary tank, but are looking to an engineering firm who can propose those design options to us.
4. The RFP states that interviews will be held April 20 and that the recommendation to award will be on May 13. The RFP also states that the project needs to be designed and ready for bidding by December 15. Given that the RFP requires a preliminary design phase with 3 public meetings and preparation of a Conceptual Design Report that will be used to select the preferred option, is December 15 a realistic deadline?
It will be an aggressive schedule. We are looking for qualified engineering firms who are highly motivated to achieve our goals.
5. As part of the Submittal Requirements on Page 17, Part II Hourly Rates and Professional Fee Proposal, the RFP states that “Cost Summary forms must be completed and submitted for sub-agreements.” Is it required that cost summary forms be completed for all services to be subcontracted (e.g., geotechnical, survey, public involvement support, engineering specialist) by task detailing labor rates and category, expenses, etc., or can the offeror provide a total fee for each subcontract?
A total fee is acceptable for each individual subcontract anticipated.
6. The Evaluation Criteria Form weighted values and maximum scores appear inconsistent. Relevant experience of the firm is assigned a weighted value of 30/100 but the maximum score assigned is 350/1000. Conversely, a weighted

value of 20/100 and maximum score of 150/1000 is assigned to Proposed Fee. Are the weighted value or maximum score figures correct?

The sheet has been revised and is attached in this addendum.

7. The Evaluation Criteria Form and the Interview Evaluation Form provide for local preference adjustment to the total score. Will total scores also be adjusted for Resident Business Preference for each of these stages of the selection process?

The Resident Business Preference will be applied as described in the "Information for Proponents" section on page 6.

8. Sorry, one more question: May we assume the Transmittal Letter, tabbed dividers and NM Tax & Revenue Business Registration Certificate are not included in the 35 page limit?

The 35 page limit indicated on page 21 will no longer apply to this RFP.

Project Manager & Water Division Engineer: Eric Ulibarri, (505) 955-4279

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM

RFP: '15/18/P

PROJECT: **Engineering Services for Hospital Tank Replacement Engineering**

NAME OF FIRM: _____

The consultant selection, or short listing for interviews, will be based upon evaluation of the proposal and the Firm's qualifications, relative to the evaluation criteria.

| Proposal Component | Weighted Value | (1=low, 10=high) | Total Score | Max Score |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Design Approach/ Methodology: Grasp of project requirements | 20 | | | 200 |
| Firm/Project Team: Relevant experience of firm project and specific qualifications & experience of project team, demonstrated by previous projects | 30 | | | 300 |
| Past Performance: The quality and timeliness of previous work for the City or other entity; the demonstrated ability to mobilize quickly, control costs, provide competent designs and accurate plans; the ability to meet schedules. List of at least 3 pre-stressed, post-tensioned tank projects with references. | 5 | | | 50 |
| Knowledge of Local Conditions; Industry std. construction practice; labor & trades, bonding, seasonal construction limitations, project site, environmental, regulatory and procurement requirements. | 5 | | | 50 |
| Work Plan & Project Schedule; discussion of work elements and time frames | 15 | | | 150 |
| Work Load: Consultant's staff size related to current uncompleted work and the amount of work proposed under this project. The amount of city work, if any, not yet 75% complete. | 5 | | | 50 |
| Proposed Fees: <i>Is fee reasonable for scope and schedule? A very low fee may reflect a narrow scope, missing scope or a reduced amount of qualified engineer time. A very High fee may reflect us paying firm's learning curve, higher than normal area pay rates or higher effort than is required.</i> | 20 | | | 200 |
| Total Score | 100 | | | 1000 |

Multiply the Total Score by factor of 1.10 if company has an approved Local Preference Certification form included with proposal:

Local Preference Score, if applicable: Total Score x 1.10 = _____

Please do not minimize the importance of an adequate response in any area.

SELECTION COMMITTEE

EVALUATOR SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____