

**ADDENDUM NO. 1**

**CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES  
FOR INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS  
RFQ NO. 21-19**

This Addendum amends and/or supplements the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) No. 21-19 for Professional Engineering Services for Infrastructure Capital Improvements.

**Respondents shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum by writing the words “Addendum No. 1” at the bottom of page 1 of the Statement of Qualifications Form included in Appendix A.**

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS – CLARIFICATIONS**

1. On Page 16, SECTION 2.3, add the following paragraph for clarification regarding multi-discipline projects:

***“Multi-discipline engineering services is not a category for which the City will select firms to negotiate contracts. However, firms may include qualifications related to multi-discipline infrastructure improvement projects within the response to a related category: Highway and Bridges, Water or Sewer.”***

2. On Page 16, SECTION 2.4 – Representative Projects, add the ***bold italicized*** text and edit the bulleted list to read as follows:

“For the purposes of evaluating the qualifications of firms responding to this RFQ, Rochester DPW desires a summary proposal in select categories outlining the firm's approach to the following representative projects:

- Traffic Signal Modernization (*Traffic Management Category*)
- Cocheco Well Treatment (*Water Category*)
- Sewer System Master Plan (*Wastewater Category*)
- North Main Street Rehabilitation (~~*Highway Category, Multi-Discipline*~~)
- Wakefield Street Improvements (~~*Highway Category, Multi-Discipline*~~)
- Route 11 Capacity and Safety Improvements (*Highway Category*)

The responding firms shall submit a summary proposal, as well as qualifications package, for each category for which they would like to be considered, as noted on the form in Appendix A. ***A summary proposal for a multi-discipline representative project may be submitted within the firm’s response to one of the categories related to infrastructure improvements (Highway and Bridges, Water, Sewer).***

Please note that there are no Representative Projects included in this solicitation for those firms responding in the ***Stormwater, Dam Engineering, Construction Engineering or Utility Workforce Management*** categories. ...”

3. On Page 25, SECTION 3.2 – Price Proposal, Second Paragraph, edit the last sentence to read as follows:

“... If the responding firm is proposing a team approach with lead and sub-consultant firms(s), ~~the rates shall apply to all firms on the team~~ **each firm shall submit a Price Proposal form.**”

### QUESTIONS/COMMENTS AND ANSWERS

Respondents are advised to read the following answers to questions and comments raised regarding this RFQ prior to submitting qualifications.

1. QUESTION: Section 1.3 - We will be submitting on multiple categories, three of which will require project specific responses so there is a significant amount of information to provide a complete response to the RFQ. While we will endeavor to be concise, between the six responses there may be more information than fits in a ¾” binder.

ANSWER: The limit of ¾” binder is intended to reflect the submission in one category. Firms submitting in multiple categories may exceed the ¾” binder limit.

2. QUESTION: Would the City like the information supplied as a one bundled document or individual documents for each category? If it is a bundled document would the City accept two binders if a firm is proposing on 4 or more categories?

ANSWER: Firms may submit a single binder for each category or combine information with clearly identified sections for responses to each category. Firms submitting in multiple categories may exceed the ¾” single binder limit. Firms are encouraged to reduce or eliminate repetitive information and to respond only with information specifically requested.

3. QUESTION: Section 2.3 - There is no multidiscipline specific submission category – Is it acceptable to submit a proposal on just one of the multidiscipline projects? Would the City like that as a separate section of the RFQ response with its own organization chart? We would like to be considered for work that is typical of the Wakefield project but do not anticipate submitting under the Highway/Bridges category.

ANSWER: Each firm may choose to provide response to any number of representative projects. Firms may respond to one or more representative projects designated as Multi-Discipline without submitting in the Highway/Bridges category (see clarification. While there is no specific category for multi-discipline projects, firms may be considered for these projects if they submit on a related category (Highway, Water or Sewer) and demonstrate experience with similar multi-discipline projects. Firms submitting in Highway, Water or Sewer categories may include multi-discipline qualifications in the category response.

4. QUESTION: Appendix A - Is there a separate check box for a multidiscipline response or does our submission under the other categories cover this?

ANSWER: Firms wishing to be considered for multi-discipline projects should demonstrate qualifications and experience within their responses to one of the categories (i.e Highway and Bridges, Water, Sewer). These multi-discipline street reconstruction and infrastructure improvements projects encompass many categories, however, a firm will not need to be selected in all categories to be considered.

5. QUESTION: In regards to the Highways and Bridges category, are firms interested in this category required to prepare a summary proposal for all three of the representative projects noted in Section 2.4?

ANSWER: Firms submitting in the Highway and Bridges category may submit a summary proposal on any number of representative projects. It is advised that firms submitting in the Highway category submit summary proposal for the potential LPA project "Route 11 Capacity and Safety Improvements" to highlight their understanding of NHDOT requirements on LPA projects.

6. QUESTION: Section 2.3 discusses multiple discipline projects. Some firms may have extensive water distribution and/or sewer collection design experience, but do not meet some of the other criteria in the RFQ to be effectively considered for those specific engineering categories, such as not having storage tank design experience or not having a certified wastewater treatment plant operator on staff. For a street reconstruction project that includes water/sewer components, would such a firm possessing applicable water/sewer design experience and selected under the Highway & Bridge category still have to collaborate with another consultant for the water/sewer design portion of that project?

ANSWER: If a firm is selected in the Highway & Bridge category and has demonstrated experience on multi-discipline street reconstruction and infrastructure improvement projects similar to the representative projects, then they will not need to collaborate with firms qualified in the Water category or Sewer category to be considered for the project.

7. QUESTION: There is one week between the date that responses to all questions will be issued (10/22) and the due date for the RFQ submittal (10/29). Can the RFQ submission deadline be extended to allow firms to effectively incorporate the question responses into their submissions?

ANSWER: The submission deadline will not be extended.

8. QUESTION: Page 5, Section 1.3 Submission Information. The RFQ states that five hardcopies of the submittal are required. Due to the requirements of the RFQ this will be a lengthy response (our 2014 response was 166 pages in length and we anticipate this one will be longer as there are additional categories and additional representative projects to include). We can envision our submittal to the City could approach 1,000 pages combined. Would the City consider an all-electronic submission for the Quals package and only a hardcopy submittal of the Price Proposal to reduce printing time and costs?

ANSWER: The City requires hard-copies for review. Consolidation of the submission may be attained by submitting general information once, with tabs for specific category qualifications and responses.

9. QUESTION: Page 17, Section 2.4.2 Cocheco Well Treatment. Can the City provide the pH value and the iron and manganese concentrations of the well water?

ANSWER: Water quality data can be obtained from NHDES OneStop online database.

10. QUESTION: Page 25, Section 3.2 Price Proposal – The RFQ states “...the rates shall apply to all firms on the team.” relative to the Price Proposal component of the submission. While we understand the City wishes to streamline administration of the contract, a single rate sheet over five years for multiple firms is difficult to develop, maintain and execute and may not provide the City with the benefits envisioned. Whose audited overhead rate would be used, the prime? What if the overhead rate is significantly higher or lower than the team’s sub-consultants? Audited overhead rates may differ drastically from firm to firm and from year to year. Furthermore, for NHDOT LPA funded projects it is a requirement to utilize the most recently-approved overhead rates per firm at the time of negotiation rather than a single 2019 overhead rate for all firms (which will be submitted for this submission) – effectively rendering the rate table moot for those projects. We ask that you also consider the situation where a sub-consultant may be added to a team to address one specific category and if our team is not selected for that category the blended rates for that firm would still be included in the single rate table, perhaps altering the rates out of favor with the City. Would the City consider allowing distinct year-one rate sheets for each firm on a team, as was allowed in 2014 that can be utilized for non-NHDOT LPA projects?

ANSWER: The referenced statement in Section 3.2 has been revised via this addendum. A single rate sheet may be provided for EACH firm on the team, and these will be considered for Year 1 of the contract.

11. QUESTION: Page 25, Section 3.2 Price Proposal – The RFQ states that annual inflation of the salary rates in the submitted rate table may be accommodated using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or NHDOT escalation rate, as agreed upon by the City and consultant. Is it the City’s intent that the overhead rate remain fixed for the entire term of the contract using the 2019 audited overhead rate or would the City consider the requirement for a new rate table accounting for inflation and the most recent audited overhead rate each year subsequent to the first year of the contract? Overhead rates are audited and approved annually.

ANSWER: Overhead rates may be adjusted annually with rate table adjustments, if a new reviewed and approved audit has been performed and submitted to the City of Rochester.

12. QUESTION: Can an overall water system map be provided summarizing the assets?

ANSWER: A system map has been added to the reference materials posted on the Rochester Public Works webpage. (<https://www.rochesternh.net/public-works/pages/2021-rfq-21-19-support-documents>)

13. QUESTION: What water hydraulic modeling software does the City use?

ANSWER: WaterGEMS

14. QUESTION: Well #1 Information - Water Quality trends for last 5 years, if available.

a. Raw and finished Fe/Mn, PFAS, As, H2S, pH, alkalinity, hardness, Na, Chloride

b. Well #1 production information for last 5 years

ANSWER: Water quality data and production data can be obtained from NHDES OneStop online database. Some pumping test raw water data have been added to the reference materials posted on the Rochester Public Works webpage.

15. QUESTION: What type of maintenance and operational issues at the existing treatment facility, if any?

ANSWER: Existing issues include fouling of wellhead, screen, aerators, and clearwell due to lack of formal comprehensive Fe/Mn treatment equipment.

16. QUESTION: Well #2 Information. We understand this well is not currently active, but the following would be helpful.

- a. Any available Water Quality
- b. Well #2 permit status

ANSWER: Pumping test water quality data has been added to reference materials posted to the Rochester DPW website. Well #2 is no longer permitted.

17. QUESTION: Are any other wells being pursued including Well #3 and/or bedrock?

ANSWER: Additional groundwater sources are not being investigated or pursued at this time.

18. QUESTION: Can an overall sewer system map be provided summarizing the assets?

ANSWER: A system map has been added to reference materials posted on the Rochester DPW webpage.

19. QUESTION: What GIS software and Asset Management software is the City using?

ANSWER: GIS software is ArcGIS. Asset Management software is Beehive.

20. QUESTION: Are there any available reports or summary documentation regarding I/I in the system? This may include summary presentations, reports, and metering information (i.e., Flow Assessment).

21.

ANSWER: A recent internal presentation and white paper related to I/I have been added to reference materials posted on the Rochester DPW webpage.

22. QUESTION: Is there any summary information (asset data) on the existing pumping stations?

ANSWER: Monthly pump station flow data and summary information have been added to reference materials posted on the Rochester DPW webpage.

23. QUESTION: WWTF flow data - are the DMR's available in Excel (digital)-last 5 years?

ANSWER: WWTF flow data and monthly operating reports have been added to reference materials posted on the Rochester DPW webpage. DMRs are not available in a single Excel file for the last 5 years.

24. QUESTION: What are the recent (actual) values for:
- a. Annual Average
  - b. Maximum Day
  - c. Peak Hour

ANSWER: WWTF flow data has been added to reference materials posted on the Rochester DPW webpage. Peak Hour flows are not included in the data provided.

25. QUESTION: Is there a summary of the WWTF Basis of Design (and headworks facility)?

ANSWER: Original WWTF design reports are not available.

26. QUESTION: The RFQ referenced the Interceptor Basis of Design Report. Is that available?

ANSWER: The Basis of Design Report for Siphon, Pump Station and Forcemain has been added to the reference materials posted on the Rochester Public Works webpage. Note that some hydraulic assumptions in the report were investigated after completion of the study. It was found that alternate means of connecting the Colonial Pines area via gravity sewer was possible. Therefore some assumptions and recommendations in the report may need to be revisited.

27. QUESTION: Would the City like the proposing team to include subconsultants for survey, geotechnical, permitting, etc. in their SOQ and Price Proposal, or can this be done upon project assignment if selected?

ANSWER: Sub-consultant services not directly related to qualifications or team approach may be submitted as part of project assignment task order proposals. However, if subconsultant services are essential to demonstrating your team's qualifications they should be submitted with your SOQ.

28. QUESTION: For the Highway & Bridge category, can we show five projects for highway and five for bridges or should it be 5 total?

ANSWER: Show no more than a total of five projects demonstrating experience in the category.

29. QUESTION: Given the complexity of the RFQ response is there a potential to be given more time for response beyond the current RFQ deadline.

ANSWER: The submission deadline will not be extended.