



LAURENS COUNTY WATER AND SEWER COMMISSION 5/2014 RFQ ENGINEERING AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR WATER WITHDRAWAL PERMITTING AND PILOT STUDY

ANSWERS PROVIDED BY: KEVIN ANDERSON, DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING & OPERATIONS

**Mandatory Meeting is Confirmed for 12:00 PM to 2:00 PM
Wednesday May 28, 2014 at LCWSC Main Office**

Question Series #1

1. Under Evaluation Criteria 3, would the County rather have relevant water plant projects over the past 10 years as opposed to all water plant projects? The list of all water plant projects over the past 10 years could be a very large list for large firms such as ours and would include many small projects that are not very relevant to this project.
2. Under items 3a, 3b, 3c, each of these say to list project references. Please confirm our understanding is correct that we can provide tables of our WTP's, but we are to also provide a contact name and reference for:
 - a. at least 1 project with each technology to be considered under 3a,
 - b. for multiple WTP projects about 5 mgd or less per 3b,
 - c. for multiple DBP Control projects per 3c,
Is name and phone number sufficient for reference or would you like more information such as physical or email address?
3. Is the intent of the Project Experience section to provide , not more than 5 relevant project with in depth descriptions and the client references, and the remainder of our relevant project experience can be presented in abbreviated, table format?

Answer Series #1

1. Yes. Our goal is to be able to call a few clients where you may have had a project go less than perfect. If you leave off some small irrelevant projects, that will be fine. Just be aware that irrelevant is defined solely by the LCWSC for this RFQ.
 2. These referenced projects should only be relevant projects that demonstrate your project team's achievements. Feel free to list as many redundant references as you like. Your understanding of a, b and c sub-parts is correct.
 3. I will probably strike that statement (paragraph F.4 Submittal Requirements and Information) and remove the 5 project limitation. But the concept of detailing your best projects and just making a table to list the rest is perfect. Unless we get a lot of negative feedback, we do want to keep the submittals to 50 pages or less.
-

Question Series #2

1. If there will be a team formed between two companies for this project, does LCWSC want the information requested under 'Submittal Requirements', Items A.1, A.2., D.1, D.2, D.3, E.1 and E.2 for both firms?
2. Under 'Submittal Requirements', Items C.2 and C.3 - we read this to be specific to the project team members, not the entire company(ies) and that this pertains to any project type, not just WTP projects. Is this correct?
3. Under 'Evaluation Criteria', Item 3 - all WTP projects completed in the last 10 years are requested; however, under 'Submittal Requirements', Item F.4 it is requested that related project experience not exceed five representative projects. We just wanted to clarify what this last statement is referencing.
4. If there is a true sub-consultant, not a teaming partner - apart from identification of the team members and their related experience, does LCWSC need any additional more detailed information outlined in the package on this company?

Answer Series #2

1. No. You can just list the team members for the other company as a sub-consultant
 2. This should be just water plant projects to be consistent with Evaluation Criteria #3. A similar question from someone else asked if all water plant projects or just relevant ones. Yes, just projects that the team members have worked on will be fine.
 3. We want a list of all projects so that we can call of couple of the clients that you're not using as a reference. It can be in a short format such as a table. Put detail into the reference projects. I will drop the 5 project limit and just let the 50 page limit rule.
 4. We didn't define sub-consultants, so we would probably consider a partner a sub-consultant since we will sign an agreement with just one firm. I assume that a partner would share a major portion of the workload, while a sub-consultant would be a smaller part?
-