



**ADDENDUM #4**

**ITB/RFP NUMBER: 2015046-PW-P**

**On-Call Term Contract for Consulting Engineering Firms RFP**

DATE: June 23, 2015

TO: All Potential Bidders/Offerors

City of Harrisonburg's On-Call Term Contract for Consulting Engineering Firms RFP, is modified as follows:

1. Question: Can you please provide the MS Word format of the attachments?

Answer: Yes, the attachments will be provided in MS Word or MS Excel format as part of this addendum. Documents will be posted separately from this addendum. Attachment H is not available in another format other than PDF.

2. Question: On page 37 general instructions Part II points 1. & 2. information for branch offices. My question is what do you consider branch office? If the company's headquarters is located in another country and our subsidiary is in the United States, and the firm located in the U.S. is the company which is applying for this solicitation, but both companies will be involved, so which office should I consider the branch office for the purpose of this application?

Answer: A Part II needs to be completed for each office that will be seeking work, regardless of whether one is a HQ or branch office.

3. Question: Section 3.11 (p. 14) addresses the SF 330, Part I, Section H, and reads, "this section should describe the organization of the proposed project staff including the role of each by individual." In 4.0 Proposal Requirements (p. 15), it states "Please do not duplicate information furnished in the SF 330 Parts I or II elsewhere in the submittal." Since the organization of the project staff and the role of each individual will be thoroughly described in the SF 330 Section I Part D (Organizational Chart) and E (Resumes Key Personnel), what additional information should be contained in the SF 300 Section H that does not duplicate information already contained in the SF 330 Section I Part D and E?

Answer: We ask that the forms be completed to the best of your ability. If some information is duplicated it will not adversely affect your response.

4. Question: Section 3.11 (p. 14) addresses the SF 330, Part I, Section H, and reads, "It should also include statements that are responsive to the attached Consultant Short List Score Sheet that will be used to evaluate your submission." The Consultant Short List Score Sheet (Attachment J, p. 52) breaks down the scoring criteria as follows:

- Firm/Team's Experience in Similar Services: 25%
- Personnel's Experience in Similar Services: 40%
- Qualifications of Project Manager: 5%
- Organizational Capacity: 20%

- Present Workload with City: 10%

However, Section 5.0, Proposal Criteria (p. 16) breaks down the proposal evaluation criteria as such:

- Qualifications of Firm & Personnel: 25%
- Understanding of the Work to be performed and plan for accomplishing Scope of Services: 25%
- Current/Past Experience in providing similar services: 20%
- References: 20%
- Compliance with contractual terms: 10%

These two scoring criteria differ drastically. In Attachment J, 45% is weighted to the personnel's experience vs. 25% weight under proposal criteria. Organizational capacity is weighted 20% in Attachment J, but not listed in Proposal Criteria. Workload is listed at 10% in Attachment J, but not listed in Proposal Criteria. Understanding of Work and plan for accomplishing the Scope of Services is given a weight of 25% in Proposal Criteria, but not mentioned in Attachment J.

In the SF 330 Part I, Section H, how would you like firms to address the Attachment J vs. Proposal Criteria in regards to each group submitted?

Answer: See answer to Question #31 in Addendum #3.

5. Question: Regarding Section 3.5 and the statement "The RFP response shall be organized in the following order," (p. 12, 13) if a firm is submitting multiple groups, may it organize the response with all requested Attachments and Appendix forms in one tabbed section? As it reads, each complete set of SF 330 forms for each individual group shall be inserted between required forms (i.e. firm data sheet, then each complete SF 330 Part I and II, then Appendix I and SAM form). May each firm organize the DPOR certificates, SCC Form, Proprietary Information, Insurance Form, Certificate Regarding Debarment, Exceptions, Firm Data Sheet, Category Consideration Request Form, and SAM Form in its own tabbed section after each complete SF 330 form for each group submitted?

Answer: That would be acceptable.

6. Question: Can we submit screenshots from the DPOR website for the offices and key personnel included in the submittal for the "On-Call Term Contract for Consulting Engineering Firms"?

Answer: Yes.

7. Question: Section 4.2.1 states that in "2 pages or less per Group provide information that will indicate your firms ability to provide the services listed in each category the consultant is seeking consideration." – is this a page limit for inside the Section H section or is this information meant for a different section?

Answer: Please adhere to the page limits and include this information with the Scope of Work.

8. Question: Section 4.2.2 states that in "2 pages or less please provide information that emphasizes the consultants methodology and qualifications in the following areas: Quality Control and Quality Assurance, Project Management, and Controls of multi-disciplinary activities." – same question as number 1: is this page limit for inside the Section H section or is this information meant for a different section?

Answer: Please adhere to the page limits and include this information with the Scope of Work.

9. Question: The evaluation criteria listed in section 5.0 does not clearly match Attachment J: Consultant Short List Score Sheet. However, under Section 3.11 it asks that the Section H "should also include

statements that are responsible to the attached Consultant Short List Score Sheet that will be used to evaluate your submission” – should we go by the score sheet or the given evaluation criteria?

Answer: See Question #31 in Addendum #3.

10. Question: Is it the intention of the city to select Consultants who meet the 10% DBE goal (per Section 8.2) – even for those groups who are highly unlikely to use Federal Funds (I.e. non-transportation related Groups, or is this requirement only applicable to federally funded roadway construction projects?

Answer: See Question #14 in Addendum #3.

11. Question: I have reviewed Addendum #3 but need clarification regarding the combining of groups. If we chose to combine 2 groups in one proposal (each group would only use 5 projects each), can we submit ONE SF 330 and ONE Scope? Even though each group is given 10 projects max, we would only be showing 5 each – would that be acceptable?

Answer: Yes.

12. Question: Who is the incumbent of the contract? (RFP# 2015046-PW-P)

Answer: See Question #25 in Addendum #3.

13. Question: Under Group 1, there are 2 possibilities...1 - Structural (Bridge), and 2 - Structural (Other). Can you clarify for us if a respondent needs to propose to Bridge and Other, all of Group 1, or if you can respond just to one of them? Can we respond just to "Other"?

Answer: Responding to just one of the two options within Group 1 is acceptable.

All other requirements, terms and conditions of the ITB/RFP remain unchanged.

Addendum page must be signed and returned with your bid/proposal to acknowledge receipt of this addendum.

---

Authorized Signature

By: Pat Hilliard, CPPB  
Procurement Manager