



ADDENDUM #2

ITB/RFP NUMBER: 2017023-PW-P

Consulting Engineering Firm for Stormwater Improvement Plan RFP

DATE: September 2, 2016

TO: All Potential Bidders/Offerors

City of Harrisonburg's Consulting Engineering Firm for Stormwater Improvement Plan RFP, is modified as follows:

1. Question: Does the City want the consultant to visit all potential retrofit sites in the field?

Answer: If a project is identified as having high-potential to remove pollutants or impact water quality during the citywide assessment, it is expected that the consultant would perform site visits on an as-needed basis to establish conceptual-level modeling/analysis to a level sufficient to analyze the potential project benefits (see Section VI of the Stormwater Improvement Plan Scoping document). Field visits are not required for all potential retrofit sites unless the consultant determines a field visit is necessary to collect the required information: BMP retrofit type, estimated POC removal, site attributes impacting retrofit feasibility, and parcel ownership (see section V. B. of the Stormwater Improvement Plan Scoping document).

2. Question: How long is the City's formal public comment period?

Answer: The city advertises 14 days prior to the scheduled public meeting and leaves the comment period open for 30 days following that meeting.

3. Question: Can you please clarify whether the SWIP should meet the requirements for the TMDL Action Plan or whether the City is developing this plan separately and the SWIP will simply incorporate its results.

Answer: It is not expected that the consultant will develop the city's TMDL Action Plan. The City will develop this plan separately from the SWIP. That being said, the projects identified in the SWIP should be heavily influenced by the pollutant reduction requirements set forth as part of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL in the City of Harrisonburg. The city's TMDL Action Plan will be developed based upon the project and program prioritization rankings set forth as a deliverable in the SWIP.

4. Question: The RFP indicates the stormwater fee is the primary source for implementation. Can these funds be used for projects on both public and private property?

Answer: Yes. The stormwater utility fee funding source does not include restrictions as to whether the funds can be used on public or private property.

5. Question: For Section 5.2.1 of the required proposal elements, can you clarify what is required in this section? It sounds like this is where we should describe our overall organization's experience and specific personnel qualifications and they should be organized around either the major Scope of Work sections or similar categories of expertise. Is this correct?

Answer: Section 5.2.1 asks the firm to outline their capabilities to meet the anticipated timeline in the context of the overall Scope of Work. This may include a more detailed schedule of the proposed Scope of Work that includes the scheduled items outlined in the RFP. Section 5.2.2 is more appropriate of a section to outline the qualifications of the organization and personnel.

6. Question: In 2015, three (3) firms were selected for stormwater management services under the On-Call Term Contract for Consulting Engineering Firms. The scope of services included in the RFP 2017023-PW-P Consulting Engineering Firm for Stormwater Improvement Plan were included in the On-Call RFP. Please clarify the differences between the two contracts.

Answer: Per the terms of the original RFP, the City is exercising its right to separately procure services for this project.

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