

PDB Services for Eastside Interceptor Section 8 Project

To:	Melissa Jordan, King County Procurement Ann Fowler, ESI 8 Project Representative	Date: March 9, 2023
From:	Brown and Caldwell	CC: ESI 8 – Project Team
Reviewed by:	Patrick Weber, Brown and Caldwell	
Subject:	RFI Contractor Responses	

1.0 Purpose

To provide high-level information to the industry about the project and the owner goals. To serve as a basis for receiving industry feedback on a variety of questions and topics associated with the project.

The RFI was issued through County's Solicitation Site. The County received 5 responses. 2 from firms indicating they would be bidding as prime and 2 from firms indicating they would be subs. 1 firm submitted a response with no answers to the questions just general firm information. Participant input and feedback have been aggregated.

2.0 Questions & Responses

Summary of experience related to rehabilitation of sewer tunnels, large diameter interceptors, and trunk lines in an active wastewater conveyance system.

Summary of Responses:

- Two respondents with extensive experience building buried infrastructure rehabilitation including various lining methods, by-pass pumping, excavation shoring, working on sites with limited space
- One respondent described extensive PDB experience
- One respondent described extensive PL rehabilitation design experience (structural and hydraulic)
- One respondent's experience limited to surveying

Form of team or consortium being considering for project.

Summary of Responses:

- 2 respondents considering a contractor-led prime-sub relationship
- 1 respondent seeking to join a team as design sub
- 1 respondent seeking to join a team as a surveying SBE/WBE

Level of interest in pursuing one or both projects.

Summary of Responses:

- 2 contractor respondents expressing high interest, pursuing both projects.

Two PDB projects are intended to be released with very close schedules. Would it be helpful if RFQs for the two projects were staggered by 2-4 weeks, rather than issued simultaneously?

Summary of Responses:

- 1 respondent said it would be helpful to stagger issuance but have capacity to respond simultaneously.
- 2 respondents recommend a 4-week separation

Is 4-5 weeks from release of RFQ to date of SOQ submission adequate time?

Summary of Responses:

- 4-5 weeks is adequate time but consider page count and level of detail required.

Is 5-6 weeks from date of RFP release to Proposal submission adequate time?

Summary of Responses:

- 5-6 weeks is adequate, assuming a reasonable level of design required for proposal, pricing requirements, and extent of submittal requirements.

Is there anything you would like the County to consider when procuring and implementing these projects?

Summary of Responses:

- Encourage use of face-to-face interactive proprietary meetings with shortlisted respondents
- Communicate liability insurance requirements in RFP
- Avoid prescriptive requirements in favor of performance requirements to increase DB flexibility. Consider negotiation of the dry weather work requirement (window described from June 1 to Sept. 30th). May offer greater flexibility in scheduling through other methods of handling the sewer flows with some risk transferred to the design-builder

Does the intent and purpose of the project make sense?

Summary of Responses:

- Yes, makes sense.
- Important elements include selecting the proper rehab technology, minimizing construction impacts to environment and communities, working with partnering agencies regarding ongoing capital improvement projects for the Coal Creek watershed.

Is the project schedule reasonable?

Summary of Responses:

- Reasonable as long as the design and permitting milestones are achieved.
- Permitting and ROW approvals likely on critical path, recommend working with agencies to confirm schedule feasibility.
- Coordinating design deliverables and milestones in parallel with KC stage gate/approvals process will be critical to schedule success.

What are the most significant risks that you see with this project? Which of those do you see as primarily owner risks? Which of those risks do you see as primarily design-builder risks?

Summary of Responses:

- One team is deferring response to this question until the RFQ/RFP process due to public nature of RFI.
- Owner - Review comment time and resolution.
- Owner - Successful team that does not have adequate and relevant experience, constructability knowledge in pipe rehab tech.
- Design-Builder – Schedule
- Design-Builder – material availability given market conditions.

What additional information do you need about the project in the RFQ/RFP documents in order to understand it well enough to produce a good response?

Summary of Responses:

- Necessary agency engagement, any third-party outreach and prior expectations already established with permitting and community partners.
- Include a Draft DB contract.
- In RFP, include all inspection and condition assessment data, engineering reports, preliminary design drawings on the existing system.
- Be explicit in scoring criteria.