

PDB Services for M Street Rehabilitation Project

To: Trisha Roth, King County Procurement
Meredith Redmon, M Street Project Representative

From: Brown and Caldwell **CC:** M Street – 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 6 responses. 2 from firms indicating they would be bidding as prime and 2 from firms indicating they would be subs, and 2 firms indicating they were vendors/suppliers. 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 all forms of pipeline rehabilitation, including large diameter sewer tunnels, interceptors, and trunk lines in active wastewater systems and full capacity bypass systems.
- Two respondents with extensive experience PL rehab experience and lining technologies
- One respondent described extensive PDB experience.
- One respondent described extensive PL rehabilitation design experience (structural and hydraulic)
- One respondent's experience limited to surveying.
- Two respondents are PL rehab technology vendors.

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.
- 1 vendor respondents seek to join a DB team. One prefers a non-exclusive position.

Level of interest in pursuing one or both projects.

Summary of Responses:

- 2 contractor respondents, 1 design sub respondent expressing high interest, pursuing both projects.
- Both vendor respondents are interested in 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.

Are there any specific commercial issues that are a concern to you?

Summary of Responses:

- Unlimited liability insurance requirements and mandated project specific liability insurance requirements are sometimes a concern, as they can cause some smaller firms to carry a higher burden along with additional risk, causing them to be less competitive.

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.

Is the project schedule reasonable?

Summary of Responses:

- Proposed timeline with NTP in October of 2023, design work in 2024 and construction in 2025 is reasonable as long as the design and permitting milestones are achieved.
- Permitting, ROW approvals, Coordination with the City of Auburn Airport and Schools 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 – 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 describing scoring criteria.

- Design parameters and post rehab hydraulic capacity requirements. Also, flow conditions during dry season to see if any of the lines could be rehabilitated without the need for bypassing.
- Specific timeline restrictions per area. This may include working hours, local activities planned, other construction project limits. Include any multiagency involvement/expectation and include any assessment or assumptions King County has already done.