RFQ ADDENDUM #1
Date of Addendum: May 20, 2025

NOTICE TO FIRMS
The Request for Qualifications for <u>Cascade Supply Program: Program and Engineering Support</u> is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original Request for Qualifications and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the Request for Qualifications. The Consultant shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Statement of Qualifications, and shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in its cover letter.

SUBMITTAL DEADLINE FOR STATEMENTS OF QUALIFICATIONS
The submittal deadline for Statements of Qualifications remains the same and is not changed by this Addendum.

1.0 – REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Item	Section No.	Description of Change
1.1	II.B	Add the following bullet to the end of the second bullet: • A graphical cover page may be included with the printed and electronic SOQ's which indicates the RFQ you are responding to and your firm(s) name(s). The cover page does not count in the page count or scoring. No text will be reviewed.
1.2	II.B	Replace the third bullet with the following: • The bound SOQ's should be in an 8 1/2" by 11" format. Main body text shall use a minimum 12-point type size. Graphics, figures, tables, captions, etc. shall use a minimum 11-point type size. The only page size exceptions are the 11" by 17" pages mentioned above, which shall be single sided.
1.3	Appendix 1	The Category F and Category G descriptions have "diameter" misspelled, Category E description has "length" misspelled in

		the instructions. Note that you may delete the "instructions" and only need to submit the table for both Appendix 1 and 2.
1.4	Appendix 2	The category Right of Way has "Obtaining Franchise Agreements" misspelled. The categories Construction Support and Operations Support have "Constructability Review" misspelled. Please correct your submitted file. Note that you may delete the "instructions" and only need to submit the table for both Appendix 1 and 2.
1.5	Appendix 2	Revise the instructions to read: • Fill in Key Staff Names and project names. • Place a closed dot in each box where a project component is complete and meets the criteria. • Place an open dot in each box where a project component is in progress that meets the criteria.

2.0 – INFORMATION AND CLARIFICATIONS

The following is provided as a matter of information and clarification only. To the extent that changes to the Request for Qualifications are required based on the following, the Request for Qualifications have been modified as noted above in this Addendum

Item	Section No.	Questions and Answers
2.1	I.C.	Question: Does CWA plan to issue future RFQs for construction management services? Or does the current RFQ (Task 8) cover construction management services for the program? Answer: A future RFQ for construction management services is not anticipated at this time. Task 8 is intended to cover construction management and inspection services for the program.
2.2	II.A.3	Question: Please confirm that availability percentage is required for only key staff listed and not for all staff identified the organization chart. Answer: Correct. Availability percentages should be provided only for key staff, similar to Section II.A.4.

2.3	II.A.3 II.A.4	Question: The personnel availability is requested in both Section 3 (Organization Chart) and in Section 4 (Relevant Experience of the Team). Would you like that information in full in both places or, would it be acceptable to include the specific availability in section 4 and an icon with 25%/50%/75%/100% availability on the org chart (thinking about limited real estate)? Answer: Please include the availability information in full in both sections. Each section should be considered stand-alone for evaluation purposes.
2.4	II.A.4	Question: The Qualifications refer to the consultant's program manager as a Project Manager in several places, including Appendix 1. Does this role correspond to the Task 1 Consultant Project Management Lead? Would it be appropriate for the consultant's program manager to use Program Manager instead of Project Manager? Answer: To avoid confusing titles between the overall lead of the program and the Task 2/Program Support Lead, we refer to the consultant's overall Program/Project Manager as the "Project Manager".
2.5	II.A.5	Question: In evaluation criteria *Section 5) Project History*, the solicitation asks for relevant projects *completed* by the proposed team. Given the long-term program nature of this type of work and how long construction can take on large projects, program management can take many years and the design project history would likely be dated if the entire program needs to be fully constructed/completed. Further, Appendix 2 indicates to differentiate work that is in progress vs. completed. In this context can you please clarify "completed"? Does this mean work performed on a project is completed? Or does this mean the project is fully constructed? Answer: In Section 5, we are asking for the beginning year, ending year/anticipated year. Work can be on-going. In Appendix 2, we have asked for a closed dot for completed/finished work, and an open dot for on-going work.

2.6	II.B.	Question: May we include a proposal cover page in the binder preceding the cover letter that will not count against the page limits? Answer: A cover page is acceptable to add per Addendum #1.
2.7	II.B.	Question: Please allow text in graphics be smaller than 12-pt font. 10-pt font is requested. Answer: Please see Addendum #1 for changes regarding font size in graphics and tables.
2.8	II.B.	Question: 12-pt font is specified throughout the Qualifications. Would 10-pt be acceptable for graphics, figures, and tables? Answer: Please see Addendum #1 for changes regarding font size in graphics and tables.
2.9	II.C.	Question: Under sub section **C. Evaluation Process**, it is mentioned that after the SOQs are reviewed by an Evaluation Committee, '*Cascade will notify up to three (3) Proposers that they are the highest-rated firms. Those firms will move forward in the evaluation process and will automatically receive the RFP*'. However, it is further mentioned that '*all remaining Proposers will be notified that they are not among the highest-rated firms that will automatically receive the RFP; however, within 24 hours of such notification, any Proposer may request further consideration during the proposal stage and will also receive the RFP from Cascade and be allowed to submit a RFP*'. Please can above be clarified further and also whether all the RFPs, including those submitted by the proposers who may not qualify as highest rated firms, will be evaluated on an equal basis or whether extra weightage will be given to those who qualify as highest rated firms in the RFP evaluation process. Answer: Per Section II.C, points are not aggregated between the RFQ and RFP phases. All firms in the future RFP phase will be scored and evaluated equally.

2.10	Appendix 1	Question: Please consider adding a column to your Appendix 1 Spreadsheet to allow for an availability percentage for each key staff identified. This will allow for easy consideration and review by Cascade's review team. Answer: Availability will be reviewed and scored per Section II.A.3 and II.A.4. Please provide this information as requested in those sections.
2.11	Appendix 1	Question: Appendix 1 is requesting LF of pipeline for roles that won't have direct experience planning, designing, or constructing pipelines. For example, the Communications Lead and Right of Way Lead will not have direct experience designing or constructing LF of pipeline. Can you please clarify what is desired for entry for roles that do not have the applicable experience? Should we simply enter LF of pipeline where it is applicable for task leads and enter N/A for roles that do not directly perform this type of work? Answer: For roles not directly involved with pipeline LF, You may answer "0" or "N/A" as appropriate. Category E, "LF in a similar role," may be more applicable to those lead roles.
2.12	Appendix 2	Question: In Appendix 2, please consider revising your instructions to allow placement of a "closed dot" where the specific work element identified in the project column is complete. Because of the long duration for most major programs similar to Cascade Water Supply, some program elements may still be on-going. Answer: That is acceptable and the intent. Please see Addendum #1.

END OF RFQ ADDENDUM # 1