

## Request for Proposal (RFP) for Water Distribution Pipeline Replacement Prioritization Software Questions and Answers

1. The General Services Agreement attached to the RFP seems to be similar to a contract for construction services (mention of Bonding, Warranty, Prevailing Wage), rather than for professional services. We are wondering whether it is the correct agreement?

Exhibit C has been updated to include the Professional Services Agreement template. Please see Addenda 1.

2. Does the District require the Proposers and sub-Proposers to be in good standing in the State of California, with all necessary license, permits certification approvals and authorizations?

Yes, Proposers must have licenses to do business in California and not on the Disbarred list.

3. Are Proposers and sub-Proposers required to be registered with the Department of Industrial Relations?

Proposers are not required to be registered with the Department of Industrial Relations.

4. Should not the Proposal Form include line items for the items noted above?

Exhibit C has been updated to include the Professional Services Agreement template which includes all contract requirements. Please see Addenda 1.

5. Is there any flexibility in the insurance requirements (given the nature of this project - not a construction project)?

The insurance requirements are standard District insurance requirements for this type of contract. Proposer may list exceptions on Proposal Form.

6. Could you specify the type of warranties you are seeking (description of the Proposed System page 6 of Exhibit A)?

Please describe any and all warranties if applicable.

7. Is there any length limit to present Exhibit A material?

There is no length limit to present Exhibit A material. The District has an email limit of 25 MB. Separate emails may be sent.

8. The Section Software Capacities does acknowledge that there may be a need for a “Process for data cleaning, validation, and resolving anomalies or data gaps.” Our experience indicates that this is indeed a key step that can be quite substantial for the first project (depending on the data). However, the RFP does not include any task that would allow for the proposer to help the District set up the data (collect, select, clean) in view of successful model development. How do you recommend that we include that step in the proposal?

RFP tasks have been updated. Please see Addenda 1.

9. Our team would want to engage in the Proof of Concept with adequate data. Depending on the quality of the data, our experience at other utilities has shown that bringing the data to acceptable

condition may take 1-3 months which may make a deadline of Sept 2025 for a Proof of Concept (one month after award) difficult to achieve with fully cleaned data.

Additional time may be provided to the selected Proposer at the District's discretion. If additional time is required, Proposers shall estimate required time for Proof of Concept.

10. For the same reason, pricing for a first project typically includes a consulting task (to cover data set up). The pricing table does not include that option.

Proposal Form has been updated. Please see Addenda 1.

11. Pricing does not include the following items that have scope narratives:

- a. Proof of Concept
- b. Installation, Training and Support
- c. Maintenance and Upgrades

Proposal Form has been updated. Please see Addenda 1.

12. The RFP indicates that data will be provided for the Proof of Concept (pipeline GIS data, relevant attribute data like pipe material, age and diameter, and historical main break data) with results due in September. In the Calendar of events data is to be provided October 2025 for risk score. Should we understand that data will be provided for LOF at project award? And then if the POC is successful, and the proposer is authorized to continue the project, more data will then be provided this time for the development of the COF scores. Here again, the development of COF requires that substantial data be collected and set up for the first project. Based on our experience at other utilities, we are concerned one month may be short for such a task.

The District will provide additional data after Proof of Concept for COF calculations.

13. The Section Software Capacities includes the following requirement: "The model should have the ability to provide spatial resolution of the prediction, such as detailing where the leak is identified (i.e. a pipe segment is identified as likely to leak or a 50-foot range of pipe where a leak is likely to occur)." Could you pls clarify the section that is underlined.

Please indicate how the software identifies and shows the location of predicted leaks (i.e. does it show predicted leaks as single point or a certain section of pipe that is predicted to leak?).

14. Do you encourage including in the proposal any capacity the proposer may have that has not been specifically requested in the RFP but the proposer strongly believes would enhance the District's overall planning objective?

Please include any additional information that might enhance the District's planning objective.

15. In Article 6 of the Agreement, there is a call out to Exhibit D, as the CEP compliance. It is NOT. Exhibit D is the "IRAN CONTRACTING ACT CERTIFICATION". I see CEP compliance listed in Exhibit A. Should this reference in the agreement be disregarded?

Exhibit C- Professional Services Agreement is a standard contract for this type of project.

Although the draft agreement includes accompanying exhibits, they have been omitted for clarity. The omitted exhibits are as follows:

- Exhibit A: Scope of Services
- Exhibit B: Compensation
- Exhibit C: Insurance Requirements

- Exhibit D: CEP Compliance

16. Is the District looking for a standalone, proprietary software to help with pipeline replacement prioritization, or could an existing software (i.e., Info360, AquaTwin Asset, etc.) be used to create the risk/prioritization model?

An existing software can be used to create the risk model.