



**Request for Proposal (RFP) for
Owner Advisor – Dewatering Improvements Project
Addendum No. 1
November 25, 2025**

To prospective proposers under RFP for Owner Advisor - Dewatering Improvements Project, notice is hereby given that the RFP for Owner Advisor – Dewatering Improvements Project has been revised as set forth below and has provided a response to questions received from prospective proposers.

RFP Revisions

The following items describe revisions to the RFP. In the case of conflicting information, the information included in this addendum supersedes information within the original RFP.

1. On Page 5, the first sentence is revised to the following: Must have had experience successfully completing at least two collaborative delivery projects (progressive design-build projects are preferred) as an owner advisor or program manager for any wastewater or water project within the last ten years, each within a minimum fee of \$1,500,000.

Questions and Answers

The following items document questions and answers received by prospective proposers. Questions may have been modified to remove identifying information. Answers are responses from the East Bay Municipal Utility District (District). Answers are provided in a blue font.

1. **Question:** Your qualifications for Project Manager state they "Must have had experience successfully completing at least two collaborative delivery projects (progressive design-build projects are preferred) as an owner advisor or program manager for a wastewater or water treatment plant within the last ten years, each with a minimum fee of \$1,500,000." We would like to ask for a modification of this qualification to "for any wastewater or water project within the last ten years, each within a minimum fee of \$1,500,000."

Answer: Modification accepted. See RFP Revisions above.

2. **Question:** During the pre-proposal meeting, it was mentioned that facility photos would be provided. Will these photos be issued in an upcoming addendum, or should we submit a separate request to obtain them?

Answer: Photos will be provided upon request by sending an email to kevin.jim@ebmud.com.

3. **Question:** The RFP notes that each evaluation criterion will be scored on a zero-to-five scale and then applied to a weighted total. For planning purposes, could you please confirm the weighting assigned to each evaluation criterion, or whether all criteria will be weighted equally by the Selection Committee?

Answer: The weighting assigned to each evaluation criterion is as follows.

Evaluation Criteria	Weight (%)
Project Manager Qualifications	20
Project Team Qualifications	20
Project Approach	15
Reference	15
Oral Presentation and Interview	25
CEP Compliance	5

4. **Question:** In the Sample Professional Services Agreement Article 6, does the District consider the final paragraph of Section 6.3, and all of the provisions of Sections 6.4 and 6.5 to be applicable to the Dewatering Building Progressive Design Build Owner Advisor services?

Answer: As this is only a Sample agreement, this question will be clarified at a later time during the contract negotiations.

5. **Question:** In Item 5 in the Project Approach on page A-6 it states “The proposal should include a clear and complete discussion of how each task in Exhibit E, as applicable, will be completed and in sufficient detail to...” A couple paragraphs down, it states to “Clearly identify planned meetings, activities where District involvement is required, and activities where outside party involvement is required for each task.” Considering we are only providing Labor Hours (up to completion of Procurement Phase only), we are assuming that we only need to identify the planned meetings up through procurement and not necessarily include a detailed list of meetings anticipated for Stage 1 and Stage 2 phases. Please confirm or clarify.

Answer: Correct. Meetings beyond the procurement phase do not need to be identified.

6. **Question:** We feel that it would be valuable to allow a single 11x17 page, counted as a single page, in both the “Firm Experience and Key Personnel” and “Project Approach” sections of the proposal. Please confirm if that is acceptable.

Answer: Acceptable.

RFP for Owner Advisor – Dewatering Improvements Project
Addendum No. 1

7. Question: Task 3.10 of Exhibit E (Scope of Work, Preliminary) requests the OA to develop a detailed QA/QC plan that will be included in the RFQ/RFP for the PDB team. It is not industry standard for the Owner or Owner's Advisor to develop the QA/QC plan for the PDB team's work. The PDB team's quality (and risks associated with quality) are best managed by the PDB team themselves and are typically under the PDB team's scope of responsibility. This would require the PDB team to develop and submit a QA/QC plan to the Owner for review and approval, which is typically an early task as part of Phase 1. An OA then provides oversight and checks compliance with the PDB's QA/QC plan, but the OA does not manage nor control the QA/QC plan or process. Please clarify the intent of this scope task.

Answer: The RFP scope is preliminary. Proposers are highly encouraged to recommend changes or additions to the scope of work. Please include a description of your proposed approach for quality oversight of the PDB team's QA/QC processes, as well as your internal QA/QC approach for the OA's submittals to the District.

THIS ADDENDUM MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THE PROPOSAL.



Kevin Jim
Associate Civil Engineer