

**Questions and Responses for EBMUD RFP 551-26-01
Engineering Consulting Services as Owner Advisor – Central Reservoir Replacement Project
as of March 11, 2026**

1. Please confirm that design and preconstruction are not part of Work Authorization #1, since these efforts would occur post PDB award, as per “Design & Pre-Construction” scope on page 7.

Refer to Section C, Table A for the delineation of scope between the two Work Authorizations. Work Authorization No. 1 will cover the scope of work necessary to completion of Contract Negotiation. Design and Pre-construction phase is covered under Work Authorization No. 2.

2. District Platforms: Since these systems will reside on the District server, will the District provide access and licensing for MS SharePoint, Teams, Bluebeam Revu Studio, Kahua, Autodesk Revit, AutoCAD, Autodesk Construction Cloud, and MicroStation?

The intent is to maintain the working files in the District’s software environment so that at the end of the project there won’t be a need to transfer a large number of files. For instance, a Bluebeam review session can be hosted based on the District’s license, but each user/commenter shall be expected to provide their own license in order to gain access to the session. SharePoint files can be hosted on District’s cloud servers and access can be given to the OA. Autodesk Construction Cloud may require the OA to carry their own licenses. That said, the District will be open to discussing more efficient means of maintaining project files once the OA is onboard.

3. Who is the District’s legal consultant?

The District has retained the services of Best Best & Krieger LLP as outside counsel.

4. Task 4.4 requests the OA to “Provide an independent financial review of the selected DBE(s) to assess their underwriting capacity.” We suggest this task be conducted by EBMUD’s Financial Staff and Legal Counsel which is industry standard and Best Management Practice. Please confirm this will be performed by EBMUD.?

The District does not have the in-house expertise to assess the underwriting capacity of the selected/short-listed DBE(s). The District prefers to receive such services through the OA contract as outlined in the scope.

5. Can the Professional Liability insurance limits be lowered to \$2 M per occurrence/aggregate for subconsultant or is it at the discretion of the Prime?

The insurance limits and requirements included in Exhibit B of this RFP apply to the OA, as it is the OA who will be in contract with the District. As indicated in Exhibit B, Article C, CONTRACTOR/OA shall require any subcontractor to carry and maintain insurance required in this Agreement to the extent the insurance applies to the scope of the services to be performed by each subcontractor. The OA shall be responsible for subcontractor compliance.

6. Would it be possible for subconsultants to receive an exception on the Cyber Liability endorsement?

See response to Question 5.

**Questions and Responses for EBMUD RFP 551-26-01
Engineering Consulting Services as Owner Advisor – Central Reservoir Replacement Project
as of March 11, 2026**

7. Request clarification of expectation for verification of accuracy of converted MicroStation files (RFP P.8: Task 0.1). Does this refer to verification of the content of the converted MicroStation files, which represent the Central Reservoir structure and related facilities? Or does this refer to verifying the accuracy of the conversion from MicroStation to AutoCAD for use as contract and reference exhibits?

District's record drawings of its facilities largely exist in MicroStation format. The District acknowledges that production of any new drawings required for the project can be performed using AutoCAD. However, the process of converting existing MicroStation drawings to AutoCAD is not always smooth and some information such as lineweights, linetypes, and annotation do not translate completely and accurately. Additionally, the process of conversion could introduce inaccuracies in the drawings' units. If the OA chooses to use AutoCAD as the means of drawing production (as procurement exhibits or any other purposes), the OA is responsible for checking each individual drawing for such inaccuracies.

8. Do you want the project descriptions in BOTH the SOQ section and the Project Teams (Firms) Section – or ONLY the Project Teams (Firms) Section?

Including the project description in the Project Experience Matrix is preferable.

9. Is Attachment B the same as the Experience Matrix- To be placed in the Project Team (Firm) Section? Because I do not see an "Attachment B" form, I assume it is the Project Experience Matrix?

Correct. Attachment B is a typo. It refers to the Project Experience Matrix

10. Can the Matrix form be reformatted – are we permitted to do with the other SOQ forms?

Reformatting the Project Experience Matrix is acceptable as long as the end product maintains the same structure so that it can be compared to other proposers. Please keep the SOQ and other Exhibit A forms in their original format.

11. Please clarify if the Key Staff (People) Qual section narrative is 6 or 8 pages max? You have stated 6 pages in one section and 8 the other. Which is the correct max number of pages?

Please use the more generous page limit.