

**Questions and Responses for EBMUD RFP 551-26-01  
Engineering Consulting Services as Owner Advisor – Central Reservoir Replacement Project  
Received by EOB March 13, 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.

**CORRECTION (3/20/2026):** 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~~ **Negotiation of Contract Price (GMP or LS)**. **Therefore, Design and Pre-construction phase is covered under Work Authorization No. 1 ~~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 request 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 an 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  
Received by EOB March 13, 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- is it 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.

**Questions and Responses for EBMUD RFP 551-26-01  
Engineering Consulting Services as Owner Advisor – Central Reservoir Replacement Project  
Received by EOB March 13, 2026**

12. Task 2.7: Can the District confirm if OA staff should plan to be present for District Board of Director meetings?

**OA staff are not expected to attend the board meetings in question.**

13. Task 4.4 #10: The OA is not an insurance or financial organization. While the OA can provide a general review of financials, the OA cannot confirm or provide independent review of financial viability or underwriting capacity. Can the District consider revising Task 4.4 #10 to “Provide a general review of the selected DBE(s) financials.” or similar?

**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. It is acceptable to provide such services through a third-party subconsultant.**

14. May we include additional key staff besides the three requested by the District under Key Staff Minimum Qualifications on page 29?

**Yes. The RFP requires at least three Key Staff but does not prohibit including additional key personnel. Proposers may include additional key staff if doing so strengthens their proposal. Please ensure to clearly identify which three meet the minimum Key Staff requirements.**

15. RFP Response Packet Guidelines note that Exhibit B – Insurance Requirements should be included in the submittal. However, the second paragraph of Exhibit B states that proposers are not required to submit completed insurance verification documents with their bid. Please verify that Exhibit B doesn’t need to be included with the bid package.

**Proposers are not required to submit completed insurance verification documents with their bid.**

16. Statement of Qualifications – Item 3(d) in REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION AND SUBMITTALS asks for resumes of Key Staff, and gives no page limit or staff count/resume limit in contrast to Item 6 on RFP page 7. Which requirement takes precedence?

**Please limit the resume page counts to 2 pages per staff member.**

17. Statement of Qualifications – Is the QUALIFYING EXPERIENCE table on RFP page 13 part of the Statement of Qualifications form?

**Yes, this table is part of the Statement of Qualifications.**

18. Key Staff (People) Qualifications – Are references to be also included in the resumes for Key Personnel. If so, how many?

**Yes. Resumes must include references—a minimum of one per Key Staff member.**

19. Summary of Sections and Page Limits – Any page limit for Labor Hours by Task? RFP page 9 lists this under the previous section’s 8-page limit.

**Questions and Responses for EBMUD RFP 551-26-01  
Engineering Consulting Services as Owner Advisor – Central Reservoir Replacement Project  
Received by EOB March 13, 2026**

**There is *no* page limit for Labor Hours by Task.**

20. Section I.D Summary of Scope p6 – RFP indicates that recommended additions, deletions, or refinements of scope shall not be included in the Proposer’s cost estimate. During the preproposal meeting it was stated that these modifications should be included, but separate, from the base scope cost. Should Proposer’s include these items into the cost estimate provided with the Proposal?

**In order for the evaluation panel to have a consistent basis to compare proposals, the proposers are asked not to include exceptions, clarifications, or amendments in the Not-to-exceed cost. Proposers are however encouraged to include estimated labor hours for exceptions, clarifications, or amendments in the labor distribution table. Any divergence from the RFP scope of work shall be listed separately and clearly identified as such.**

21. Section 1.3 and Section 1.4 of the Scope of Work – Section 1.3 states that a cost-loaded look-ahead schedule is required. What level of cost loading is expected in the schedule and is it acceptable to do this cost loading in the Microsoft Project/Planner Schedule required in Section 1.4?

**Monthly progress reports, which are submitted with the monthly invoices, shall describe in detail the work that is performed for each subtask and identify the anticipated level of effort and corresponding level of spending for the following month. If a cost loaded schedule is delivered in Microsoft Planner or Microsoft Project to convey this information, it will need to be updated with each monthly progress report and invoice.**

22. Table A: Work Authorization Phasing – Does EBMUD have a high-level schedule target for the duration of Phase 1 (Procurement/Design and Precon) and Phase 2?

**At this point, the District can only share a high-level target of completing DBE procurement by mid-2027. The duration of the subsequent design and pre-construction activities has not yet been developed to a level where it can be reliably projected.**

23. Scope of Work Section 5.5 Cost Estimate Review – Section 5.5 states that “the OA shall retain services of an Independent Cost Estimator...”. Can the proposing firm cover this scope with qualified staff with specific experience in developing independent cost estimates for PDB project as an OA and Guaranteed Maximum Price Proposals as an at-risk design-builder?

**Given the variability historically observed in internal engineer’s estimates on projects of this complexity, the District intends to rely on Independent Cost Estimators (ICE) with demonstrated expertise in PDB and GMP development to ensure accuracy and consistency. Proposers are therefore expected to include services of an ICE as indicated in Section 5.5. Proposers may propose an exception outlining the qualifications of their internal estimating staff; however, the assumption for the base proposal shall remain the use of an independent third-party ICE.**

24. we kindly request the Approach Section to be expanded from 20 to 30 pages with an additional 11” x 17” to be used for non-schedule material.

**Please keep the approach page limit to 20 pages. Inclusion of an additional 11x17 is acceptable.**

