



**Sites Project Authority
Request for Qualifications No. 25-01
Reservoir Package Construction Manager at Risk**

Addendum 02

This addendum provides clarifications to questions regarding the SOQ and applicable changes to the RFQ.

Questions and Answers

1. For SOQ Appendix A – Reference Project Profiles, please adjust for projects completed within the last 30 years so that proposers may demonstrate comprehensive project experience and key personnel linkage to that project experience.
 - **Response:** See RFQ revision 2.1.

2. In reference to Section 1.4, pg. 4-5, the RFQ states: “If the proposed Reservoir Package CMAR Contractor is a JV or partnership, provide a required letter for each member or partner.” For large projects like this one, it is customary for the sureties to provide a single letter on behalf of the joint venture entity confirming its ability to obtain the payment and performance bonds. If the proposed Reservoir Package CMAR Contractor is a joint venture, please confirm that the Respondent may submit a single letter on behalf of the joint venture in response to this requirement.
 - **Response:** Respondent may submit a single surety letter for an established joint venture. See RFQ revision 2.2.

3. Given the required page lengths of the minimum requirement forms required as part of Section 1: Ability to Meet Minimum Qualification Requirements, please confirm that these forms are excluded from the 50-page limitation for this SOQ (this would include Sections 1.1-1.7).
 - **Response:** The page limitation excludes Forms D, E, F, G, H, I, and J.

4. In reference to Section 3 - Proposed Reservoir Package CMAR Contractor (SOQ pg. 4-10), it states: "Include an affirmative statement that the proposed Reservoir Package CMAR Contractor will serve as the prime contractor for construction of the Sites and Golden Gate dams which work shall be self-performed. "Please confirm that the self-performance requirement for Sites and Golden Gate Dam work is in reference to the zoned embankment scopes of work exclusively for these sites.
 - **Response:** The self-performance requirement for Sites and Golden Gate Dam work applies to earthwork including but not limited to zoned embankment scopes.

5. In Table 4-1 SOQ Sections 2 through 9 state that CM/GC and GC/CM projects may be used to fulfill experience requirements. Given the similarities between CMAR and other collaborative delivery models (namely IDaC and PDB), may we include project/personnel experience from these delivery models to indicate our team's ability to work collaboratively with the Sites Authority?
 - **Response:** Respondents are required to identify and describe CMAR, CM/GC, and/or GC/CM experience. A Respondent may describe other collaborative delivery experiences, but that experience cannot substitute for CMAR, CM/GC, or GC/CM experience.

6. SOQ Section 3 requires the Respondent to provide the estimated percentage of work to be self-performed and the aggregate estimate of the percentage of work to be performed by Key Subcontractors. While delivering the brief description of work anticipated to be self-performed or performed by Key Subcontractors at the SOQ stage, it would seem a bit premature to estimate the actual percentage of the overall package this work would encompass. We'd suggest removing the requirement to provide estimated percentages of work within the SOQ.
 - **Response:** The requested estimated percentage of work may be identified as preliminary. Respondents may provide ranges where applicable.

7. Please confirm that Forms A, B, and C are not included in the 50-page limit.
 - **Response:** Forms A, B, and C are included in the 50-page limit.

Revisions to the RFQ

2.1 Replace RFQ Table 4-1, SOQ Appendix A – Reference Project Profiles first paragraph with the following:

“Provide up to seven descriptions of relevant projects. Respondents are encouraged to provide recent projects and projects that are nearly complete (past substantial completion) if possible. Projects that are currently in progress or were completed more than 10 years prior to issuance of this RFQ are acceptable, but their level of completion and/or date achieving completion will be considered in the evaluation. .”

2.2 Add the following to submittal requirements for Payment and Performance Bonds (RFQ Table 4-1, SOQ Section 1.4)

“A single surety letter for an established Joint Venture (JV) is acceptable. If the intent is to establish a JV for the Reservoir Package, then individual letters from each firm to be part of the proposed JV will be required.”