



ADDENDUM NO. II

DATE: March 8, 2022
TO: All Potential Proposers
FROM: James McKeehan, Assistant Purchasing Agent, City of Knoxville
SUBJECT: Addendum No. II to RFQ - On-Call Engineering Services for Stormwater Quality
PROPOSALS TO BE OPENED: March 14, 2022 at 11:00 am Eastern Time

This addendum is being published to provide clarification regarding the above referenced ITB. This addendum becomes a part of the contract documents and modifies the original specifications as follows:

Item 1: Page 9 of 28 of the RFQ indicates that the subcontractors are required to maintain the same insurance requirements as the contractor. Does this apply to disadvantaged businesses that are subcontracted for this contract as well?

Response: Yes, all subcontractors are required to maintain the same insurance requirements as the contractor

Item 2: On Page 18 of 28, wherein the sections of the proposal are listed, Section H indicates the Body of the Proposal should be response to the Evaluation Criteria found in Section 9, but there is no Section 9 of the proposal. Are you referring to the Evaluation Criteria listed at the bottom of that same page?

Response: Yes, that section is referring to the evaluation criteria listed at the bottom of page 18.

Item 3: Under Evaluation Criteria "Experience and References of the Qualifier," (Page 18 of 28), the RFQ states the criteria will be evaluated based on the qualifier's response related to 7.4 of the RFQ, but Section 7.4 does not exist. Please advise.

Response: This evaluation criteria should reference Section 5: Scope of Service

Item 4: Providing accurate dollar amounts on the "Subcontractor/Consultant Statement" is difficult given the on-call nature of this contract. Is it acceptable to simply indicate "TBD" in place of a dollar amount?

Response: Yes, please indicate "TBD" in place of the dollar amount.

Item 5: If our firm completes design or feasibility related tasks for a project under this contract, are we precluded from doing future construction/implementation on the same project either as a prime or subcontractor?



Response: Yes, the firm that completes design or feasibility related tasks for a project would be precluded from doing future construction/implementation on the same project.

Item 6: In the Evaluation Criteria under the Experience and References of the Qualifier section, a response to section “7.4 of this RFQ” is mentioned. Where can we find section 7.4?

Response: See Item 3

Item 7: Is it permissible to state that we will provide a certain percentage and a “TBD” dollar value for the percentage? If not, please provide more detail on how submitters should complete this form.

Response: See Item 4

Item 8: Page 18 of the RFQ states “Proposer’s response to the Evaluation Criteria found in Section 9 and any other relevant information that demonstrates how the proposer intends to complete the scope of service detailed herein.” There was not a Section 9 included in the RFQ. Can the City provide clarification?

Response: See Item 2

Item 9: Page 18 of the RFQ states “This particular evaluation criteria will be evaluated based on the qualifier’s response related to 7.4 of this RFQ.” There was not a Section 7.4 included in the RFQ. Can the City provide clarification?

Response: See Item 3

Item 10: The Subcontractor/Consultant Statement included on page 26 of the RFQ request specific dollar amounts in several places. Because a specific scope of work is not yet defined, dollar amounts cannot be provided. Can the City Clarify what information should be included on this form?

Response: See Item 4

END OF ADDENDUM NO. II