



**City of Tacoma**  
**Tacoma Public Utilities / Tacoma Water Division**  
**Hydrogeological Consultant Services for Municipal Groundwater**  
**Wells**  
**RFQ Specification No. TW20-0388F**

**QUESTIONS and ANSWERS**

All interested parties had the opportunity to submit questions in writing by email to Samol Hefley by February 2, 2021. The answers to the questions received are provided below and posted to the City's website at [www.TacomaPurchasing.org](http://www.TacomaPurchasing.org): Navigate to *Current Contracting Opportunities / Services*, and then click *Questions and Answers* for this Specification. This information IS NOT considered an addendum. Respondents should consider this information when submitting their proposals.

**Question 1:** Some of the links in the RFQ document appear to be internal to the City's systems (pointing to cityshare). The Contract Questionnaire and some of the supporting documents mentioned in the appendices do not appear to be available. I don't think that these are critical in the preparation of our response to the RFQ, but will they be available for our review if needed later in the process?

**Answer 1:** The documents from these internal links should not be significant to submitting Statements of Qualifications. The Contract Questionnaire is primarily meant to help City staff populate the contract template based on the type of work involved. Other documents referenced in the appendices will be available if relevant to the selected consultant.

**Question 2:** There are no specific BCEs for Well 1B, 11A, or 13A included in the RFQ package. Will these be developed as a part of this project?

**Answer 2:** Short form BCEs for Wells 1B and 11A were postponed because the initial planning was for these wells to not be addressed until the next biennium (2023/2024). Brief summaries of the work at these sites is on pages 153-154 of the RFQ (Appendix E3). Well 13A was not initially one of the wells selected for improvements, but may be included in this project if needed to make up for any production lost at Well 3A when addressing aquifer separation there. These additional BCEs will be developed later by Tacoma Water, and are expected to generally be similar to the BCEs for the other wells in South Tacoma (Appendices E5-E8).

**Question 3:** In the Wells Master Plan, an "Aquifer Reliability Grade" is mentioned and used (p128 and 129 of the RFQ document). What is this and what does the score mean?

**Answer 3:** The Aquifer Reliability Grade was an approximate way of reflecting existing decreases in production from each well. Wells with an "B" grade have been consistently producing near the original design capacity (or there was insufficient data to demonstrate otherwise); wells with a "D" grade have had production decline more noticeably relative to the original water right. The nominal (typical recently observed) capacities listed on page 129 (Appendix E3) of the RFQ can be compared to the design capacities on pages 64-70 (Appendix D4). It is thought rehabilitation is likely to increase production closer to the original

design. The full cost comparison spreadsheet, as well as drawdown and production data from SCADA, will be available to the selected consultant.

**Question 4:** In section 11 in the Criteria and points allocation table (page 6) 10 points are included for “experience with relevant ancillary work”. What do you consider ancillary work? For instance, do you mean all types of work related to municipal drinking water supplies (i.e., distribution, treatment, etc.) or just specifically related to drinking water wells, etc. Or do you intend that to mean something different?

**Answer 4:** The intent was ancillary work would be related to the scope described in the Technical Provisions on pages 13-15 of the RFQ, and be beyond the other three experience criteria listed on page 6..