



ADDENDUM to the REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION and INSPECTION SERVICES for the CAPITAL TRANSIT VALLEY TRANSFER STATION (C3) RFP E22-030

ADDENDUM NO.: ONE

DEADLINE FOR PROPOSALS:
July 2, 2021

PREVIOUS ADDENDA: NONE

ISSUED BY: City and Borough of Juneau
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, Alaska 99801

DATE ADDENDUM ISSUED: June 30, 2021

The following items of the contract are modified as herein indicated. This addendum has been issued and is posted online. Please refer to the CBJ Engineering Contracts Division webpage at:
<https://juneau.org/engineering-public-works/current-bids-and-rfps>

Item No. 1 SECTION 3.0 PROPOSAL CONTENT REQUIREMENTS
Delete the Firm's Hourly Rates paragraph

Item No. 2 SECTION 3.0 PROPOSAL CONTENT REQUIREMENTS
Delete the Juneau Proposer paragraph

Item No. 3 SECTION 4.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS, Subsection 4.2 EVALUATION DATA
Delete and replace subsection 4.2 **with** the following:

"4.2 Evaluation Data

The evaluation Data discussed below is the presented in an effort to delineate what criteria will be used to score proposals. Please do not include a separate section in your proposal for Evaluation Data. Much of the information discussed and requested below should be included in the proposal as part of the Proposal Content Requirements discussed in SECTION 3.0 of this RFP.

4.2.1 Proposed Method to Accomplish the Project (40%)

- a. Proposer exhibits a complete understanding of the project and requested deliverables. **Scoring Weight 10%.**
- b. Proposer identifies general or specific problems that may be encountered during Valley Transfer Station Construction and states how they intend to handle the identified situations. **Scoring Weight 15%.**
- c. Proposer explains how they will ensure that the inspection services they provide for this project meet CBJ's quality expectations. **Scoring Weight 15%.**

4.2.2 Organization, Capacity of Firm and Personnel Qualifications (25%)

- a. Proposer's organization and the ability to perform the desired services within the established schedule. **Scoring Weight 10%.**
- b. Proposer's experience and performance with similar projects. **Scoring Weight 15%.**

4.2.3 Relevant Experience and Past Record of Performance (30%)

- a. Proposed team members' qualifications. **Scoring Weight 15%.**
- b. Firm's past record of performance. **Scoring Weight 10%.**
- c. Team Efficiency. **Scoring Weight 5%.**

4.2.4 Quality of the Proposal (5%)

Is proposal clear and concise? Is proposal responsive to the needs of the project? Evaluation will include the clarity and professional quality of the document(s) submitted."

Item No. 4 SECTION 7.0 JUNEAU PROPOSER POINTS
Delete SECTION 7.0 in its entirety

Item No. 5 SECTION 9.0 CONSULTANT'S GOOD STANDING WITH CBJ FINANCE DEPARTMENT
Delete the last Paragraph of Section 9.0, which reads:
"Note: Juneau Proposer preference (7.0) has requirements regarding a firm's good standing with the City at the time a proposal is submitted. Please review the Purchasing Code cited."

Item No. 6 PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM
Delete and replace the Proposal Evaluation Form **with** the attached Proposal Evaluation Form

Receipt of this addendum must be acknowledged or your proposal may be considered non-responsive. Acknowledge the addendum in the submitted proposal.

By: 

Greg Smith,
Contract Administrator

Section	Criteria - Per SECTION 4.2 of RFP	Criteria Weight	Outstanding (10 points)	Adequate To Good (6 7 or 8 points)	Marginally Acceptable (3 or 4 points)	Unacceptable (0 or 1 point)	Sub Total
4.2.1	Proposed Method to Accomplish the Project.						
a.	Proposer exhibits a complete understanding of the project and requested deliverables.	10					
b.	Proposer Identifies general or specific problems that may be encountered during construction and states how they intend to handle the identified situations	15					
c.	Proposer explains how they will ensure that the inspection services they provide for this project meet CBJ's quality expectations.	15					
4.2.2	Organization and Capacity of Firm						
a.	Organization and ability to perform services within desired schedule	10					
b.	Proposer's experience and performance with similar projects.	15					
4.2.3	Relevant Experience						
a.	Team member/personnel qualifications	15					
b.	Past record of performance	10					
c.	Team efficiency.	5					
4.2.4	Quality of Proposal	5					
GRAND TOTAL							

Scoring

No scores using 2, 5, 9

Outstanding = 10

Adequate to Good = 6, 7, 8

Marginally Acceptable = 3 or 4

Unacceptable or Poor = 0 or 1

Juneau Proposer Points awarded by Contracts Division = 10 or 0 points

Maximum Score Achievable = 1,000

Evaluator _____ Rank _____ Date _____