

**FY 2014 & FY 2015 Stormwater Modeling, Mapping, & Analysis
Responses to RSFOQ Questions, 9/16/2013**

Number	Comment	Response
1	After reviewing the RFSOQ for Stormwater I would like to request a list of eligible M/WBE firms from the City Contract Compliance Office. Is this a request that needs to go through you or can I contact them directly?	The official list of eligible M/WBE firms should be obtained directly from the City of Memphis Office of Contract Compliance. They may be reached at 901-636-6210.
2	Was the City's project announcement meeting mandatory for companies which plan to submit bids as prime?	No.
3	In the RFSOQ, submittal options are either electronic via email (with the possibility of multiple emails) or hard copy. Would the City consider electronic submittal via flash drive to eliminate the need for multiple emails? If so, how many copies (flash drives) would need to be submitted?	Electronic submittals via flash drive are acceptable. The submitting consultant would need to send one (1) copy in an envelope addressed in the same manner as for hard copies. Flash drives will not be returned.
4	1. Page 5, Item VI. 2. - WMBE participation If an MBE firm serves as the prime consultant and has a participation level of 30% (of the total professional fees), but also has a 10% mark-up on each of 2 team members, their participation level is actually $30+(10\%)*(70)=37\%$. Will you count that accordingly, or will you only count the 30%? If an MBE firm serves as the prime consultant, do you count them at a 100% MBE participation, or do you just count their percent of fees?	A M/WBE firm serving in a prime role will be counted at 100% M/WBE participation. The other intricacies related to this question will be worked out by the selection committee.
5	Page 5, Item VI . 3. - Local availability How are you defining local? Is it within the City of Memphis, within Shelby County, within a given radius, etc.?	A "local" firm will be defined as one having an office in Shelby County, which is permanently staffed. Additionally, to be considered local, those employees must be assigned to the projects in question.
6	On page 5 of the SOQ, Article VI.2.b you outline a sliding, prorated system of awarding points base on M/WBE participation. The firm promising the highest participation will get 9 points, the firm promising the second highest will get 8 points, and so on. We have several concerns. Unless a firm knows which basin they will be awarded, how do they know how to break out the participation of any M/WBE sub consultants? For example a larger basin may require more surveying than a smaller basin, therefore a M/WBE survey company may require more participation in a large basin study than in a small basin study. Also what prevents a firm from exaggerating their M/WBE participation to a very large percentage in their SOQ response – in order to get the maximum 17 points - and then end up using a percentage that is about equal to a firm that is prudent in stating their M/WBE participation?	1. The sliding point scale for M/WBE participation does not quite work in that manner. The points are awarded, in whole number increments, based on the relative percentage of participation compared to the highest participation. 2. City staff understands there may be some variation between basins, and feel this can be handled properly during the contract negotiation phase of this process. 3. The intent is to have each submitting firms to detail the planned roles for any M/WBE participants. Allowing some wiggle room for the variability of the projects; if City staff feels a firm is not honoring their proposed roles included in the SOQ, they have the authorization and right to cease negotiations with the offending firm and approach another firm to begin contract negotiations.
7	Would the City object if a firm were to submit as a prime consultant – and then also be a sub-consultant for a second firm that also submits as a prime consultant?	The City would not object to consultants submitting on multiple teams; however, only one submission as a prime consultant will be considered.
8	The status of the storm sewer GIS layer will be important to the effort required for data collection and model development. Please provide some comment on the completeness of the current/developing storm sewer GIS dataset. Does the dataset include most or all of the known storm sewer system line work in the Study Areas? Does the dataset include pipe attribute information (e.g. diameter, elevations, shape)? Is the current/developing dataset based on information gleaned from archival design or record drawings ("as-builts")? And if so, it is expected that all of the current dataset (that portion which is based on archival information) be field verified? Has more attention been given to the storm sewer layers in the high-priority areas as opposed to the low priority areas?	The GIS datasets provided are to be used for reference purposes. The data included in the modeling effort shall be based on field surveys.
9	The Q&A issued with the RFQ indicates that a "hand-held" GPS unit will not provide sufficient accuracy for this project. We assume this is referring to meter-level accuracy handheld GPS units which are commonly available as consumer electronics. TDOT allows for the use of survey-grade GPS units for field survey data collection which meet or exceed the horizontal and vertical surveying standards specified. Use of this technology in applicable locations may reduce time and costs associated with data collection and not impact the accuracy of the model or results. Please clarify that if a survey-grade GPS achieves the stated TDOT survey accuracies, its use would be acceptable.	GPS equipment is permissible; however, the required vertical and horizontal accuracies specified in the RFSOQ must be achievable.