



"Protecting Public Health and the Environment"

RFQ/RFP for Parallel Interceptor Project Program Manager

Submitted Questions & Responses

August 24, 2026

Updated: N/A

PVSC provides the following responses to all inquiries received through August 21, 2024, regarding the above-referenced project RFQ/RFP. PVSC will update this document as necessary.

1. Given that the Parallel Interceptor Program is primarily a program management, planning, procurement, and delivery oversight contract, the minimum qualifications for the key personnel appear heavily weighted toward specific tunnel project experience. Can PVSC clarify whether demonstrated success managing similarly complex water and wastewater capital programs will be considered equivalent to the listed tunnel-specific experience requirements?

Response: Deviation from the stated minimum qualifications will not be considered non-responsive but will be factored into scoring the response.

2. Because the scope of services is focused on program management and owner advisory functions, can PVSC clarify whether comparable experience leading large-scale water and wastewater infrastructure programs of similar complexity and risk will be considered when evaluating team firm qualifications?

Response: Deviation from the stated minimum qualifications will not be considered non-responsive but will be factored into scoring the response.

3. Given the anticipated 15-year duration of the Program and the evolving nature of planning, design, procurement, construction, commissioning, and operational transition activities, can PVSC clarify how compensation proposals will be evaluated and whether Respondents may identify assumptions, exclusions, escalation methodologies, or future adjustment mechanisms necessary to address long-term program uncertainties?

Response: Respondents are directed to prepare the qualifications proposals and compensation proposals in accordance with the requirements outlined in the RFQ/RFP.

Recommendations made by the Selected Respondent, if any, regarding work previously performed will be reviewed and considered by PVSC and, if appropriate, be the subject of a potential change in scope of service.

4. The Program Management scope includes early-phase activities such as geotechnical investigations, route analysis, constructability evaluations, alternatives assessment, and risk management prior to advancing the Program to approximately 10% design. Given the uncertainties associated with the currently identified soft-ground tunnel alignment, can PVSC clarify its expectations regarding revalidation of previous recommendations and the degree to which alternative technical approaches may be considered if they demonstrate a reduction in program risk, cost, schedule, or operational impacts?

Response: Respondents are directed to prepare the qualifications proposals and compensation proposals in accordance with the requirements outlined in the RFQ/RFP. Recommendations made by the Selected Respondent, if any, regarding work previously performed will be reviewed and considered by PVSC and, if appropriate, be the subject of a potential change in scope of service.

5. The RFP indicates a 15-year Program Management contract and requires respondents to provide a compensation proposal for the anticipated duration of the Program. However, many critical elements of the Program, including the number and type of future contract packages, procurement strategies, project sequencing, and execution approach, will not be fully defined until completion of the early planning efforts and development of the 10% Basis of Design Report (BODR). Additionally, the current NJPDES permit requirements are focused on the initial 3 to 5 years of the Program, during which the most significant decisions affecting scope, cost, risk, and overall Program delivery will be made. Given these uncertainties, would PVSC consider limiting the required compensation proposal to the initial 3- to 5-year phase of services, with options for renewal or future negotiated phases as the Program becomes better defined? This approach could provide more accurate pricing, reduce the need for assumptions and future contract modifications, and encourage broader competition.

Response: Respondents are directed to prepare the qualifications proposals and compensation proposals in accordance with the requirements outlined in the RFQ/RFP. Recommendations made by the Selected Respondent, if any, regarding work previously performed will be reviewed and considered by PVSC and, if appropriate, be the subject of a potential change in scope of service.

6. There appears to be a potential inconsistency between the project experience requirements. Section VII. Qualifications requests references for three (3) Tunnel and Dewatering Pumping Station Projects with Program Management Services, while Section IV. Professional Evaluation & Ranking, A.2 Experience requests descriptions of the three (3)

most recent projects, programs, or contracts similar to the Parallel Interceptor Program. Can PVSC clarify which requirement is correct?

Response: PVSC does not consider the sections to be inconsistent.

7. If responses to questions generate material impacts to the submittal response, would PVSC consider a 2-week extension, depending on the timing of release of an Addendum?

Response: Not at this time.

8. RFP Page 83 states “The Respondent may include adjustments to salary rates, once every two (2) years, beginning after ‘Year 3’ of the Program. Salary rate adjustments should not be greater than the “Engineer’s Pay Index of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics – Employment Cost Index (“ECI”) for Professional Specialty and Technical Workers Wages and Salaries” or 3% every two (2) years whichever is less. We have several questions related to these restrictions:

- a. Can the direct rates used for the first three years be escalated to account for no rate increases until year 3 i.e. can we use a base rate that is escalated to year 1.5 for the first three years of the project.

Response: The Respondents shall identify appropriate rates to use within their compensation proposal that suit the requirements of the RFQ / RFP.

- b. Is the rate cap the lesser of ECI or 3% cap per year or every two years, for example if 3% is the effective cap is the allowable increase 3% per year or 3% over two years (1.5% per year).

Response: The requirement within the RFQ / RFP is salary adjustments every two-years after year three at ‘ECI’ or 3% whichever is less. For example, same rate for years 1, 2, and 3. For years 4 and 5, rate from year 3 escalated per ‘ECI’ or 3% whichever is less and should be the same rate for years 4 and 5. For years 6 and 7, rate from year 5 escalated per ‘ECI’ or 3% whichever is less and should be the same rate for years 6 and 7, and so on.

- c. A 3% rate increase cap per year for a 15-year contract is problematic. Would PVSC consider a more equitable cap of actual direct rate increases of ECI or 5% whichever is greater?

Response: No. The Respondents shall identify appropriate rates to use within their compensation proposal that suit the requirements of the RFQ / RFP.

9. The qualifications for key/lead team members are overly prescriptive. For several of the positions the requirements include 15 to 20 years of experience in a specific role such as program manager, principal in charge, program controls/quality lead along with requirements for that experience to be on water or wastewater infrastructure programs of 100 or 200 MGD or greater. For some positions there are also requirements for a certain number of tunnel programs valued at over \$350M. Combining all of these requirements greatly limits the number of people in the industry who qualify for each role.

Response: Deviation from the stated minimum qualifications will not be considered non-responsive but will be factored into scoring the response.

10. Please confirm All allowances are just place holders to compare each bidders estimate and not an idea of actual costs associated with the individual scope items.

Response: Allowance amounts have been identified to provide the Respondents with a base for the items and descriptions associated with the Allowance Task items. Refer to Tasks 10 through 14 and Section IX – Costs for how allowances will be addressed.

11. An allowance of \$300,000 is provided for a subcontractor/subconsultant to provide geotechnical information. Compared to other programs of similar complexity, this allowance is much lower than would be commonly expected and will likely be deficient for sufficiently defining ground conditions along alternative alignments. Does PVSC intend to authorize additional funds for geotechnical investigations following expenditure of this allowance? Should proponents scale their effort in Task 6 to just the amount of borings that can be completed and information collected for \$300,000? Recommend that PVSC remove the allowance from the RFPQ and separately procure the geotechnical investigations. The costs for this effort will be significant for the tunnel, drop shafts, lift station, collector sewers, etc. The Program Manager can assist PVSC with the procurement process, identification of boring locations, and execution of the work.

Response: The allowance amounts noted within the RFQ / RFP are place holders. Refer to Tasks 10 through 14 and Section IX – Costs for how allowances and their actual costs for services will be addressed. The Respondent will be required to perform and provide soil boring (geotechnical) information to complete the services outlined within Task 6. The services of the subcontractor/subconsultant to perform and provide the soil borings information (geotechnical) is included within Task 13. If additional soil borings information (geotechnical) beyond the allocated allowance amount is required by the subcontractor/subconsultant in order for the Selected Respondent to complete the services outlined within Task 6, then PVSC and the Selected Respondent shall discuss potential changes to the Program Management Services.

12. What is PVSC's expected timing of their appeal to NJDEP regarding the construction of the Parallel Interceptor?

Response: Unknown at this time. However, NJDEP denied a request to stay the challenged requirements of PVSC's NJPDES permit, as well as similar requirements in the NJPDES permits of PVSC's eight (8) CSO municipalities, during the appeals process. PVSC and the CSO municipalities are, thus, obligated at this time to proceed accordingly.

13. With respect to critical questions and ones that can materially change the RFP, can PVSC please provide responses with clarity and prior to September 11, 2026?

Response: If possible.

14. One of the nine contracts is a progressive design-build contract for the Parallel Interceptor. Has PVSC developed a Progressive D-B contract that the PM is to use or is it expected the PM is to develop such contract? Additionally, will PVSC lead and coordinate contract negotiations prior to contract execution with D-B Contractor?

Response: PVSC has not developed a Progressive D-B contract. Refer to the referenced reports, studies, and permit for documents for additional information related to the Parallel Interceptor. The Respondents shall prepare the qualification proposal and compensation proposal in accordance with the requirements outlined within the RFQ / RFP and the referenced reports, studies, and permit. Should the Selected Respondent's updated route analysis and recommended construction contracts and construction delivery methods differ from what is noted within the RFQ / RFP, PVSC and the Selected Respondent shall discuss potential changes to the Program Management Services. The Respondent shall refer to Task 3.1 [the Program Management Plan (PMP)] and Task 4.1 [investigates, reviews, assesses to verify and confirm the recommendations of the Parallel Route Analysis Report] {both of which should identify and recommend the number of construction contracts and the method of construction for each construction contract}. Afterwards, the Selected Respondent will develop the Final (PVSC approved) BODR to 10% design status for each construction contract and preparation and solicitation for professional engineering services for each construction contract. The Respondent shall refer to Task 8 – Implementation/Execution for the requirements of the Selected Respondent pertaining to the Program Manager Services efforts during design, bidding, and construction for each construction contract.

15. Will there be another opportunity after the September 9th pre-proposal meeting for firms to ask questions generated from the pre-proposal meeting?

Response: If PVSC deems that additional opportunity for questions is necessary, it shall advise potential respondents of the same.

16. Under Qualifications Evaluation, page 19 of 162 – Statement of Qualifications, Key/Lead Team Member, the RFP states: “the Principal in Charge shall have a minimum of 20 years of experience and shall have served as Principal in Charge for 200 MGD or more water or wastewater tunnel infrastructure capital programs.” We request that PVSC considers removal of the requirement specific to tunnel infrastructure and allow for other capital programs related to wastewater infrastructure, such as treatment works. It can be beneficial to a Program of this magnitude that the Principal in Charge serves as a client liaison for a variety of Program-level issues, with competency in key areas above and beyond tunnel infrastructure, such as stakeholder management, CIP planning and funding, navigating regulatory requirements, delivery strategies, and overall contractual oversight and management.

Response: Deviation from the stated minimum qualifications will not be considered non-responsive but will be factored into scoring the response.

17. Under Qualifications Evaluation, page 20 of 162 – Statement of Qualifications, Key/Lead Team Member, the RFP states: “The Deputy Program Manager/Program Delivery Manager shall be responsible for assisting Program Manager with the program validation, delivery, monitoring, budgets, and schedule of a program team on at least two (2) complex water or wastewater infrastructure programs, with a tunnel construction value of \$100 million or more, within the last fifteen (15) years, that are similar in complexity to the PVSC Parallel Interceptor Program.” We request that PVSC considers removal of the requirement specific to tunnel construction value, to allow for consideration of other directly relevant complex water or wastewater infrastructure programs of similar cost and scale.

Response: Deviation from the stated minimum qualifications will not be considered non-responsive but will be factored into scoring the response.

18. Under Qualifications Evaluation, page 23 of 162 – Statement of Qualifications, Key/Lead Team Member, the RFP states that the Tunnel/Geotechnical Lead/Manager shall have, “strong knowledge, understanding, and expertise of large tunneling and dewatering pump station and CSO projects associated with LTCPs. We request that PVSC also allows for water supply tunnel projects, instead of limiting the requirement to CSO tunnel projects under Long Term Control Plans.

Response: Deviation from the stated minimum qualifications will not be considered non-responsive but will be factored into scoring the response.

19. Under Qualifications Evaluation, page 26 of 162 – Statement of Qualifications, Key/Lead Team Member, the RFP states the Engineering Specialists shall have at least five (5) years’ experience on tunneling, dewatering pump station, and CSO projects associated with LTCP projects for wastewater treatment plants. We request that PVSC allow for water supply tunnel experience for Geotechnical Engineers instead of limiting the requirement to CSO

tunnel projects under Long Term Control Plans, and also remove tunnel experience requirements for Hydraulics Engineers, LSRPs and Environmental Engineers overseeing permits.

Response: Deviation from the stated minimum qualifications will not be considered non-responsive but will be factored into scoring the response.

20. Could you please confirm whether Attachment P (Disclosure of Investments in Iran) and Attachment Q (Certification of Non-Involvement in Prohibited Activities in Russia or Belarus) are required to be completed and submitted as part of the proposal package? We note that both are included in the RFQ/RFP as “sample” forms.

Response: Attachments P and Q must be completed.

<https://www.nj.gov/treasury/purchase/forms/DisclosureofInvestmentActivitiesinIran.pdf>

<https://www.nj.gov/treasury/administration/pdf/DisclosureofProhibitedActivitesinRussiaBelarus.pdf>

21. Section IV.E.8 (page 29) The RFQ states:

“For the Subconsultant firm(s) providing key/lead team members, provide a description of a minimum of three (3) programs similar/relevant to the PVSC Parallel Interceptor Program previously performed by the key/lead Subconsultant, one of which should be a complex water or wastewater infrastructure capital program with a value, or multiple projects with an aggregate of, \$250 million or more. Each description shall be limited to two (2) pages and shall demonstrate the Subconsultants experience relevant to its specifically defined responsibility.”

We request the language to be amended as follows (with suggested added text in green italics):

“For the Subconsultant firm(s) providing key/lead team members *in technical roles*, provide a description of a minimum of three (3) programs similar/relevant to the PVSC Parallel Interceptor Program previously performed by the key/lead Subconsultant, one of which should be a complex water or wastewater infrastructure capital program with a value, or multiple projects with an aggregate of, \$250 million or more. *For Subconsultant firm(s) provided key/lead team members for communications, funding assistance, public outreach, or similar non-technical support functions, provide a description of support on a minimum of three (3) complex infrastructure programs.* Each description shall be limited to two (2) pages and shall demonstrate the Subconsultants experience relevant to its specifically defined responsibility.

Response: Deviation from the stated minimum qualifications will not be considered non-responsive but will be factored into scoring the response.

22. We request that the requirements for Funding Assistant Lead/Manager be revised as shown in green italics (added text) and red strikethrough font (deleted text):

“...shall have a minimum of ten (10) years of experience overseeing the financial resources associated with heavy construction-related *municipal infrastructure* projects ~~in the wastewater industry~~. The Funding Assistance Lead/Manager must have worked as a Funding Assistance Lead/Manager on at least one (1) or multiple projects with an aggregate construction value of \$100 million or greater, *municipal infrastructure* ~~water or wastewater treatment~~ capital improvement project.

Response: Deviation from the stated minimum qualifications will not be considered non-responsive but will be factored into scoring the response.

23. In lieu of a continuous 15-year commitment from certain key personnel, would PVSC accept a succession planning approach demonstrating continuity of leadership and knowledge transfer?

Response: As provided for in the RFQ/RFP, key personnel may be changed with the consent of PVSC.

24. Can PVSC further define the scope of legal support identified in the RFP [with regard to interceptor routing and geotechnical work]?

Response: In both instances, legal support may be necessary for land and/or easement acquisition, including, but not limited to, condemnation proceedings.

25. Given that PVSC is conducting a qualifications-based selection for this engagement, should Attachment G be included in the Compensation Proposal rather than the Qualification Proposal since it contains labor hours and billing rate information?

Response: No.

26. Given that many of the capital programs that we are supporting are multiple years in length, often spanning decades, will PVSC accept project references that are still underway? For example, we started a program in 2001 and it is still underway today.

Response: Yes.

27. Please confirm that the various “Engineering Specialists” and resources for “Additional services as required by Section VI” do not require full resumes.

Response: Full resumes for such positions are not required in the submission but may be required upon PVSC’s request.

28. Please confirm that the biographies requested on page 18 of the RFP should only be included in an appendix with the full resumes.

Response: The biographies requested on Page 18 of the RFQ/RFP should only be included in an appendix with the full resumes.