



"Protecting Public Health and the Environment"

RFQ/RFP for Parallel Interceptor Project Program Manager

Submitted Questions & Responses

August 24, 2026

Updated: September 16, 2026

PVSC provides the following responses to all inquiries received through August September 16, 2026, 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.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

September 16, 2026

29. The responsibilities outlined for the Principal in Charge include providing overall leadership and direction to the Program team, acting as the client liaison, reporting directly to PVSC's Chief Engineer, monitoring Program performance, establishing key performance indicators, reviewing budgets and schedules, and overseeing corrective actions. These responsibilities appear to overlap with functions typically associated with the Program Manager role on large program management engagements. Can PVSC clarify its expectations regarding the respective roles, authority, and level of involvement of the Principal in Charge versus the Program Manager? Specifically, what level of day-to-day engagement, decision-making responsibility, and client interaction does PVSC expect from the Principal in Charge throughout the Program, and how will these responsibilities differ from those of the Program Manager?

Response: Please refer to RFQ/RFP Section IV.E for the descriptions of the key/lead team members.

30. How should the Final BODR acceptance, the 10% design development, and the RFQ/RFP issuance be sequenced in the proposal schedule, given that page 62 states work on the multiple design contracts should not proceed until the Final BODR is accepted? If PVSC limits the RFP to the first 5 years of the program, aligned with the NPDES permit, these items will be resolved allowing the best course of action for the delivery of the project.

Response: Respondents should prepare the qualifications proposals and compensation proposals in accordance with the requirements outlined in the RFQ/RFP. As stated within Task 8 (page 64), the Respondent shall develop the Final BODR to 10% design status and create RFQ/RFP to solicit and select professional engineering services to complete the

designs and oversee the construction administration services for the multiple design contracts.

31. The RFQ/RFP indicates that the Program may be delivered through multiple procurement packages and over a 15-year implementation period. Can PVSC clarify the expected level of detail and accuracy for compensation associated with later phases of the Program where scope, schedule, delivery methods, and resource requirements may not yet be fully defined?

Response: Respondents should prepare the qualifications proposals and compensation proposals in accordance with the requirements outlined in the RFQ/RFP, with as much detail and accuracy as may be practicable at this time.

32. Regarding Part 7. Business Entity Experience and References, Section C, Item viii – Key Staff Resumes: Please clarify the intent of Item viii. The RFP already requires resumes for proposed key personnel in a separate section of the submission. Under Part 7, Section C, Item viii, are Respondents expected to:

1. Include the same key staff resumes again, resulting in duplication of the resumes provided elsewhere in the proposal;
2. Include resumes for the individuals who worked on the referenced projects, even if they are not proposed as key personnel for the PVSC Parallel Interceptor Program; or
3. Simply identify the proposed key personnel who participated in the referenced projects and provide their resumes only once in the designated key personnel section?

Response: The Respondents may include resumes for the individuals who worked on the referenced projects. However, the resumes for key personnel for the PVSC Parallel Interceptor Program will be the focus as part of the professional evaluation and ranking methodology. Duplication is not required.

33. The RFQ/RFP specifies Professional Liability Insurance of \$15,000,000 per claim and annual aggregate. Because this requirement exceeds the professional liability limits commonly required on comparable assignments, would PVSC consider accepting a lower limit of \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000? If not, would PVSC provide additional information regarding the rationale for the \$15,000,000 requirement? Does this apply to subconsultants as well?

Response: The amount of Professional Liability Insurance is reflective of the scope and duration of the project as well as its function as the single-most important component of the overall Regional Long Term CSO Control Plan. While PVSC may, if requested by the Successful Respondent, consider a lower limit, Respondents should respond with the limits as currently set forth, which also apply to subconsultants.

34. In reviewing Attachments G and H, we anticipate using more job categories as we prepare the estimate, please confirm that we can add more columns to the official Excel document?

Response: Additional job categories may be added at the discretion of the Respondent.

35. Section VII Qualifications, page 82, the RFQ/RFP response shall include, as a minimum, the following information: i. Provide lists of anticipated Contract Drawings, Table of Contents of Technical Specifications (6-digit CSI format), and Shop Drawings for major components. These deliverables are typically developed by the lead designer and are generally not available until after the 10% design stage. Given that this procurement is for Program Management services and these items should not impact the review or award, can PVSC clarify whether this requirement is intended for the Program Manager, or if it was inadvertently carried over from a design services procurement?

Response: This requirement is part of the 10% design stage, not part of the qualifications proposal.

36. The RFQ/RFP indicates that the Program may be delivered through multiple procurement packages and over a 15-year implementation period. Can PVSC clarify the expected level of staff that will be available after the BODR/10% design is developed to assist with supporting the subsequent phases of the Program?

Response: PVSC will have sufficient staffing levels to assist in procurement for supporting phases of the Program.

37. On page 82, The RFQ/RFP response shall include, as a minimum, the following information: h. Acknowledgement of Receipt of Clarifications Schedule. Please provide the form or expand on what is required to be provided in the submittal.

Response: Please refer to Attachment I (Page 114) for the required form.

38. The RFP asks for a letter of commitment for all key personnel, does this include the category of Engineering Specialists (as required)?

Response: If a Respondent believes the Engineering Specialist (as required) are “key personnel,” the Respondent should prepare the qualifications proposal accordingly.

39. Section IV of the RFP states, “Only Respondents scoring 70 points or higher on the Qualifications Evaluation shall be considered for Step 2. Compensation Proposals for Respondents scoring less than 70 points shall not be reviewed.” For proposers scoring 70 points or higher on the Qualifications Evaluation, how will the Compensation Proposal be

factored into the final selection? Are there specific weighting criteria for the qualifications and cost, or will the proposer with the lowest cost be selected?

Response: The Compensation Proposal will be one factor in PVSC's overall evaluation and selection of the Successful Respondent.