



BRUNSWICK-GLYNN COUNTY JOINT WATER & SEWER COMMISSION

May 6, 2026

**PROJECT: REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 26-008 Progressive Design Build
Services for PS3103 & PS4119 Expansion and Force Main**

ADDENDUM: THREE (3)

DUE DATE: THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2026 – 12:00PM, NOON

**THIS ADDENDUM IS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ANSWERING THE FOLLOWING
QUESTIONS:**

- 1) QUESTION: Please confirm the current installed pump make/model, impeller trim, HP, level controls, control setpoints, alarm setpoints, and operating logic at PS3103 and PS4119, and whether the data is available documenting those currently installed conditions. Available vendor documents suggest PS4119 may have been upgraded in 202 with two WILO FA10.78Z pumps with 57 HP, 460V motors; please confirm whether that remains the current installed configuration at PS4119.**

ANSWER: The pump curves for each site have been added to the solicitation website, <https://www.bgjwsc.org/request-for-proposal-no-26-008-progressive-design-build-services-for-the-ps-3103-and-ps4119-expansion-and-force-main/>. Conditions for PS4119 remain the same as the 2022 upgrade. Additional information including but not limited to, level controls, control setpoints, alarm setpoints, and operating logic will be discussed with the awarded firm as part of Phase One design.

- 2) QUESTION: Please confirm whether the BGJWSC has already evaluated whether the existing wet well geometry, operating volume, and control elevations at PS3103 and PS4119 can support the proposed future pumping capacities without excessive starts per hour, and whether any supporting hydraulic or operational basis data is available.**

ANSWER: The BGJWSC has not evaluated whether the existing wet well geometry, operating volume, and control elevations at PS3103 and PS4119 can support the proposed future pumping capacities without excessive starts per hour.

- 3) **QUESTION:** Please confirm whether the BGJWSC has identified anticipated future flows from planned development tributary to PS3103 and PS4119 that form the basis for the proposed station capacity increase, and whether supporting planning, hydraulic modeling, or other basis-of-design data is available. In addition, please confirm whether the proposed 8-inch and 12-inch force main sizes are based on that future flow analysis, the 2020 Master Plan, owner standards, or other conceptual planning assumptions.

ANSWER: The BGJWSC has considered potential future flows based upon submitted sewer capacity requests for development in the tributaries of the two pumping stations. Some of these capacity requests have moved forward with construction while others are still in planning. Unless a significant user request is received prior to construction of this project, the BGJWSC is comfortable with the proposed flow rates. The proposed flow rates include peaking factors in accordance with BGJWSC standard practices. Suggested force main sizing takes into account flow velocities in the force main while attempting to limit downstream impacts.

- 4) **QUESTION:** Please clarify whether the BGJWSC has established operational criteria for PS3103 and PS4119 regarding maximum allowable shutdown duration for planned tie-ins, electrical cutovers, or pump replacements, and whether data is available regarding upstream storage, bypass pumping expectations, or other operational contingency assumptions that proposers should consider.

ANSWER: Shutdown durations will be discussed with the selected proposer as part of Phase One design. The connection at PS4119 will likely need to occur at night to allow additional time for connection. Given the location of PS3103 adjacent to homes, work will need to be coordinated during the daytime hours depending on GA Ports Authority flows.

- 5) **QUESTION:** Should all teams participating in the RFP be required to include 3rd party inspections during construction?

ANSWER: All teams participating in the RFP must include 3rd party inspections during construction.

- 6) **QUESTION:** Can the BGJWSC please define the role you see the Design Manager having in this project? Is the role to serve as the true designer on the project or the overall project manager for the design team?

ANSWER: The BGJWSC expects the Design Manager to serve as the primary link between design, construction, and the owner, ensuring that design development remains within budget, on schedule, and practical from the outset. They encourage teamwork, manage potential risks, and guide the design process to meet a Guaranteed Maximum Price.

- 7) **QUESTION:** On page 10, in Section 5.3 Submission Content, the RFP asks respondents to provide information in the order listed: Cover, Table of Contents, and Transmittal Letter. Later in that same section on page 11, the RFP asks respondents to list items in the order provided in 5.1.1-5.3.7. In 5.3.1 - Transmittal Letter, the order of items is listed as transmittal letter, checklist form, and then table of contents. Could BGJWSC confirm the correct order of items for this section?

ANSWER: Please submit documents in the following order: Transmittal Letter, Checklist Form, Table of Contents.

- 8) **QUESTION:** On page 10 of the RFP, in Section 5.2 Submission Format, the RFP asks for the proposal document to have “1-inch or greater margins”. Would half-inch margins be acceptable?

ANSWER: Half-inch margins will be acceptable.

- 9) **QUESTION:** On page 10 of the RFP, in Section 5.2 Submission Format, the RFP states that “The Proposal must not exceed 45 total pages”. However, on page 2 of the Pre-Proposal Agenda document, under Proposal Form Review, it says, “Please limit the proposal to 75 total pages”. Could the BGJWSC confirm the page limit for this proposal?

ANSWER: Please limit the proposal to 75 total pages, not including BGJWSC required forms/addendums.

- 10) **QUESTION:** Per Addendum 2, resumes are limited to the Project Manager, Design Manager, Construction Principal in Charge, and Construction Manager. Per page 13 of the RFP (Section 5.3.4, item 4), these resumes should be included in Part 3. However, on page 12 of the RFP, Section 5.3.3, item 3, the RFP asks respondents to “Please submit resumes for the key team members included in the Proposer’s organizational chart” in Part 2. Could the BGJWSC confirm that resumes are limited to the four roles listed in Section 5.3.4, item 4 (Project Manager, Design Manager, Construction Principal in Charge, and Construction Manager)? If so, what information should be included for Part 2, item 3 – Personnel Experience?

ANSWER: Yes, please include experience for the following roles: Project Manager, Design Manager, Construction Principal in Charge (Site Superintendent), and Construction Manager. Please include relevant project experience that relates to force main installation/pump station upgrades for these personnel.

- 11) **QUESTION:** Please provide the existing electrical service information for PS3103 and PS4119, including service voltage, phase, available capacity, transformer information, motor control equipment, and any known deficiencies. Please also confirm whether BGJWSC anticipates any service voltage modifications as part of this project, including any required conversion or upgrade to 480V, 3-phase power.

ANSWER: The BGJWSC expects a service voltage modification for this project, which will involve converting or upgrading to 480V, 3-phase power at PS3103. The PS4119 site is currently operating on 480V, 3-phase power. Required electrical sizing should be confirmed by the selected proposer.

- 12) **QUESTION:** Please confirm the basis of the stated pump flow rates, PS3103 at 650gpm and PS4119 at 1950gpm. Please identify whether these are peak design flows, the peaking factor used, and any I&I, buildout, or tributary area assumptions used to establish these flows.

ANSWER: Please refer to Question #3 of this addendum.

- 13) **QUESTION:** The BGJWSC standards define standard duplex pump stations as 80gpm to 749gpm and standard triplex pump stations as 750gpm to 3,000gpm. Please confirm whether PS4119 is intended to be upgraded as a triplex station.

ANSWER: This will depend on construction costs to convert the station to triplex.

- 14) **QUESTION:** Please clarify whether the existing force mains serving PS3103 and PS4119 are to be abandoned in place or removed.

ANSWER: The existing force main serving PS3103 and PS4119 remains in place to allow for continued service during routine maintenance or unplanned shutdown of the new line.

- 15) **QUESTION:** Please confirm whether new flow metering is required at PS3103 and PS4119 as part of this project.

ANSWER: There should be flow metering for both stations.

- 16) **QUESTION:** Please confirm if the awarded firm will be required to take over bypass operation at PS4119 upon Phase One Notice to Proceed and if that cost should be included in the Phase One cost proposal.

ANSWER: Current bypass at PS4119 will be the responsibility of the Owner (BGJWSC), with expected removal late May to early June

- 17) **QUESTION:** Please confirm whether the BGJWSC requires continuous 24-hour on-site attendant during Phase Two construction bypass operations, or whether only remote monitored telemetry is acceptable.

Answer: During the construction bypass operations, the BGJWSC does not require a 24-hour on-site attendant. A 24-hour remote-monitored telemetry system is acceptable. When the pumps are operating, the awarded firm will have an experienced operator readily available to be on-site within an hour of notification to monitor operations, adjust pumps, make minor repairs to the system, and report problems. Bypassing will be the responsibility of the selected firm and coordinated with BGJWSC staff to which maintaining, sizing, and operation will be assumed responsibility of the Phase Two construction staffing.

- 18) **QUESTION:** please confirm if the preliminary cost estimate for Phase Two should include the overhead and profit percentages listed in “Attachment E Price Proposal”.

ANSWER: The preliminary cost estimate for Phase Two should include the overhead and profit percentages listed in the “Attachment E Price Proposal”.

- 19) **QUESTION:** Part 6 (on page 15 of the RFP) asks for the preliminary cost estimate with a form provided in attachment E. The Proposal checklist (on page 106 of the RFP) does not include Part 6. Is the Preliminary Cost Estimate only to be provided in the separately sealed envelop with the Price Proposal or is it to be included in a Part 6 tab of the proposal?

ANSWER: Please include the Preliminary Cost Estimate as part of Attachment E – Price Proposal in a sealed envelope.

- 20) **QUESTION:** How is the preliminary cost estimate going to be scored as part of the cost proposal?

ANSWER: Please provide a preliminary cost estimate for completion of the work as described in Phases One and Two. Owner understands that this number is subject to change as a result of information learned during Phase One. No evaluation point value is assigned to the Preliminary Cost Estimate, as it is intended to provide general cost estimates for the anticipated work. However, the Fee Proposal for Phase One Services has a possible point value of (10) ten points.

- 21) Please confirm if the Proposal Checklist (on page 106 of the RFP) represents the preferred document organization. It matches the detailed breakdown of sections in Section 5.3 beginning on page 11 but does not match the bulleted list in that section beginning on page 10.

ANSWER: Please use the Proposal Checklist (page 106) as it correlates to Section 5.3 page 11.

- 22) **QUESTION:** Does BGJWSC prefer to relocate the pump station discharge piping and valves above grade and demolish the existing valve vaults?

ANSWER: The costs and benefits of relocating the valves and discharge piping above grade may be considered during design.

- 23) **QUESTION:** Are flow meters required for effluent monitoring at the pump stations?

ANSWER: Please refer to Question #15 of this addendum.

- 24) **QUESTION:** Are permanent bypass pumping systems and/or permanent standby generators required at the pump stations?

ANSWER: No.

- 25) **QUESTION:** Will permitting through the Royal Oaks HOA be required for PS3103 and the associated force main?

ANSWER: There is no required permitting through the HOA. The ROWs inside the neighborhood are public and will required Glynn County ROW permitting. Project communication with the HOA will be necessary as a courtesy to the customers in that area.

- 26) **QUESTION:** Regarding PS4119, the record drawings indicate a 25' wide proposed utility easement along GA Hwy 99. Please provide the recorded easement document. It also appears that GDOT and Glynn County own a 75' wide strip along the east side of GA Hwy 99 which appears to overlap the 25' easement. Is it proposed that the 12-inch FM would be in the existing easement or within the 75' GDOT/Glynn County strip?

ANSWER: The proposed 12-inch FM alignment is preferred to be constructed in the existing easement and is subject to refinement during Phase One design.

- 27) **QUESTION:** Are any wetlands delineation documents for GA Hwy 99 when the existing FM was installed and/or improvements to GA Hwy 99 available?

ANSWER: Any wetlands delineation documents will be discussed as part of Phase One design with the awarded proposer.

- 28) **QUESTION:** Are the as-builts for the new roundabout at GA Hwy 99 and Golden Isles Parkway available?

ANSWER: This was a GDOT project, and not BGJWSC. If available, the as-builts for the new roundabout at GA Highway 99 and Golden Isles Parkway can be obtained through the Glynn County Clerk of Superior Court, which maintains land records, or the Glynn County GIS Department, which maintains records construction as-builts. You can search for and request copies online via the Georgia Superior Court Clerks' Cooperative Authority (GSCCCA) website, or in person at 701 H Street, Brunswick, GA, or Glynn County GIS, 1725 Reynolds Street, Brunswick, GA.

- 29) **QUESTION:** Are there any as-builts available for the Royal Oaks Subdivision? Water & Sewer and Paving & Drainage?

ANSWER: Record Drawings for the Royal Oaks Subdivision have been added to the Dropbox link for this project,
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/hoedlil4avpew2t61p1jn/AFFAiAcDxEbBYvke3JF6xO0?rlkey=par0vxd45chi5hibkmxnjlkg&st=s6ddsvdb&dl=0>

- 30) **QUESTION:** On page 13, paragraph 4 under Personnel Experience, it lists out Construction Principal in Charge, but on page 17, under evaluation criteria table there are points given for Project Site Superintendent and not Construction Principal in Charge. Is the Construction Principal in Charge the same as the Site Superintendent?

ANSWER: The Principal in Charge (PIC) and the Project Site Superintendent serve as the two ends of project delivery: strategic leadership and on-site execution. Since PDB relies on early contractor involvement and close teamwork to define scope and risk, these roles work more closely together than in traditional Design-Bid-Build, with the PIC leading pre-construction efforts and the Superintendent overseeing construction logistics.

- 31) **QUESTION:** Does Phase One take the project to 90% design and does Phase Two take the project to 100% with final construction documents?

ANSWER: Phase One should take the project to 30% design and Phase Two should complete the project.



All applicants under this Request for Proposal are kindly requested to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in original only.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
ADDENDUM: THREE (3)**

DATE: _____

The above Addendum is hereby acknowledged:

(NAME OF PROPOSER)

Signature

Title