

Attachment E

Addendums No. 1 & 2 to RFP #10951

COUNTY OF MONTEREY

PUBLIC WORKS, FACILITIES AND PARKS

Randell Ishii, MS, PE, TE, PTOE, Director

1441 Schilling Place, 2nd Floor

Salinas, California 93901-4527



(831) 755-4800

www.co.monterey.ca.us

April 7, 2025

ADDENDUM NO.1

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR CHUALAR WASTEWATER CONSOLIDATION

PROJECT NO. C-06-8676-110

RFP#10951

The purpose of this Addendum is to provide revisions and clarifications to RFP#10951; and to provide answers to questions. This acknowledgement signature page of Addendum No. 1 must be submitted with your proposal.

If this acknowledgement signature page is not submitted with your proposal, your entire proposal is considered non-responsive.

RECEIPT IS HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGED OF ADDENDUM NO.1, RFP # 10951, CHUALAR WASTEWATER CONSOLIDATION, PROJECT No. C-06-8676-110.

Authorized Company Signature

Printed Name

Company Name

Date

Additions/Deletions/Revisions:

1. Revise Section 2 in the Proposal or Qualifications Package Layout table, under section 8.1 Content and Layout with:

Section 2	PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK
	LICENSING AND WORK QUALIFICATIONS

2. Add the following to Section 2 Pre-Qualifications/Licensing Requirements, under section 8.1 Content and Layout:

Proposed scope of work to include project understanding and approach, work plan, and schedule.

3. Add the following to section 5.0 Scope of Work, sub-section 7 Financial Assistance Applications, on page 9.

7.3 The County is anticipating preparation and submittal of a CWSRF Financial Assistance Application for a second phase of the project – to cover costs associated with the final design and actual construction of the Selected option. The CONTRACTOR will be expected to assist with the work necessary to be completed in order to assemble and file that Application, to include all technical materials necessary to comply with the requirements for preparation and submittal. IF funds are successfully secured via that application or otherwise, the County, at its option, may elect to retain the same CONTRACTOR to provide final design, construction administration, and other support services necessary to construct the project; however, the costs associated with those second phase support services are not necessary to be delineated/included as part of this proposal.

4. Replace Attachment B – Pricing with the attached updated Attachment B

Response to Questions:

Question 1: Force main route- has any preliminary work been done to determine the best route? It looks like it could be either from the community towards Salinas Highway 101, or from the Plant, along River Road to Davis. ROW Acquisition would vary greatly.

Response 1: No, best route not yet determined, that is part of the scope for this project.

Question 2: LAFCO is working a new MSR for the CSA's – their 2006 study shows this CSA#75 working at 45 gpm, with a capacity of 60 gpm... (I might have the metric wrong, it could be MGPD- .45) Is that still the case?

Response 2: The existing WWTF is permitted for a maximum month average daily flow of 100,000 gallons per day (gpd). Averaged Flow Data from years 2005-2020 indicates an Annual Average Daily Flow (ADF) of 63,401 gpd. The Average Day Max Month Flow (MMF) during those years was 97,596 gpd with a Peak Day Flow (PDF) of 135,171 gpd.

Question 3: Section 6.0 Agreement Term: Does this agreement authorize the County to extend the scope of work to include the final design phase if County receives funding? Please confirm that the selected team is intended to provide full design support upon future scope and fee negotiation, with the caveat that the County has the right to terminate the contract and go out to RFP for future work.

Response 3: See number 3 under Additions/Deletions/Revisions section of this addendum.

Question 4: Also, is the consultant able to raise rates each year during the term of the contract without increasing the contract value if noted on our rate schedule without prior 90 day authorization?

Response 4: Yes, contractor will need to fill out the attached 10 H form (Attachment B).

Question 5: Section 11.3.1, Can you please confirm the cost proposal? It is noted to be a cost-plus fixed fee. Please confirm this is correct, or should it be a Time & Materials - Not to Exceed fee estimate?

Response 5: Correct, the cost proposal follows a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee structure.

Question 6: Is the Design consultant required to comply with any DBE requirements? If so, please provide more direction on these requirements.

Response 6: No DBE goal has been set for this project.

Question 7: Attachment D – This project is not a federal highway project and thus should not be required to comply with the 10-H process. Please confirm if this requirement can be removed from the RFP process.

Response 7: Contractor will need to use Attachment B.

Question 8: Can you please clarify if you would like to have the following sections included in the proposal:

- 1. Understanding*
- 2. Approach*
- 3. Scope of Work*
- 4. Schedule*

If so, please clarify which section of the proposal you would like them to be included. Thank you!

Response 8: See number 1 and 2 under Additions/Deletions/Revisions section of this addendum.

Question 9: when is this project expected to go to bid for contractors and what is the expected start date for construction?

Response 9: At this time, the construction start date is unknown. The County will advertise for construction bids once the design is complete.

COUNTY OF MONTEREY

PUBLIC WORKS, FACILITIES AND PARKS



Randell Ishii, MS, PE, TE, PTOE, Director

1441 Schilling Place, 2nd Floor
Salinas, California 93901-4527

(831) 755-4800
www.co.monterey.ca.us

April 16, 2025

ADDENDUM NO.2

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR CHUALAR WASTEWATER CONSOLIDATION PROJECT NO. C-06-8676-110 RFP#10951

The purpose of this Addendum is to provide revisions and clarifications to RFP#10951; and to provide answers to questions. This acknowledgement signature page of Addendum No. 2 must be submitted with your proposal.

If this acknowledgement signature page is not submitted with your proposal, your entire proposal is considered non-responsive.

RECEIPT IS HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGED OF ADDENDUM NO.2, RFP # 10951, CHUALAR WASTEWATER CONSOLIDATION, PROJECT No. C-06-8676-110.

Authorized Company Signature

Printed Name

Company Name

Date

Additions/Deletions/Revisions:

Delete third sentence, "All prices and notations must be typed or written in BLUE ink.", of "Signed Signature Page and Signed Addenda" paragraph under Section 1, Requirements, of Section 8.0, Proposal/Qualifications Package Requirements, on Page 11 of the RFP.

Add the following to section 11.1:

Only specific cost proposal for task 1 Project Report and Preliminary Design is required at this time.

Response to Questions:

Question 1: It is anticipated that responses to these questions may significantly impact the scope of work. We request a 2-week extension to the proposal deadline to allow for development of a complete and comprehensive proposal, following posting of responses to written questions.

Response 1: Yes, the county will extend the proposal deadline to May 09, 2025, 3PM. Please note that there may be some flexibility in the project schedule (between anticipated Contract date of June 2025 and the draft Project Report date of 9/30/25). CONTRACTOR should address the timeframe needed to complete all work associated with Task 1 – Project Report and Preliminary Design.

Question 2: Please provide a map of additional parcels outside the existing Chualar wastewater collection system being considered for inclusion in the Project planning work. Is planning and design for collection system infrastructure needed to serve the additional parcels included in the project?

Response 2: (R1) Additional parcels not yet identified. (R2) This is to be determined based on the Selected Construction Project Alternative.

Question 3: Is planning and design for existing collection system infrastructure rehabilitation included in the project?

Response 3: Not in Chualar except for modification as may be necessary to accommodate the Selected Construction Project Alternative.

Question 4: Please provide copies of any prior available planning documents related to the Project. This includes prior condition assessments of the Chualar wastewater collection and treatment facility, and capacity assessments of the City of Salinas's wastewater collection system.

Response 4:

(re: Chualar): We have attached a DRAFT WASTEWATER PROJECT REPORT prepared in August of 2022 – which may have useful/relevant background information regarding the Chualar wastewater collection system and a wastewater treatment facility (WWTF). This information was subsequently utilized in the preparation of the County's Grant Application; however, please understand that although this was the basis for the initial Grant submittal, the County and State Water Resources Control Board staff worked together to adjust the scope and relevant documents. The final scope, budget and schedule from the executed agreement vary significantly from the initially submitted application and plan of study. The RFP

includes a copy of the final executed agreement for use/reference in assembling the Proposal and contains vital information about the Grant.

(re: Salinas): Detailed Condition assessments for the City of Salinas' wastewater collection system are not presently available – if/as needed or necessary, CONTRACTOR is to assemble those as part of task(s) documenting existing system.

Question 5: Please provide the grant application prepared for obtaining Project funding.

Response 5: We have attached: (1) The original 'General Application' dated April 4, 2022; (2) Revised Planning Grant Application dated May 4, 2023; and (3) Plan of Study dated May 3, 2023. Please understand that the County and State Water Resources Control Board staff worked together to adjust the scope and relevant documents prior to Grant Award and the final scope, budget and schedule from the executed agreement vary significantly from the initially submitted application form and the 'Updated' plan of study which is attached. The RFP includes a copy of the final executed agreement for use/reference in assembling the Proposal and contains vital information about the grant.

Question 6: Is a condition assessment and capacity assessment of the existing City of Salinas wastewater system anticipated to be required as part of the Project? If so, please provide atlas maps and/or record drawings of existing facilities to be analyzed.

Response 6: This is to be determined based on the Selected Construction Project Alternative.

Question 7: Should the Project Report address condition or capacity for Monterey One Water conveyance and treatment facilities. If so, please provide atlas maps and record drawings of existing facilities to be analyzed.

Response 7: This is to be determined based on the Selected Construction Project Alternative.

Question 8: Should improvements to other agencies' facilities be included in the 30% design scope and CEQA document? If so, what improvements should be included?

Response 8: Possibly. This is to be determined based on the Selected Construction Project Alternative.

Question 9: If a consolidation occurs, what is the anticipated fate of the existing WWTP site? Should a phase I environmental assessment of the existing site be included in the Project scope?

Response 9: No. If necessary, that will be part of a subsequent Project for final design.

Question 10: Paragraph A.5 of the funding agreement requests the use of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) for procurement of services. Is there a DBE goal or target for the Consultant team?

Response 10: No.

Question 11: Is there an alternative which should be used as the basis for developing a proposed scope and fee for development of an environmental document (CEQA)? Alternatively, can development of scope and fee for environmental work be deferred until a preferred alternative project is selected?

Response 11: Refer to Section 5.0 Scope of Work, Task 3 – Environmental Documents on page 8 of the RFP.

Question 12: Is there an alternative which should be used as the basis for developing a proposed scope and fee for development of 30% design documents and permitting? Alternatively, can development of scope and fee for design and permitting work be delayed until a preferred alternative project is selected?

Response 12: please see response to Question 25.

Question 13: Should a geotechnical investigation be included in preparation of the 30% design package?

Response 13: If necessary to complete 30% plans and specifications (Refer to Section 5.0 Scope of Work, Task 2 – Plans and Specifications on page 8 of the RFP); however, no ground disturbing activities unless/until the Environmental review process is complete.

Question 14: Should scope for public outreach be included as part of the project?

Response 14: Public outreach is not required for Task 1 – Project Report and Preliminary Design, however, include public outreach in as part of the CEQA process.

Question 15: The allocated budget for Task 5 appears disproportionate to the scope of simply identifying required easements. In Task 5, should services be included to support easement acquisition, including boundary surveys, development of plat maps and legal descriptions, obtaining title reports, and/or easement negotiation and acquisition support services?

Response 15: No. If necessary, those services will be part of a subsequent Project for Final Design.

Question 16: The Cost Proposal in Attachment B includes alternative cost methodologies. What is the form of compensation to be used for this contract, Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee, Lump Sum, Firm Fixed Price, or Time and Materials to a not to exceed (preferred)?

Response 16: The fee structure is Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee. See Addendum No. 1.

Question 17: Can the County clarify if only the Signature page needs to be a wet/manual blue signature?

Response 17: The Signature Page and Addenda, if any, need to be signed in wet/manual blue ink. Please refer to the “Signed Signature Page and Signed Addenda” paragraph under Section 1, Requirements, of Section 8.0, Proposal/Qualifications Package Requirements, on Page 11 of the RFP.

Question 18: Can the County clarify if the Cover Letter requires a wet/manual blue signature?

Response 18: No, the Cover Letter does not require a wet/manual blue ink signature.

Question 19: Can the County clarify if the entire proposal and cost proposal needs to be in blue colored font?

Response 19: No, the entire proposal and cost proposal does not need to be in blue font.

Questions 20: Can the County clarify if only the cost proposal needs to be in blue colored font?

Response 20: No, the cost proposal does not need to be in blue font.

Question 21: “In Section 7 (Financing Assistance Applications), you only reference the CWSRF. Are you willing to consider a more comprehensive financing plan that looks into a range of financing options, contains a financing model, and includes the financing implementation assistance?”

Response 21: Yes, depending on the Cost Estimate for the Selected Construction Alternative.

Question 22: Has the County discussed the option of sending this wastewater through the City’s collection system with the City of Salinas? Did they agree in concept?

Response 22: Yes, preliminarily at time the Grant Application was filed in 2022; however, will need coordination and written agreement if the Selected Construction Alternative involves connection to/through the City’s system.

Question 23: Assuming that answer is yes, will the City of Salinas provide a copy of their collection system map and model for the designer’s use?

Response 23: Yes, when work commences.

Question 24: If collection system upgrades are required in Salinas, will this grant cover them?

Response 24: Yes, this project would need to include outlining the necessary improvements. Design and Construction would be included in the subsequent Financial Assistance Application.

Question 25: The cost of the work will vary depending on the option selected under Task 1. Should the designer assume the largest possible project when preparing a scope and fee, or will the county contract for the alternatives analysis up front, and then contract for the remaining work once that scope is better defined? We are concerned that the Geo-Tech, Env., ROW work will be greatly inflated unless this can be considered in two distinct phases; agree to a single project, then estimate further costs needed to pull permits and build it.

Response 25: As suggested, we have decided to Modify the RFP to only require a specific cost proposal for Task 1 ('Project Report and Preliminary Design') at this time. After there is an agreed upon 'Selected Construction Alternative', County (at its option) may elect to retain the same CONTRACTOR and request a subsequent cost proposal for the balance of the work/tasks outlined under Section 5.0 - SCOPE OF WORK.