Attachment F

County of Monterey
PUBLIC WORKS, FACILITIES AND PARKS
Randell Ishii, MS, PE, TE, PTOE, Director

1441 Schilling Place, 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901
O: 831 755 4800
F: 831 755 4958

January 15, 2026

ADDENDUM NO. 2

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #10964
TO PROVIDE BRIDGE DESIGN SERVICES
FOR
BORONDA ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT
County Project No. 1181
Federal Aid Project No: BRLO-5944(150)

Proposals Are Due: January 29, 2026 at 4:00 pm (PST)

The purpose of the Addendum is to provide answers to questions received to date, post project documents as reference to this RFP and extend the proposal due date.

A signed copy of **Addendum #2** must be submitted along with your original bid proposal package. If this acknowledgement signature page is not submitted with your proposal package, your entire proposal package may be deemed non-responsive. It is the CONTRACTORS responsibility to ensure all items in the Addendum are included in the original bid proposal package.

Receipt of Addendum #2 for RFP 10964 has been received and all requested information included in the original proposal package.

_____ _____
Authorized Company Signature *Printed Name*

_____ _____
Company Name *Date*

The questions received to date are the following, along with their respective responses:

1. ***Question: The RFP references that a Fee Schedule (Attachment J) be submitted in a separate sealed envelope apart from the proposer's technical proposal. However, there is no Attachment J included with the RFP or as a separate attachment on the County's solicitation website. Can the County please provide proposers with Attachment J??***
   Answer: Attachment J - Fee Schedule is a construct of the proposer. The proposer may make use of the Sample Cost Proposal in Appendix IV.
2. ***Question: Regarding Attachments A-I, are those actual attachments proposers need to fill out or are they just what the County wants proposers to label sections in their proposals as (for example, section 1 is Attachment A, section 2 is Attachment B, and so on and so forth)? If they are actual attachments proposers need to fill out, can the County please provide proposers with Attachments A-I, since they are not included with the RFP or on the County's solicitation site?***
   Answer: Content and sub-content identified in the RFP shall be labeled with the corresponding attachment.
3. ***Question: Can the County please provide proposers with a copy of the MND the County did in 1999?***
   Answer: Yes, a copy of the document will be posted with this addendum.
4. ***Question: Will the traffic technical memorandum identified in the PES be part of the scope of services or will the County address it?***
   Answer: The technical memorandum will be part of the scope of services.
5. ***Question: Will the information attached as an appendix be subject to grading if it is a continuation of another section being graded.***
   Answer: Content listed in the appendix will not be graded. However, it may help support content that will be graded.
6. ***Question: Has the bridge ever been evaluated under National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) criteria? If yes, can this documentation be made available?***
   Answer: Yes, a copy of the document will be posted with this addendum.
7. ***Question: Can the County confirm with Caltrans that a Historic Resources Evaluation Report (HRER) is not required?***
   Answer: A HRER is not required.
8. ***Question: Can the County provide a copy of the existing EIR that is mentioned in the background section of the RFP?***
   Answer: Yes, a copy of the document will be posted with this addendum
9. ***Question: To what extent is it expected that the project would rely on the existing EIR?***
   Answer: None. A new separate and independent CEQA/NEPA document is required.
10. ***Question: "Wetland Delineation and Assessment" is not changed as a required technical study in the PES, however the email from Kelso Vidal and the "Attachment A: Notes to Support the Conclusions of the PES Form" in Appendix VII seem to indicate that a delineation/assessment would be necessary. Is preparation of a wetland delineation requested as part of the scope?***
    Answer: Yes, preparation of a wetland delineation study is requested as part of the scope.
11. ***Question: Is regulatory permit acquisition being requested as part of this scope? If so, for all relevant agencies, or some subset (e.g., just NOAA & USFWS)?***
    Answer: Permit acquisition is requested as part of this scope of work. All relevant agencies will be required.
12. ***Question: Will all right-of-way appraisal and acquisition work be done by the County or a separate consulting firm such that it is excluded from the scope of work for this RFP***
    Answer: Right-of-way acquisition and appraisal services will be through another RFP.

13. ***Question: Section 7.1 requires "one (1) original hard copy, two (2) hard copies, and one (1) CD or Thumb Drive." Should the CD/Thumb Drive contain all attachments A through K, including the sealed fee proposal (Attachment J)? Or should the fee proposal only be submitted in the separate sealed envelope and not included on the electronic media?***
    Answer: The fee proposal should only be submitted in the separate sealed envelope and not included on the electronic media.
14. ***Question: Section 8.9 (Conflict of Interest Statement) is listed as Pass/Fail but is not listed as a required in Section 6.0. Should proposers include a "Conflict of Interest Statement" as part of the cover letter?***
    Answer: Conflict of Interest Statements shall be included in the proposals and attached after attachment K.
15. ***Question: Due to the request for proposal attachments and supplemental environmental information that was identified in the RFP but not provided, can the County please provide a two-week extension and all of the County attachments and environmental information in order for proposers to adequately implement the necessary requirements and scope elements into their proposals?***
    Answer: See revisions to the RFP below. Proposal Package Submittal Deadline has been delayed one week.
16. ***Question: In reference to Addendum 1, Question 2, the project understanding and project scope should be written under section 8.6.1. This section of the proposal appears to be the evaluation criteria. Is there an appropriate place in Section 6 for the project understanding to be written to ensure all bullets within section 8.6 can be addressed/ scored?***
    Answer: Project understanding and project scope should be described under section 6.5.1.
17. ***Question: Preparation of a Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER) is not checked in the Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) - can the County confirm that preparation of this document is not required?***
    Answer: See answer to question #7.

Revisions to the Request For Proposals (RFP) #10964

1. On the Cover Page **Replace** “Thursday, January 22, 2026” with “Thursday, January 29, 2026”
2. On Page 2 under Section 3.0 CALENDAR OF EVENTS **Revise** Proposal Package Submittal Deadline to January 29, 2026.
3. On Page 58 under Section Proposals are due in the Office of Public Works, Facilities and Parks By: **Replace** “Thursday, January 22, 2026” with “Thursday, January 29, 2026”

Documents posted to the County Website:

1. BOS Negative Decl Mitigations 11-04-1999
2. Supplemental Historical Evaluation Report
3. NOP Boronda EIR 11-02-2000