



Highway 17 Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing Project
TLG 19-818-0803
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
ADDENDUM No. 1
Posted December 22, 2020

The following modifications and clarifications are hereby made to the Request for Proposals – Released December 4, 2020. These modifications and clarifications are made based on questions received regarding the RFP as follows:

1. Please consider extending the proposal deadline to January 14th due to the holidays.

The proposal submittal deadline is hereby extended to 1:00 PM January 14, 2021.

The revised milestone schedule for the RFP is as follows:

MILESTONE	ORIGINAL	REVISED (12-22-20)
Release of Request for Proposals	December 4, 2020	December 4, 2020
Pre-proposal Meeting	December 17, 2020	December 17, 2020
Question Cut-Off (before 3:00 PM)	December 22, 2020	December 22, 2020
Proposals Due (via e-mail before 1:00 PM)	January 7, 2021	January 14, 2021
Proposal Hard Copies - postmarked by		January 14, 2021
Proposal Review and Evaluation	January 8 – 29, 2021	January 15 – 29, 2021
Consultant Oral Interviews/Presentations	February 9-10, 2021	February 9-10, 2021
Negotiations with Top Ranked Consultant	February 15-26, 2021	February 15-26, 2021
Town Manager Considers Contract Award	March 2021	March 2021
Notice to Proceed	April 1, 2021	April 1, 2021

2. Please consider deleting the requirement for hard copies due to COVID restrictions.

The Town is requesting hard copies be submitted to the Town and to be postmarked by January 14th. If the Proposer is not able to provide the hard copies to the Town, please indicate this in the Proposal and the Town will make alternate arrangements.

3. Please clarify how many references per resume are required.

There is no specific requirement for the number of references per resume. Proposers should include references that are relevant to the work the team member would be providing on this project.

4. Please clarify if the evaluation of references (10 points) refers to those references provided in the Consultant Information, Qualifications and Experience section.

Yes the evaluation of references refers to those included in Proposal Requirements #3 - Consultant Information, Qualifications and Experiences section of the RFP, as well as the references provided in # 4 -Organization and Approach – Item #3 – References for all key team members.

5. Does the City have a fully executed PID Co-Op with Caltrans?

a. If not, what is the anticipated date of approval?

The Town does not have a PID Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans, and does not have an anticipated date of approval. Please refer to Task A.4 Stakeholder Coordination and Project Permits – Caltrans Coordination. The Town is looking for the consultant to assist the Town in the development of the necessary Cooperative Agreements with Caltrans.

6. Regarding the “Financial Interest” section of the RFP:

a. Please clarify “disclose any *relationship* with any construction company that might submit a bid on the construction Project”

b. We do not know which construction companies may bid the Project; please clarify.

c. Is this a requirement for subs as well as the Prime?

These questions appear to be regarding the Conflict of Interest Requirements and required Statement included in the RFP. Proposers are to review the Conflict of Interest Requirements contained in the RFP and provide any disclosures for the Consultants and subconsultants that the Proposers deem appropriate. If the Proposer does have a financial interest or relationship with a construction company that the Proposer believes may submit a bid on the construction of the project, this should be disclosed. If the Proposer does not have any indication of what construction companies may submit a bid on the project, a statement to that fact would be sufficient to include in the Proposal.

7. Litigation – please clarify what is meant by “prior project”.

a. Is this a requirement for subs as well as the Prime?

Prior project would mean any project completed by the prime consultant prior to the issuance of this RFP. This is a requirement for the prime consultant only.

8. Cost Proposal (RFP Pg. 20): Please consider Phase 1 compensation as “cost per unit of work basis” instead of “lump sum” for the initial cost proposal (re: Caltrans review/approval schedules are beyond the control of the consultant and may become protracted for key milestones, resulting in delayed compensation).

The Town has selected the lump sum method of payment as the most appropriate for the initial cost proposal for Phase I. Proposers are to submit proposals based on this method of payment for Phase I, and on cost per unit of work for Phase II.

9. Task B.2 Construction Support Services (RFP Pg. 15): Consultant services for geotechnical, structural inspection, construction surveying, materials testing and inspection services during construction are not typical for professional A&E services. Please consider hiring an independent contractor to provide these referenced services during Project construction.

Noted. For the purpose of the proposal, Proposers may include in their proposal for Task B, those services for which the Proposer believes they can provide to the Town during the construction of the project. The final scope of services for Task B would be negotiated and amended into the contract at a later date when construction funding for the project has been secured.