



CITY OF ARVIN

ADDENDUM NUMBER ONE

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ) FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR FRANKLIN STREET REHABILITATION PROJECT

RFQ NUMBER: CD20-01

CITY PROJECT NUMBER: 2004

ADDENDUM ISSUE DATE: DECEMBER 15, 2020



ADDENDUM No. 1

This addendum is hereby issued to all interested parties for the **REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR FRANKLIN STREET REHABILITATION PROJECT**. This document and the information contained herein is provided as a supplement to the original RFQ documents and previous addenda (if any), and modifies those documents as described herein. Any firm interested in supplying a response to this proposal must acknowledge the receipt of this and any other addenda. Failure to do so may subject any submission to being deemed incomplete and or non-responsive at the discretion of the City of Arvin.

REVISIONS TO RFQ PACKAGE:

1. **SUBMITTAL DUE DATE:** The submittal due date shall be extended. The new submittal due date shall be **January 14, 2020 at 4:30 p.m.** The method of submittal and all other submittal requirements shall remain unchanged as shown in the RFQ documents.
2. **PRE-PROPOSAL RFI DEADLINE:** Please note that the deadline for all pre-proposal RFIs shall be set as **January 6, 2020 at 5:00 p.m.** Prospective bidders must provide requests for interpretations and information to the City Engineer (email only) no later than this date and time to allow for a reasonable amount of time to review and to provide a response. Any such requests received after this deadline are subject to not be responded to.
3. **RFQ SCHEDULE:** The RFQ schedule shall be modified as shown below.

Activity	Date
RFQ issued	October 30, 2020
Final questions due from potential firms	December 3, 2020 January 6, 2020
Grantee responses to questions and/or addenda issuance	December 10, 2020 January 8, 2020
Proposal Submission Deadline	December 17, 2020 – 4:30 p.m. January 14, 2020 – 4:30 p.m.
Proposed Shortlist Selection Date*	December 30, 2020 January 29, 2020
Proposed Interviews and Contract Discussions*	January 21, 2021 February 19, 2021

4. **ADDENDA ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:** An acknowledgement form is provided as an attachment, and shall be required to be submitted by any parties responding to this RFQ. Failure to do so may subject any submission to being deemed incomplete and or non-responsive at the discretion of the City of Arvin. This form shall not count towards the page limit as outlined in the RFQ documents.

ADDENDUM No. 1

CONTRACTOR QUESTIONS:

The following questions (requests for interpretation) have been provided in writing by interested parties. Such questions may have been edited for clarification purposes only. In some cases, multiple firms may have asked the same question in which case the questions have been combined such that only one response is necessary. The response to these questions should not be construed as a formal modification to the RFQ documents unless otherwise noted. They are intended to clarify information contained therein only to aide each firm in developing their bid for the project.

Q1: Can you please clarify, is there an overlay or just FDR on the outside 12'?

A1: *The intention is for the entire approximate 65 foot width of Franklin Street to be treated with an FDR methodology. This was the methodology that was submitted to HUD and is what was approved through the CDBG application process. This should not be construed to mean that other methodologies will not be allowed if recommended by the successful consultant. However, such a change shall constitute a formal amendment that must be approved by HUD, and would only be possible post award to the successful consultant. Any such modification to the project plan must be approximately the same cost or less expensive as an FDR methodology.*

Q2: Our understanding is that the drainage study is primarily to determine flow paths and possibly quantities within our area of work. Any flow entering or exiting the project area would be taken from the City's master plan?

A2: *As outlined by the RFQ on page 7, the plan is for a basic analysis to be provided to quantify the amount of runoff generated within the project limits, and is not intended to be a city wide drainage analysis. However, acknowledgement should be shown in the study showing where runoff will be entering the project site and where the flow paths lead from the project site. These flow paths should also be shown in some form within the design drawings and annotations should be added to alert the contractor of the need to plan activities around the potential for inundation of the job site if work occurs during the traditional rainy season.*

Q3: Schedule – we feel that perhaps 4 weeks is not quite enough time to prepare the 50% submittal, especially if that includes time to perform survey first. Would the City be open to a schedule of 6-4-2 weeks each instead of 4-4-4, both with a total of 12 weeks?

A3: *The City is understanding that front end survey can sometimes consume the first two weeks or so of any project. The concern is valid, and rather than stick to a rigid 12 week time frame to get through the entire design, it shall be allowable to assume a 6-4-4 schedule model.*

Q4: Would the City accept a statement about our financial health and capabilities in lieu of a balance sheet?

A4: *It is understood that private companies have reservations and policies in place against providing specific financial information as requested in the RFQ. Please note that the rating matrix shown on page 21 of the RFQ does not specifically assign points to the financial integrity of a firm, and the request for the information is merely to give the City a general introduction to each responding firm. As such, a statement as mentioned in lieu of a "balance sheet" will not be a reason to reject any submittal as being non-responsive.*

ADDENDUM No. 1

Q5: We have noted some language, particularly item 5.3 of the sample contract that makes reference to a performance bond. This appears to be contractor language, will the City be requiring consultants to provide a performance bond?

A5: The sample contract is an example of an agreement traditionally used between the city and a contractor for capital improvements. The final form of the contract will likely be modified to exclude any such item that is exclusively applicable to a construction contract. As such, a performance bond will not be required of the successful consultant(s) as a part of the services rendered in response to this RFQ.

Q6: Would the City be open to electronic submission of the SOQ?

A6: No. Submissions must be submitted in a physical sealed envelope as outlined in the RFQ documents.

Q7: Item C on page 22, we wanted to confirm that we will not be including a cost proposal (sealed or otherwise, with the SOQ).

A7: Correct. A cost proposal will be requested of the selected firm, once identified through the RFQ process.

Q8: We noticed on the striping plan that in ground flashing lights are proposed. Is this part of the grant also and part of the work that will be completed? Some of the jurisdictions we work with have been going with sign mounted flashing beacons in lieu of in ground lights. It may be a requirement if part of the grant application, if so that will work fine. If there is some flexibility, we might want to suggest having a conversation of some alternative treatments that may be a little less maintenance.

A8: The inclusion of the in-ground flashers was reported to the granting agency as an item that the city desired to install. However, in the time since the application was submitted to HUD in 2018, the City of Arvin has developed some reservations against the use of in-ground beacons due to negative feedback received by the maintenance department on devices already installed within the city; likely a cause for other jurisdictions to go with sign mounted beacons. For this reason, the City Engineer will be supportive of a move away from the in-ground beacons, and will communicate the change to HUD during the design phase of the project. Approval cannot be guaranteed however, and the respondents to this RFQ should assume that in-ground beacons will be required for the purposes of submitting a cost proposal once the top firm is identified.

Q9: What is the expected completion date for the design and the construction?

A9: As discussed in question 3, a total of 14 weeks shall be allowed for the design or the project. Considering the uncertainty of when a formal agreement will be signed, no specific date can be given at this time. There is even more certainty surrounding a construction contract due to the intricacies and unknowns of the bidding process.

As shown on page 14 of the RFQ, the construction phase is expected to take upwards of 60 working days to complete. However, this timeframe is subject to change based on the professional judgement of the consultant based on projects of similar scope and size. The City does have a decent amount of time to construct this project assuming that a construction

ADDENDUM No. 1

agreement can be executed in a reasonable amount of time, but does not want to provide an inordinate amount of time to the contractor such that they could become complacent regarding the timely completion of this project. The City will have an open dialogue with the consultant on this topic post-award.

Q10: The RFQ mentions a 90 day “break-in period” for new landscaping before the City will accept the landscaping improvements, but there is also mention of the need to complete the project in 60 days. How will this work?

A10: See the response to question 10 above. Logistics regarding the timely completion of the project are negotiable based on the professional judgement of the consultant provided everything is completed within the ultimate timeline of the CDBG grant. It may be necessary to keep the project “open” while this 90 day period is pending. This can ultimately be discussed in detail in the project specifications.

NOTE: As outlined in this addendum, any response to this RFQ must include the “ADDENDUM ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM”. Failure to do so may result in a bid being determined to be non-responsive, and subject to disqualification.

Approved by: _____


Adam Ojeda, P.E.
City Engineer

_____ 12/15/20

Date