May 23, 2018

SUBJECT: RFP 18-031: Electrical Lighting Design Services for Various Park Locations

The following changes/clarifications have made to the above Request for Proposal (RFP):

1. QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

QUESTION #1:
On page A1-1 under Pacific Electrical Bike Trail, it mentions that “irrigation controllers with electrical connection points are on site.” Are we to understand that the electrical meter pedestals powering these irrigation controllers may be used to power the new lights along the trails? Per the Attachment5, Exhibit 1, it does not identify the locations of the irrigation controllers or electric meter pedestals. Please confirm intent of electrical connections and identify on exhibit.

ANSWER:
On-site electrical connections for Pacific Electric Bike Trail irrigation controllers are located at McFadden and Edinger. The intent of identifying the locations of electrical services in the description or exhibit is to inform proposers that there are electrical meters on site. Please utilize discretion per your proposal in this regard.

QUESTION #2:
For Saddleback View Park, the irrigation controller and electric meter pedestal is defined and shown on Attachment 5, Exhibits 4 & 4. Are we to understand that the electrical meter pedestal powering this irrigation controller may be used to power the new lights in the park? Please confirm intent.

ANSWER:
Please utilize discretion per your proposal in this regard.
QUESTION #3:
For Morrison Park, there is an existing meter pedestal feeding the site. However, the RFP is asking for a newly centralized electrical system centralized. Are we to remove design for the existing meter pedestal to be removed and a new one installed? The existing meter pedestal looks like it is filled up and it is indeed very old. Or are you anticipating that a second meter be installed for the new lighting to be installed? If the latter is the case, SCE will not allow 2 points of service to the same site. Please confirm intent.

ANSWER:
Intent is to combine into one meter pedestal to serve all the lights in the park.

QUESTION #4:
Under Consultants Responsibilities, you identify as deliverables, Preliminary, 30%, and then 85%/100% plans. With this sort of electrical project, we can easily go from Preliminary straight to 85%/100%. Would this be acceptable? It will be less expensive to eliminate the 30% deliverable.

ANSWER:
Deliverables at 30% is required.

QUESTION #5:
Also, under the same section as above, you refer to plans being provided in Micro Station format. This is an older software technique that we used to use when design waste water, sewage treatment sites and so forth. Is Auto CAD now as acceptable format of software?

ANSWER:
No.

QUESTION #6:
Also, under the same section as above, you refer to Technical Specifications being written in Word. However, all technical specifications are clearly called out on electrical plans. Specifications such as luminaires, conduit type, wire type, pull boxes, concrete, trenching, meter pedestals and etcetera. Once again, this step can be eliminated. Please let us know if this approach is acceptable.

ANSWER:
The consultant shall use the City’s standard boilerplate special provisions. All additional technical specifications shall be added to the electrical section of the boilerplate section, not as a plan.

QUESTION #7:
Under Payment and Invoicing, you identify that invoicing shall be billed on a T&M basis. However, this sort of work is typically billed on a fixed fee basis. Is this negotiable?

ANSWER:
No. Time and Material are required.
QUESTION #8:
Under Exhibit B (Compensation), it refers to Fee Proposal, Contingency and NTE amount. Once again, this is more easily captured under a Fixed Fee basis. Please clarify if this is acceptable.

ANSWER:
Please see response provided in Question #7.

If you should have any questions regarding this project, please contact me at (714) 647-5632.

Sincerely,

Kenny Nguyen, P.E.
Senior Civil Engineer