August 31, 2017

ADDENDUM THREE

SUBJECT: RFP NO. 16-110: WELL 29 REHABILITATION- ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

QUESTION: RFP has several references to “on-call” contract. I assume this is not applicable to the Well 29 project?

ANSWER: Any references to “on call” contract shall are not applicable to this request for proposal.

QUESTION: Task 2 in Scope of Work has conflicting information on the number of potholes required. Can you clarify if you are requesting 10 or 12 potholes?

ANSWER: The number of potholes shall be sufficient to determine any underground utilities and or structures that might be in conflict with the new design.

QUESTION: How many geotechnical borings are anticipated? We would recommend one boring on site and possibly one in 1st or Flower.

ANSWER: It’s the sole responsibility of the designer to determine the number of borings required for this project size and type, but no less than three borings shall be made.

QUESTION: We assume City will take the lead on processing building permit and our scope would include responding to building dept. comments. Is that a correct assumption?

ANSWER: The City will take the lead on getting the building and any of the approvals. It is anticipated that this project will need approval by the City’s Planning Commission for architectural. But, it is the consultant responsibility to comply with all standards and regulations as determined by the City to fulfill and to obtain the necessary permits such as: building, electrical, mechanical, plumbing, etc.
QUESTION:
Does City intend to prepare one bid package for all proposed improvements?

ANSWER:
Yes, the City will prepare a bid package of the proposed improvements and due a public invitation for bids for construction.

QUESTION:
For purposes of preparing our scope and fee, should we assume City would like to replace the existing pump, motor, mechanical and electrical equipment?

ANSWER:
Yes, the City’s intent is to replace all the above items listed. In addition, the City would like the consultant to prepare a well assessment recommendation as part of the proposal for all of the below surface equipment in the well hole.

QUESTION:
Item 4 in Task 6 mentions optional storm drain improvements. Can City provide us with as-built to show location of nearest storm drain?

ANSWER:
Yes, the City has as-built plans and will be provided for the selected consultant or you can visit our City records office to review storm water infrastructure plans.

QUESTION:
Alternative 3 shows a new driveway with access on 1st street and it appears a bus turnout is proposed, widening the street at this location. It’s not clear if scope of this project includes design of this bus turnout. Can you clarify you intent?

ANSWER:
Yes, the design should include a bus turnout and a bus stop hut (City of Santa Ana) as part of this proposal.

QUESTION:
Appendix of RFP has Attachments 3-1, 3-2 and 3-3 which are titled “Constructability Review.” Is this a typo?

ANSWER:
Yes, the title “CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW” it’s not part of attachments:
Attachment 3-1 Non-Collusion Affidavit, page A3-1
Attachment 3-2 Non-Lobbying Certification, page A3-2
Attachment 3-3 Non- Discrimination Certification, page A3-3
QUESTION:
From the Tech. Memo prepared by Michael Baker, it appears that Well 29 utilized a salt system to generate chlorination for the well (prior to the car accident which took out the chlorine room). The Memo further goes on to say that the system will be replaced in-kind. However, the Memo does not go into detail on the system. Can you provide a brief clarification on the system that was in place (i.e. basic direct-injection tablet chlorinator or more elaborate salt-brine-hypochlorite storage system)?

ANSWER:
The water treatment (sodium hypochlorite) will be done at the new (under construction) Walnut Pump station located within an 800ft radius of this well site. Plans and specifications will become available to the selected consultant (if necessary).

QUESTION:
We visited the site the other day and notice that the chlorine building and chlorine equipment are still missing from the site. The well also did not appear to be running. Is it safe to assume that the well will be shut down until the design is complete and construction is finished? Or does the City plan to make the well operational in the near future?

ANSWER:
Well 29 has been shut down and it will not be put back in service until the design and the construction improvements are completed. This well does feed the Walnut Pump Station currently under construction.

QUESTION:
The Tech Memo mentions an existing storm drain located in 1st St. From our site visit, we were unable to verify its location (manhole markings were not visible enough from sidewalk). However, we noticed a manhole located in between the 1st and 2nd lanes of the eastbound side of 1st St. This manhole also appears to line up with a manhole located in the intersection of Flower and 1st St. Is this the correct location of the storm drain mentioned in the Tech Memo? If so, this would make connecting a waste line much easier.

ANSWER:
Existing Plans for existing storm water infrastructure within the vicinity will become available to the selected consultant or you can visit our City records office to review storm water infrastructure plans.

QUESTION:
Does the City have a particular schedule in mind for completion of design? That is, are there any factors driving the schedule (other than bringing the well back online)?

ANSWER:
At this point the City would like to bring this well back to service but, no other key factors are driving the design and construction schedules.

QUESTION:
For the Tennis Court relocation, will this be a part of the Construction Scope (i.e. Plans) or does the City plan on relocating the Tennis Court separately?

ANSWER:
The tennis court relocation design and construction scope of work are part this proposal.

QUESTION:
Task 12, Part d. “...forty (20) hours...”. Is it forty or twenty hours?
ANSWER:
Page A1-7; Task 12. Construction Phase Services bullet (d) shall read as follows:
Assist the City with start-up of the facility upon commissioning of the well into operation. Assume a total of forty (40) hours for the purpose of this proposal.

QUESTION:
Task 2, Part 2 states “...a maximum of twelve (10) potholes...”

ANSWER:
It’s the sole responsibility of the designer to determine the number of borings required for this project size and type, but no less than three borings shall be made.

ADDITIONS:
On Page A1-3, 2nd paragraph, ADD
It is the responsibility of the consultant to obtain an approved traffic control plan for any of the work related to potholing and or field investigations needing traffic control in the City’s public right-of-way. The traffic control plan needs to be approved by the City’s Public Works Department prior to commencement of work. The cost for the preparation, and the traffic control shall be borne by the consultant.

FOR THE CITY OF SANTA ANA

Edwin “William” Galvez, P.E.
City Engineer