

ADDENDA #1
McKinleyville CSD, Request for Qualifications
For
Highway Sewer Crossings Retrofit

Date of Issue: 01 April 2025

The following is the District's response to all questions submitted prior to the RFQ deadline of March 28, 2025, 5:00 pm.

It should be noted that, as stated in the Request for Qualifications, most of the following questions are related to the cost of the performance of design services. As stated in Section 6.3 of the RFQ

Once a tentative selection has been made by the selection committee, the District will attempt to negotiate a contract with the selected Consultant. If the negotiations are not successful, the District will terminate negotiations with the selected Consultant and will begin to negotiate with other qualified consultants in the order of their respective SOQ ranking (from highest to lowest) until an agreement is reached, or the District decides to terminate the selection process.

1. The 30% Design construction budget was completed in January 2020. Given the construction cost climate since COVID, we expect costs to come in much higher than that budget. How does the District anticipate proceeding if costs come in over the funding limit? Are there additional funds to cover the cost overages? If not, will all improvements still be designed, but bid with additive or deductive alternates?

Response: The District anticipates that the construction costs will likely be higher than the \$5.65M detailed in the Basis of Design Report, GHD, February 1, 2021. It is still the District's intent to design and construct the entire project. The District will utilize existing reserves, existing Sewer Bonds, and seek additional grant funding to cover cost increases. It is still possible that the District will request Bid Alternatives to be added to the final bid documents.

2. Will all of the preliminary data be provided for use to the selected consultant, including the 30% design AutoCAD drawings?

Response: All existing design and permitting data will be provided to the selected consultant, including the 30% design AutoCAD drawings.

3. Has any work on the Caltrans Encroachment Permit acquisition taken place?

Response: Preliminary conversations have occurred with Caltrans with regards to the encroachment permit, but no formal forms or permit applications have been submitted as these are pending the final design documents.

4. Caltrans Encroachment Permit Guidelines and Specifications language includes a requirement for full-time inspection by either a full-time Safety Engineer or a full-time Safety Representative on some projects. Have any discussions been had regarding what Caltrans will require for this project?

Response: No conversations have been conducted with Caltrans with regard to their construction inspections requirements for this project.

5. The Basis of Design Report identifies 16 properties that would be affected the project. Only temporary easements from some sites are mentioned as being needed from local owners. Have discussions with the affected property owners been discussed in terms of preliminary right-of-way and/or easement efforts? Is it known if any permanent right-of-way will need to be purchased from these properties? What is the status of the preliminary Right of Way? It is understood that final Right of Way [sic]

Response: It is anticipated that construction easements will need to be obtained for the construction of the project. The extent of these easements will depend on the final design. It is anticipated that the existing sewer Right-of-Way will be sufficient for on-going maintenance and operation of the new sewer crossings; however, this may also change based on the final design.

6. A community notification plan is indicated to be needed in the Basis of Design Report. Would the consultant be expected to complete this effort?

Response: It is anticipated that the District will develop and issue the community notification plan with input from the selected Consultant.

7. The Basis of Design Report indicates that existing flow capacities and flow through the new lines will be evaluated using the District's Sewer model during the final design process. Will the sewer model be provided to the consultant, and if so, what software is the model currently in?

Response: The District has already performed preliminary analysis of the flow through the new crossings in our existing SewerCAD model. It is anticipated that the District will perform any additional analysis required as part of the final design.

8. The Biological Resources Evaluation prepared by GHD on January 8, 2021, states that floristic surveys for special-status plants would be conducted in spring-summer of 2021. Where those surveys completed?

Response: These surveys were not conducted and will need to be conducted by the selected Consultant.

9. The RFQ shows the deadline for completing final CEQA documents as September 2025. Is this the date for final adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration by the District and obtaining the Coastal Development Permit?

Response: This is the anticipated date for the selected Contractor to complete the CEQA documents. The District will circulate and adopt the documents after this date.

10. The schedule shows the Board approving the contract on May 7, 2025. If September 2025 is the date for final adoption, the IS/MND would need to be circulated through the State Clearinghouse by early August to allow time to respond to comments. This is a pretty tight timeline. Is a time extension possible?

Response: As stated in the response to question 9, it is anticipated that circulation of the CEQA documents will begin in September/October. This District is fully aware of the extremely tight timeline for the completion of the design and construction of this process. The District has also made CalOES aware of the extremely tight timeline. This timeline is being driven by the FEMA Disaster Allocation for the grant funding. The District will work with the selected Consultant and Contractor and CalOES to extend the timeline out to the furthest extent possible.

11. Have any of the geotechnical bore holes, settlement monitoring points, vibrating wire piezometer, inclinometer or extensometers been installed? Or are all still proposed?

Response: No Geotechnical fieldwork has been performed.

12. GHD Basis of Design Report dated 2/1/21, Section 4.3 indicates geotechnical monitoring to be by contractor. Is that confirmed, or is it anticipated the Geotech subconsultant will be doing this effort?

Response: The District will work with the selected Consultant to finalize the recommended approach to be included in the Construction Bid Documents.

13. Appendix C – Geotech Memo by Crawford mentions an existing geotechnical report by LACO dated 9/11/13. Is this available for review?

Response: The District does not currently have a copy of the LACO geotechnical report. We will endeavor to obtain it and provide it to the selected Consultant if we are able to obtain it.

14. Appendix C discusses drilling methods, depths, and proposed locations. Has any of this effort been completed?

Response: As stated in the response to Question 11, no geotechnical fieldwork has been completed.

15. If start of work is not projected until May, and final environmental, geotechnical, Caltrans permitting, and right-of-way acquisition are still required to be completed, meeting a final construction date of August 2026 will be very challenging. Please verify all of these are still needed. Is there a contingency plan if this is not possible?

Response: As detailed in the response to Question 10, the District is fully aware of the challenge to completing the design, permitting and construction work prior to the current August 2026 CalOES/FEMA deadline. The District will do everything in our power to extend this deadline out, but at this point do not know if we will be successful. The Consultants should be aware that this may remain as the deadline and that the District

will expect that they expend every reasonable effort to assist in the completion of the work by that date.