

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

DECEMBER 2, 2009

ADDENDUM NO. 1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES
STABILIZATION OF MEMORIAL PARK SLOPE

This Addendum forms a part of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the above referenced project and makes clarification and/or correction to the items as noted below. Portions of the RFP, not specifically mentioned in the Addendum, remain in force. All subcontractors affected shall be fully advised of these changes, deletions, and additions.

1. RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION (RFI)

B&E Engineers
Cornerstone Studios
Hall & Foreman, Inc.

Q1. Can Standard Form (SF) 330 be used in lieu of SF 255?

A1. *The RFP is hereby revised as follows: Wherever "SF 255" appears in the RFP, replaced it with "SF 330".*

GeoDesign, Inc.

Q1. Regarding Section 4.5 of the RFP; are resumes AND SF 255 required, or just SF 255[?]

A1. *The SF 330 resumes are sufficient.*

Q2. Can you provide clarification regarding Sections 3.8 and 3.9 regarding the requirements for this submittal? Are we supposed to respond in our proposal to these sections and omit providing a specific cost; or will the City request separate proposals at a later time for these services?

A2. *For the purpose of this RFP, Sections 3.8 and 3.9 are for your information and no responses pertaining to these two sections are required at this time. The City will request separate proposals for these services at a later time.*

Q3. Are there limitations on what type of attachments can be included?

A3. *The response to the RFP should be short and to the point pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.6 of the RFP. The attachments should be limited to the provisions of the Standard Form (SF) 330.*

Q4. Has an order of magnitude cost for the construction been established?

A4. *No.*

Q5. Can the city provide plans of the existing park and slope, specifically as-built grading plans for the slope?

A5. *See attached Caltrans Relinquishment Request No. 1011 and As-Built plans for Foothill Boulevard and La Cañada Boulevard Separation. The City/Selected Consultant will be responsible for researching and providing the available documents relevant to the project pursuant to the provisions of Section 3.11 of the RFP.*

Q6. Have any prior geotechnical investigations been performed and if so, is that information available for our use in developing our proposal?

A6. *The City is not aware of any prior geotechnical investigations.*

Hall & Foreman, Inc.

Q1. How do you define tree management and assessment? For example this could include structural integrity of specific trees, aesthetic evaluation and appropriateness of location.

A1. *Under Section 3.6 of the RFP, tree management and assessment involves the preservation of the existing trees on the slope with emphasis on the City's five (5) protected tree species: Oaks, Sycamores, Deodar Cedars, Chinese Elm, and California Pepper. As the slope is part of the park, the goal is to maintain/enhance the slope relative to the natural characteristic of the park. To the extent practicable, the design scheme for the reconstruction of the slope and trail should include measures to protect and minimize the impact to the existing trees.*

Provide a separate scope of work and cost for the evaluation of the health and/or stability of the affected trees by a certified licensed arborist.

Q2. As this property is actually school owned will there be a DSA/ADA compliance component to the project?

A2. *To the extent practicable, ADA compliance is required regardless of the ownership of the property. As for any DSA requirements, this is a task to be included in the proposed scope of work to verify with the La Cañada Unified School District (LCUSD) if the DSA needs to be involved. According to the LCUSD, the DSA only gets involved with structural, life, and safety type construction.*

Q3. Will the park play area be affected by the slope repair?

A3. *This area, as well as the entire park, shall remain open and operational at all times during construction. The design should incorporate measures to protect the play area. There is no budget for replacement of the park play equipment.*

Q4. Will an easement be necessary for the maintenance of the slope?

A4. *No. The City is already responsible for maintaining the slope.*

Q5. Will a right of entry suffice for a construction easement?

A5. *No construction easement is required for the construction of the slope itself provided the construction limits do not encroach into the LCUSD and/or Caltrans ROW. The type of ROW document required needs to be verified with the LCUSD and/or Caltrans. It may be as simple as a right of entry or as complex as a temporary construction easement. This task shall be included in the proposed scope of work for verification with LCUSD and/or Caltrans.*

Q6. Does this project encroach the Caltrans R/W?

A6. *See attached Caltrans Relinquishment Request No. 1011 and As-Built plans for Foothill Boulevard and La Cañada Boulevard Separation. This task shall be included in the proposed scope of work for verification with Caltrans.*

Q7. Is the driveway approach the only improvements in La Cañada Blvd R/W?

A7. *Yes, the existing driveway approach is to be relocated northerly to line up with the existing decomposed granite path.*

VA Consulting, Inc.

Q1. Is engineering survey for the entire Memorial Park site required?

A1. *Pursuant to the third bullet item in Section 3.4 of the RFP, provide a separate scope of work and cost for performing an engineering survey of the entire Memorial Park site for consideration.*

Q2. Provide clarification regarding responses for Sections 3.8 and 3.9 of the RFP.

A2. *See Response A2 under GeoDesign, Inc.*

2. Add the following to the scope of work in Section 3.1 of the RFP: Street light system (four lightpoles minimum) along the base of the slope.
3. Please indicate receipt of Addendum No. 1 in your response to the Request for Proposals. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RENDER YOUR BID NON-RESPONSIVE.

Approved:



Ying Kwan, P.E.
City Engineer

~~DECEMBER 1, 2009~~
DECEMBER 2, 2009

Date