

**CITY OF EL SEGUNDO  
PARK PLACE EXTENSION RFP  
PROJECT NO.: ENG20-20**

**ADDENDUM NO. 1**

**DATE:** April 8, 2021

**TO:** All interested parties

The following questions have been raised regarding this RFP. The response to each question is provided here and made available to all interested parties. The information and clarification provided in this Addendum shall be considered as incorporated into the proposal for the above-referenced project. All other portions of Contract Documents and not specifically mentioned in this Addendum remain in force.

**Question 1:** Are resumes to be included for only key personnel from the organizational chart or for all supporting staff?

Answer: Only Key personnel.

**Question 2:** Are 11 x 17 fold-outs permitted for select proposal elements (e.g. project exhibits, schedule, etc.)? If so, please verify that they will count as only one page.

Answer: Yes. Count as one page, the blank back side would not be included in the sheet count.

**Question 3:** Has the City had discussions with Plains All American regarding relocation of their petroleum pipeline? If so, will Plains All American be designing relocation of their facility?

Answer: Yes. but personnel might have changed. It is assumed that all non-city utilities will do their own design, and the designer of the Park Place Extension is to suggest suitable alignment for respective utilities, coordinate and incorporate designs from other utilities. However, due to the nature of the petroleum pipeline, Consultant shall list the design of the petroleum pipeline as optional item cost.

**Question 4:** The Professional Services agreement is dated 2019 – is a newer version to be used, if so, can it be provided before the proposal is due?

Answer: The professional service agreement template is the most update.

**Question 5:** The Professional Services Agreement (PSA) and scope of work appear to be in conflict in regard to incidental & reproduction cost. PSA page 1 Item 4 states ..... *City to pay CONSULTANT ... CONSULTANT must submit a detailed ... each personnel category **and reimbursement cost** (all as set forth in Exhibit "A") ... Page 31 top of page states ... **Other Direct Cost such as mileage, incidentals and reproduction cost shall be considered as part of the rates.** The project will require multiple plan submittals (35%,65% & 100%),*

reports & etc. In addition to Railroad Protective Insurance, various permits, and plan check fees, encroachment permits. These are normal / typical direct project cost and rarely if ever included in the billing rate structure. Assuming the PSA is a Time & Materials contract we recommend an allowance for ODC's be established and CONSULTANT can charge against this allowance with supporting back-up documentation and not incorporated into the billing rate. Please confirm this is acceptable.

Answer: Yes. This is acceptable and recommended.

**Question 6:** will the City be maintaining pump station (if any is needed) outside with City's PW's staff or vendor?

Answer: The City will be maintaining any potential pump station (if any is needed.)

**Question 7:** Please confirm that the City will provide all the required Right of Entry permissions in order for CONSULTANT to conduct all the necessary Geotechnical, Survey, and Phase 2 Environmental investigations within Private Properties that are needed? Will these ROEs be provided at no cost to the Consultant? Will the City grant no fee permits for encroachment permits within their jurisdictional authority for work related to this RFP?

Answer: The consultant should account for potential Right of Entry permission cost in the reimbursable cost item. The cost is expected to be only incidental such as cost of security personnel to accompany the visit and other nominal cost for the property owners. The City will grant no fee encroachment permit within our jurisdictional authority for work related to this RFP.

**Question 8:** What level of public outreach does the City envision for the selected consulting firm to provide? This has a wide range of work that can either be extensive or minimal. Providing guidance will assist us in properly scoping and pricing the RFP.

Answer: Consultant should price conservatively based on their experience in similar project.

**Question 9:** Is there a conflict of interest if the Prime Consultant or any of their sub-consultants are working / hold a contract with any of the stakeholders – UPRR – BNSF – Developers?

Answer: The likelihood of a prime consultant or any of the subs are working with any of the stakeholders is very high, given the number and size of the stakeholders and consultants involved. This has to be worked out with the City Attorney's office after the submittal and it depends on the nature and specifics of the contract.

**Question 10:** Haul Routes – repair / repave: will this be a project cost or be done as a separate City CIP project after completion of project?

Answer: This should be part of the project cost.

**Question 11:** Task 3.3-7: Will property owners be responsible to relocate existing on-site monitoring wells or will this work be performed by the CONSULTANT as part of the project? Which environmental wells will require relocation?

Answer: It is assumed that the property owners will be responsible to relocate existing on-site monitoring wells. However, the Consultant shall include the relocation of monitoring wells as an optional item cost. The information of the wells are in the EIR.