

ADDENDUM 01
August 28, 2024
Request for Proposal
For
Geotechnical Services for Carmichael Park for
Carmichael Recreation and Park Measure G General Obligation Bond
Program
RFP #2023-08-2024-01

To: ALL HOLDERS OF RFP FOR THE GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES FOR THE ABOVE-REFERENCED RFP.

This Addendum forms a part of the RFP for the Geotechnical Services and modifies the original Documents.

This Addendum consists of Addendum Item 1.01 which provide additional information for the RFP. All prospective bidders for the above-referenced project are to be aware of the following changes, additions, and/or clarifications, and they are bound by all conditions set forth therein.

Item No.	Bid Document Sheet	Description of Change or Clarification
1.01	Questions	Answers to questions regarding the RFP for clarification

All other parts of RFP #2023-08-2024-01, including its attachments, forms, certifications, etc., remain the same.

Item 1.01 - Questions

Proposer #1 Questions:

1. Under “Commercial General Liability and/or Commercial Auto Liability” on pg. 17 of the RFP under SUBCONTRACTORS it states that the “Consultant shall be responsible for the acts and omissions of all its subcontractors and additional insured endorsements as provided by Consultant’s subcontractor.” Is it the District’s intention for any lower-tier subcontractor hired by the Consultant to also carry the same insurance policies and limits as required of the Consultant? Or is the District open to accepting lower insurance limits and/or insurance policies as applicable to an individual subcontractor’s scope of work and trade?
Response: Without knowing the services will be subcontracted; it is difficult to consider lower limits. This could be further discussed when negotiating the contract.
2. The indemnity provision in the RFP does not comply with California Civil Code section 2782.8 and requires an up-front duty to defend which is not insurable for professional liability claims. Will the District consider revising this provision so that it is compliant with California Civil Code?
Response: Indemnity terms specific to professional services can be further discussed when negotiating the contract.

Proposer #2 Questions:

1. Will down-hole percolation testing, or double-ring infiltration testing be needed for the new irrigation and drainage system associated with the La Sierra Community Center?

Response: No, neither will be necessary.

2. Is a Geologic Hazards Study needed for all four locations?

Response: No

3. Is CRPD open to more than the specified borings per park site as shown in Exhibit A?

Response: No

4. To help save CRPD some cost, could cuttings be neatly dispersed on-site in landscaped areas near the locations of the borings?

Response: Yes, that's acceptable.

5. Would CRPD like to see a not-to-exceed fee per site (4 separate fees) or one fee for all 4 sites combined?

Response: Please provide a not-to-exceed per site (4 separate fees).

6. Will notice to proceed be provided for all four sites at one time? Can the field operations be performed in conjunction with each other, or should we budget for them to be performed at separate times?

Response: The notice to proceed will be provided at one time. The field operations can be in conjunction with each other, but you can budget them at separate times assuming it may not align.

7. A topographic survey is referenced within Proposal Evaluation Criteria. Does CRPD want geotechnical services to include a topographic survey for each site?

Response: No, this has been corrected.

8. Does CRPD expect the Fee Proposal on page 24 to be included in the proposal, or does a fee table included in the proposal suffice?

Response: Fee table included will suffice.

9. What is the estimated construction cost for this project?

Response: Estimated Construction costs are:

- o Carmichael Park \$1,420,000
- o La Sierra Community Park \$3,216,000
- o Cardinal Oaks Park \$1,404,000
- o Glancy Oaks Park \$374,000

10. Is the District planning to award all four project sites to a single firm?

Response: Yes.