



**Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District  
Chromium 6 Mitigation Project  
Addendum No. 2  
November 3, 2016**

Consultant is advised that the requirements of the District's Request for Proposals for the Chromium-6 Mitigation Project are modified in the following manner and the following manner only. Responses to questions below are fully incorporated into the RFP by reference hereon. All other requirements of the RFP remain unchanged.

*Question: At pages 9 & 12 re reservoirs, no mention made of two reservoirs, that is, the proposed at the Districts yard?*

**Answer:** Consultants are referred to Task 2 Preliminary Design Report, Item 4. The Consultant shall determine whether it is in the Districts best interests to erect one or two reservoirs. The PDR will determine the final reservoir configuration(s). Final design includes the design of 5.0 MG of storage whether it be one or two reservoirs. Consultants shall propose accordingly.

*Question: No mention of re-equipping wells – not in scope?*

**Answer:** Consultants are advised that all work identified in the Project Description is included in the Scope of Work. The dairy wells (4) will all be required to be re-equipped for the installation of vertical turbine pump and motors. Two of the existing wells are currently equipped with submersible pump and motor assemblies and the remaining two wells are not currently equipped. Tasks 6 and 7 of the project Scope of Work are revised to include preliminary pump and motor design and final well equipping design, respectively, by reference hereon.

*Question: At page 13 mods to both booster stations indicated, Meaning?*

**Answer:** For clarification, the booster station at the Meadowbrook Dairy Site is a new installation. A second new booster station will be required along the pipeline near the Wells 2 and 5 site. The exact location will be determined in the project PDR by the Consultant. Booster modifications include only the booster station at the Wells 10, 11 and 12 site. Modifications will be primarily to yard piping to collect the blended water for pumping into the distribution system.

*Question: Seems to be no mention of booster station review/sizing/layout etc. at the Preliminary Design Report. As intended?*

Answer: Preliminary booster design/sizing/layout is included in Task 6, Item 2. Consultants may submit preliminary information ahead of the 50% submittal to ensure that he/she is meeting the Districts intent and requirements.

*Question: It was mentioned that funds from Edison would be available for upsizing the pipeline size. Is the diameter to be dictated by Edison or will Edison provide the additional flows that they need in order to run the hydraulics for the initial preliminary design stage?*

Answer: Consultants are advised that energy efficiency should be considered in all aspects of the project. Edison provides rebates for energy savings projects; however, Edison has not been contacted or committed any funding to this project. Consultant's hydraulics shall be based on the needs of the project only.

*Question: It states that Tom Dodson will handle the environmental permits. To what extent are the remaining permits handled? Will the District be submitting plans for approval or will the Consultant be required to do the coordination?*

Answer: Tom Dodson and Associates are engaged as the Environmental Consultant for the project. Their efforts will include CEQA, NEPA, CDFW and Army Corps of Engineers depending on the final pipeline alignments. Consultant shall identify any further permitting needs and include the coordination in his/her proposal.

*Question: I did not see any mention of utility potholing that should be included. For the amount of piping anticipated, a significant amount of potholing (80-100) could be required. This would add a significant cost to the design project costs. Can the District provide a budget number of potholes (similar to what was done for the geotechnical borings) that should be accounted in the cost? This can be done on an as-needed basis such that 80 potholes budgeted, but the money will only be billed on the actual potholes performed.*

Answer: Potholing is not included in the Scope of Work. Potholing, if required, will only be performed in conjunction with the final approved pipeline alignment. For purposes of Consultant's proposal, no potholing will be included. Potholing if needed will be performed by District forces or under a separate contract. Consultant, as part of the pipeline design, will advise the District as to what needs to be potholed.

Question: *Would the District consider extending the deadlines for the proposals?*

Answer: The District is operating under a finite time line for the project and time is of the essence. Nothing herein should require a time extension and the District is maintaining the submittal date of November 9, 2016.

Question: *RFP page 6, wells 6A, 6B, 10, 11, 12, and 14. These wells will need to be re-equipped with vertical turbine deep well pumps and manifolded together to pipe to one receiving location. There is no mention of this work in the scope of work?*

Answer: Consultants are advised that all work identified in the Project Description is included in the Scope of Work. Only the dairy wells (4) will all be required to be re-equipped for the installation of vertical turbine pump and motors. Two of the existing wells are currently equipped with submersible pump and motor assemblies and the remaining two wells are not equipped. Tasks 6 and 7 of the project Scope of Work are revised to include preliminary pump and motor design and final well equipping design, respectively, by reference hereon.

Question: *The RFP is requesting separate construction bid packages (pipeline, pump stations and reservoir). Which bid package will include the well pumps and equipping.*

Answer: The Meadowbrook Dairy wells equipping work will be included as part of the booster station bid package.

Question: *RFP page 12, under Task 7, it states the consultant will receive review comments on the 95% package and there is no mention of the final 100% submittal? Can we assume after receiving the 95% District comments, the 100% package will be submitted for construction advertising?*

Answer: That is correct.

Question: *On page 10, Task 4 – Geotechnical, first bullet – you mention borings along the pipe alignment should be spaced 1,000-feet apart and then you ask to include 12 borings. Can you please clarify?*

Answer: Task 4 – Geotechnical first bullet item is revised to reflect a requirement of 2 borings per mile of pipeline. Consultants shall include 24-borings in his/her proposal.

Consultants are advised to incorporate all the above information in their proposal. All Consultants must acknowledge receipt of this addendum on Attachment D in Appendix C of the RFP. Failure to acknowledge the addendum may result in a "non-responsive" proposal.

Approved By:  \_\_\_\_\_  
George Cardenas – Engineering Manager

Date: 11/3/16