

**PLANNING AND ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE  
MOKELUME AQUEDUCTS DELTA TUNNEL  
RFP 534-19-03**

**Responses to Questions October 23, 2019  
(via Information Meeting and email)**

Q1: For the new pipe alternative under Task 3, should the Proposers consider an above ground variance for the new pipeline alternative?

A1: Yes it should be considered and evaluated.

Q2: The District's SPAD study evaluates several alternatives. Does the District want these various alternatives from SPAD study also considered in the Task 3 Alternatives Analysis Report?

A2: No. The SPAD study was an internal study that examined all possible alternatives, however many of these alternatives were quickly eliminated due to the lack of risk reduction or practicality. E.g., one of the alternatives to construct an armored corridor across the Delta with Hwy 4, the Mokelumne Aqueduct, and other utilities requires unrealistic levels of coordination with other agencies and would be impossible for a consultant to estimate costs and should, therefore, be ignored.

Q3: [Page 6, Exhibit A, Required Documentation and Submittals, 2. Description of the Proposed Services]

Per Exhibit A - Required Documentation and Submittals, 2. Description of the Proposed Services, we are required to provide, "a basis of estimate for services including start and completion dates, the number of Proposer's and District personnel involved, and the number of hours scheduled for each person." May we please have clarification on this requirement? It appears the same information is also required in Exhibit B-1 Cost Distribution and Exhibit B-2 Labor Distribution Forms.

A3: The labor distribution forms (Exhibit B-1 Cost Distribution and Exhibit B-2 Labor Distribution) are sufficient. The intent of this section is to explain the timing/duration/roles/% of employee time/ etc. for personnel on the project. There is no need to repeat the information from the forms.

Q4: [Page 6, Exhibit A, Required Documentation and Submittals]

May we insert requirements from the Evaluation Criteria (page 22) into the proposal outline provided on page 6, Required Documentation and Submittals?

A4: Generally staff has an easier time reviewing the proposals if the overall organization is per the outline shown on Exhibit A pages 6 & 7, but the proposal will not be penalized if it deviates from the outline provided.

Q5: [Page 6, Exhibit A, Required Documentation and Submittals]

May we provide organizational project experience and capabilities relevant to the Mokelumne Aqueducts Delta Tunnel project? If yes, which section would you like to see this information? And, would the District like to see specific information for each project?

A5: Yes. It is logical to see the firm's relevant project experience and capabilities included in Section 4 Key Personnel and Organization Chart. Some successful proposers in previous projects have changed the name to "Qualifications and Organization Chart". Or it can be included as a separate section.

Q6: [Page 6, Exhibit A, Required Documentation and Submittals]

Aside from the Letter of Transmittal, are we subject to a proposal page count limit?

A6: No page limit.

Q7: [Page 8, Exhibit A, References]

Are the Exhibit A – References forms only required for each of the 5 key personnel (Project Manager, Lead Geotechnical Engineer, Lead Tunnel Engineer, Environmental/Permitting Leader, Pipeline Lead) or for all proposed personnel?

A7: These references are for relevant projects of the firm, not specifically for key personnel, but they will likely have more impact, if it is demonstrated that some or all of the key personnel worked these projects.