



May 14, 2021

Sonoma County Water Agency Supplement to Request for Proposals

Deadline for Submission

2:00 p.m., Wednesday, May 19, 2021

RE: SUPPLEMENT NO. 01 TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE CENTRAL SONOMA WATERSHED PROJECT

This Supplement forms a part of and modifies the Request for Proposals dated April 13 2021. Modified text is indicated as follows: Double-underline designates text to be inserted; ~~strikeout~~ designates text to be deleted.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. No changes.

2. PASS/FAIL REQUIREMENTS

2.1. No changes.

3. FUNDING

3.1. No changes.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1. Modify Paragraph 4.3, Table 1, as follows:

Table 1- Central Sonoma Watershed Plan Structures

Structure	Year Completed	Age
Brush Creek Reservoir	1962	54
Piner Reservoir	1964	56
Matanzas Reservoir ¹	1964	59
Santa Rosa Creek Reservoir (Spring Lake)	1963	58
Santa Rosa Creek Diversion Structure	1962	59
Diversion Structure Outfall (Channel Drive)	1963	58
Spring Creek Diversion	1962	59
Downtown Santa Rosa Box Culverts	1963	58
Spring Creek Bypass Culvert	1988	33

¹ – Condition Assessments for Matanzas Reservoir Structures to be Completed by Others.

4.2. Add the following to the end of Paragraph 4.6:

Consultant should rely on information generated as part of the Matanzas Dam Assessment project for completing the new Central Sonoma Watershed Plan.

4.3. Add the following to the end of Paragraph 4.8:

Sonoma Water is open to considering facilities that were part of the 1958 Plan that were not completed but could maintain or improve flood protection and is open to new opportunities, facilities, or operational changes that improve flood management in the watershed. The consultant team should be prepared to explore best available options to meet flood protection objectives and to demonstrate and quantify the flood benefits with documented modeling efforts.

5. MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

5.1. No changes.

6. PREVAILING WAGES

6.1. Modify Paragraph 6.2 as follows:

A proposal from any firm that is not a DIR-registered contractor at the time the proposal is submitted will be rejected for non-responsiveness. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1725.5, all subcontractors identified in a firm’s proposal shall be DIR-registered contractors at the time the proposal is submitted as well.

7. LIVING WAGE

7.1. No changes.

8. SUBMITTAL OF PROPOSALS

8.1. No changes.

9. EVALUATION

9.1. No changes.

10. FINALIST INTERVIEWS

10.1. No changes.

11. SCHEDULE

11.1. Add the following as Paragraph 11.2:

Sonoma Water is committed to meeting the one-year schedule defined in the RFP. However, the consultant team may propose an alternative schedule that relies on their experience conducting similar work.

12. CONTACTS

12.1. No changes.

13. ATTACHMENTS

13.1. No changes.

14. QUESTION(S)/ANSWER(S)

Sonoma Water responses to questions are for the purposes of interpretation and clarification of the Request for Proposals and shall not be construed as changing, superseding, or contradicting any express term in the Request for Proposals. Questions received are listed below.

1. Question: Under Item 6. Prevailing Wages on Page 8, you state that "Each firm submitting a proposal must be a DIR-registered contractor pursuant to Labor Code section 1725.5 prior to submission of a proposal." Does this requirement apply to the prime contractor only, or the entire team? If it refers to the entire team, can a non-DIR registered subconsultant apply for DIR registration prior to proposal submittal, to be secured before the contract start date?

Answer: Answered in this Supplement, above.

2. Question: In Phase I, is a condition assessment requested for Mantanzas Creek Dam, even though that is being covered in the separate NRCS contract for Matanzas Creek Dam Supplemental Watershed Plan/EA?

Answer: Answered in this Supplement, above.

3. Question: As part of Phase III alternatives development, is Sonoma Water interested in revisiting facilities proposed in 1958 plan that were not constructed?

Answer: Answered in this Supplement, above.

4. Question: As part of Phase III alternatives development, is Sonoma Water interested in recommendations on facilities not included in 1958 plan or RFP, should modeling reveal a new opportunity within the watershed to improve flood management?

Answer: Answered in this Supplement, above.

5. Questions: The RFP in Section 11 mentions a 1-year project duration, which appears aggressive given the complexity of the system, extent of considerations for proposed alternatives, and standard NRCS process requirements. Is the 1-year schedule a requirement, or would Sonoma Water consider an alternate schedule recommendation?

Answer: Answered in this Supplement, above.

Sincerely,

James Jasperse, P.E.
Chief Engineer/Director of Groundwater Management

Encs.

c: Carlos Diaz
Susan Haydon
Aaron Fulton
Jennifer Willits
Lynne Rosselli
Joan Hultberg
Sherry Barbic

rw: s:\clerical\pinks\05-10-21\2021-106_supplement_1.docx