



**CITY OF EAST PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – ENGINEERING DIVISION**

ADDENDUM 1

**East Palo Alto Trash Capture Device Project
CIP-SD-09**

General Information and Questions

Question 1: Can the City provide record drawings for Newbridge Street which show existing utilities in the area for review by proposers?

Answer 1: The City is currently unable to provide the requested records. However, the proposer may independently research and collect data to make informed assumptions for their proposal.

Question 2: Is the City open to the use of night work for data collection efforts?

Answer 2: Once the selection process is complete, the City will negotiate with the chosen consultant and evaluate the necessity and feasibility of working night hours based on the potential disruption to the surrounding area.

Question 3: Can the City provide its storm drain hydraulic model for review by proposers?

Answer 3: The City currently does not have any detailed hydraulic modeling for this project. As part of their scope of work, the selected consultant will be responsible for developing new hydraulic modeling to support the installation of the new Trash Capture device.

Question 4: Section 1 of the proposal, the design criteria section mentions StormTrap baskets which can tolerate a minimum velocity of 10 fps through the screens. It was our understanding that the City was open to evaluating baffle boxes or HDS units from a variety of manufacturers. Is this requirement applicable to other device types?

Answer 4: Yes, as long as the chosen device can be certified by the water board.

Question 5: Task 2, Stakeholder Engagement and Coordination, includes the formation of a Project Development Team. Can the consultant instead use the Project Coordination meetings with City staff as a vehicle for potential meetings with project stakeholders, if they are determined to be needed?

Answer 5: Upon completing the selection process, the City will collaborate with the chosen consultant to strategize and facilitate potential meetings with various project stakeholders.

Question 6: Task 2, Stakeholder Engagement and Coordination, includes a task for individual agency coordination to evaluate the potential for co-benefits. What agencies more specifically would the City of East Palo Alto like the project team to engage with (Menlo Park, for example)?

Answer 6: Yes, Menlo Park and Caltrans

Question 7: Is the Site Access Plan described in Task 5 intended to be a site access plan for the purposes of operations and maintenance activities, or for data collection and field visits anticipated as part of the project design development effort?

Answer 7: Primarily for future maintenance operations.

Question 8: For the bid package, hard copies of 24"x36" are requested, but other submittals require 11"x17" submittals. Would 22"x34" full size plans be acceptable (which is double the size of 11"x17" sheets)?

Answer 8: Yes, as long as the plans are accurately drawn to scale.

Question 9: To accelerate the project schedule and review process, would City staff be open to eliminating hard copies of interim submittals (i.e. electronic submittals only for interim submittal packages)?

Answer 9: We are receptive to this idea, but we will make a final decision during the negotiation phase with the selected consultants.

Question 10: Does construction have to be complete by June 30, 2025, or is it the City's intention to begin construction ahead of this date to show good faith progress towards the deadline?

Answer 10: Our intention is to start construction before the June deadline, which could provide leverage to request a deadline extension from the Water Board by demonstrating

our good faith efforts.

Question 11: The RFP indicates that the City's preference is for a consultant to expedite the preparation of construction contract documents by February 2025. Is the City flexible on this, as long as construction begins prior to June 30, 2025?

Answer 11: The deadline is set by the NPDES permit and is enforceable by the Water Board, potentially including third-party lawsuits under the Clean Water Act. Changing the date would require amending the MRP, which the Water Board has expressed no interest in doing. However, they have discretion in enforcing the timeline and may consider factors such as acceptable plans, schedules, funding, and reasonable delays. While they might forgo enforcement if a device is installed within six months after the deadline, this is not guaranteed. Therefore, we should adhere to the existing deadlines in the meantime.

Anwar Mirza

Anwar Mirza
City Engineer
City of East Palo Alto

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.