

## **ADDENDUM No. 2**

### **RFP No. 976 Engineering Design Services for Sister Lakes Stormwater Retrofit**

**Due: June 21, 2016 at 10:00 A.M.**

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions shall be made to the Request for Proposal for Engineering Design Services for Sister Lakes Stormwater Retrofit RFP No. 976 on which proposals will be received on/or before June 21, 2016 at 10:00 A.M.

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any), and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes 2 pages.**

**Offeror is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 2, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum will be considered nonconforming.**

#### **I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

One question was received as of the Friday, June 10, 2016, at 5:00 pm stated deadline.

##### **Question #1**

*The RFP referred to Section 8: Redirection of Tributary Drain into First Sister Lake. This section was a response to the 1997 report recommendation that storm drain SD 5 be retrofitted to avoid direct discharge into First Sister Lake. The 1997 study suggested extending the existing drain pipe 100 yards southward along the shore to drain into a cattail marsh area.*

*The 2015 Review advises that this may no longer be the best option. Though the Review does list some ideas for consideration (stormwater treatment on Lakeview, the intersection with Parklake, and the lawn area by the lake), it does not give an estimate for the cost of designing, permitting, and constructing this scope of work. It appears to break down a cost estimate that includes a feasibility study on whether these options are possible. The design, construction, and permitting services in the estimate were kept the same as those in the 1997 report—that is for the extension of the drain 100 yards into the cattail marsh. To quote the 2015 Review: “The engineering design, permitting, and construction costs were kept the same as the Lake Study report. However, an additional \$10,000 was added to account for the newly recommended feasibility study.”*

*For our potential work effort required for the project, the extension of the pipe in the 1997 study priced out at current rates in the 2015 report is different than the scope of work that was discussed in the meeting on Monday. We wonder if perhaps there is any room for negotiation on the proposed fee or if that is a set cost due to previous approvals?*

**Answer #1**

*The budget was established for a related, but distinctly different project, and has been provided as reference information only. The current project is more focused on green infrastructure solutions, and water quality improvements, not the pipe extension described in the 1997 report.*

*The proposed work plan and fee developed by the consultant should be based the project scope of work described in the RFP and discussed at the pre-proposal meeting.*

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.