



April 2, 2021

**Addendum 3
25 & I Road Drainage Improvement Project
RFP 21-03056**

This addendum to the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the above referenced project supersedes all contrary and conflicting information which is hereby supplemented or revised in certain particulars as follows:

Question (1):

Who completed the design of the current system that was completed in 2014.

Answer (1):

Rolland Consultants completed the original design.

Question (2):

Can the existing design report/drawing be provided prior to submittal of the RF.

Answer (2):

The original design is included with this addendum.

Question (3):

The RFP states that Mesa County will provide a right-of-way plan depicting all survey information that creates the right-of-way. Can we please get a copy of this to review prior to submission of the RFP?

Answer (3):

The right of way map will be provided to the chosen consultant. The map will not be available prior to closure of the RFP.

Question (4):

What was the objective/purpose of the 2014 design? What issues was it intended to address?

Answer (4):

Please reread the RFP.

Question (5):

When did the County last observe the French Drain functioning properly?

Answer (5):

Mesa County cannot provide an answer to this question, as it is not known.

Question (6):

What is the driving need for a French Drain and surface drain in this area. What symptoms/issues are present? What concerns does the County have?

Answer (6):

Please reread the RFP

Question (7):

What does Mesa County believe is the root cause of the issue being observed? Is it groundwater, irrigation water, stormwater, or a combination?

Answer (7):

Please reread the RFP

Question (8):

One of the project goals is to upgrade the storm drain system to a larger pipe. Are you referring to the French Drain and does the County want a larger pipe for maintenance purposes or capacity.

Answer (8):

Maintenance and capacity issues.

Question (9):

Does the county want the new system to collect and convey surface water?

Answer (9):

Yes

Question (10):

Is the County open to an alternative designs vs a "French Drain" approach?

Answer (10):

Yes

Question (12):

What is the objective of the three public open house meetings? This seems excessive and costly for a project of this scope. Since we are meeting with all the adjacent property owners separately, is there a need for public meetings? If the County feels there needs to be a public meeting, does there need to be more than one?

Answer (12):

All Mesa County CIP projects require public meetings. If the consultant can objectify 1 public meeting with no land owner issues, 1 public meeting can be considered.

Question (13):

30%, 60%, and 90% design meetings also seem excessive for this project. Would the County be open holding less design review meetings for this project as a cost saving measure?

Answer (13):

30%, 60%, and 90% design meetings are typical for Mesa County CIP projects. Alternatives as a cost savings to the County can be discussed with the chosen Engineering Consulting firm.

Question (14):

The schedule the County is proposing is very short for the scope of work and dates provided in the RFP. No time has been allotted to investigate and determine the root cause of the issue. We suggest splitting this project into two phases. The first phase would be to investigate and study the situation to verify the root cause or causes of the issues noted. This would involve groundwater monitoring, observation of irrigation practices, and post storm drainage analysis. The second phase be to create a design that would address the root cause, resolve the issues observed, and provide a long-term solution. Would the County be open to a two-phase approach for this project and extending the project schedule to allow for an investigation phase?

Answer (14):

The schedule can be discussed with the chosen design consultant.

Question (14):

Due to the nature of these questions and the potential impact they could have on the proposal, can a two-week extension be given to the RFP deadline to allow consultants to review and digest this information?

Answer (14):

The schedule will remain unchanged for the submittal for the RFP.

All remaining requirements of the RFP remain unchanged.

Provided by:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Carrie Gudorf". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'C'.

Carrie Gudorf
Mesa County Engineering
Regulatory Programs Manager