



Addendum for Request for Proposals for a Feasibility Study of Property to Become a HHW Facility for Zero Waste Sonoma

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

1. When does the Agency anticipate completing the site selection process?

Site selection will be dependent on approval of the Board of Directors to approve the project and create a funding mechanism. Site selection will also be dependent on property inventory. There is no projected timeline.

2. Based on Exhibit A statement, “Once a property is selected by the AGENCY...the Executive Director will provide the Proposer written notice to proceed”. – The feasibility study will include the evaluation of only one site, correct?

Correct, the Agency intends to evaluate only one property. If the site is determined to have poor potential to become an HHW facility, the Agency would enter into another agreement for a second feasibility study.

3. Is there a timeline the County is targeting for completing the feasibility study?

For clarification, Zero Waste Sonoma is not the County of Sonoma, it is a Joint Powers Authority and will be referred to as the “Agency”. The timeline between now and the start of a feasibility study is unknown (see Question and Answer #1), however, after the Notice to Proceed is issued, it is the Agency’s desire to have a feasibility study completed within ninety (90) days. The Agency understands certain factors may cause the study to take longer and a time range should be included in the proposal.

4. Please provide site size parameters and a general description of the existing features for each property being considered for development. These elements will impact costs associated with the site survey and environmental assessment and therefore are necessary to bracket costs for bare-land and redevelopment/retrofit scenarios.

There are no properties currently under consideration for development. The Agency’s preferred site elements include a 10,000 square foot building and a lot size of approximately two acres. Because of the unknowns, a price range will be an acceptable response. As a reminder, the Agency is seeking a quote for both a bare land option and for a property with an existing building. The Agency understands and acknowledges that unknown factors will complicate the proposal process, so a Proposer may choose to break down costs associated with different scenarios and calculate a price range.

5. The scope of services states “The chosen Proposer will be expected to work in conjunction with, and receive input from, the AGENCY and other AGENCY contractors for their expertise in HHW design and operations.” Please identify the “other Agency contractors” who will be

engaged in the review / collaboration on this contract and their role in the process that can be anticipated.

The Agency currently contracts with Sweetser and Associates for HHW program and expansion analyses. It is expected that the Agency, Sweetser and Associates, and the chosen Proposer will work together to identify best practices and facility features that are most appropriate for the Agency's and its constituent's needs.

- 6. Task 9 includes development of “a design drawing that can be used for construction bidding”, and Task 10 requires “proposed development plans for the site and building, architectural, mechanical and electrical systems...The final feasibility study report must include civil engineering services detailing utilities, drainage, a preliminary storm water management plan, and a conceptual site plan.”**
- a. Seeking detailed drawings to be used for construction bidding and subsequently referencing a conceptual site plan seems inconsistent. Are the drawings anticipated to be conceptual in nature, with a suitable level of detail for the Agency to subsequently procure a design-build contractor to prepare construction-level drawings?**

The Agency intends to receive conceptual site plans as improvement options and then once the Agency agrees to the conceptual site plan, the Agency intends to receive construction-level drawings as part of this RFP.

- b. If it is the Agency's intent for a detailed design set to be developed as part of this contract which can be used for construction bidding, a reasonable cost estimate can likely be provided for a bare-land site scenario. However, if an existing building is planned to be used / retrofit for use, it will be challenging to develop the cost estimate because construction plan set development for this scenario will be highly dependent on specific site / structure conditions of the existing building. Will the Agency consider the costing of this element of the scope of work as a second phase of the feasibility report and allow for amendment of the cost proposal for this phase once a site is selected?**

The Agency understands there are many variables to this component so Proposers are encouraged to provide an estimate based on a standard, structurally sound building and build upon costs and scenarios from there. Include features that would cost the most or fluctuate the most in cost. The Agency will consider a second phase of the feasibility report or may choose to request two separate contracts, though a cost range should be provided in the Proposer's response. An explanation of the variables and the inability to quote on a specific task should be provided.

- 7. What is the budget the Agency has allocated for this contract?**

A budget will be determined based on the responses to this RFP.

- 8. Given the short time available to receive responses to questions prior to the submittal deadline, will the Agency extend the deadline for proposals? A one- to two-week extension**

will enable each of the scenarios to be carefully considered as we develop our scope of work and proposed budget.

The Agency does not anticipate a deadline extension at this time. However, if the Agency does not receive any responses by the deadline, the RFP may be redistributed with a new timeline.

9. Are markups of subcontractors approved under this agreement?

Any contracts executed between the Agency and the chosen Proposer will include a “not to exceed” limit. It is up to the Proposer to allocate funds as they see fit.