

Butte County Public Works RFP:

Design, Engineering, Permitting Assistance, Preparation of Bid Documents for Diversion, Recycling, Transfer and Associated Facilities – Neal Road Landfill

Questions and Answers (December 12, 2008)

Question 1:

Do transfer trucks currently use the landfill?

Answer:

Yes

Question 2:

Are building permits part of Phase 1 of the project?

Answer:

No, building permits will be in the next phase of development.

Question 3:

Is the most recent aerial topo suitable for preparing the site plan?

Answer:

It is anticipated that for the preliminary site plan (building placement, etc) the most recent aerial topo will suffice, but for the final engineered plan and preparation of bid plans/specifications for infrastructure construction, surveying will be required. If you are asking if there has been any cut or fill activity in the project area since the aerial (July 2008), the answer is no.

Question 4:

Did all team members need to attend Tuesday's (Dec 2, 2008) meeting?

Answer:

No, each team needed to have a representative.

Question 5:

Are there any geotechnical investigations available for the site, and in particular the Landfill Improvement Site?

Answer:

The only geotechnical information that the landfill has is that included as Exhibit F (extract taken from Closure/Post Closure Maintenance Plan) of the RFP.

Question 6:

Is the discussion regarding preliminary permit applications included in item D, page 14 (CEQA) meant to be in Item E (Permit Assistance) to the extent that discussions with permitting agencies will be the basis for formulation of the permit applications that are beyond the scope of CEQA?

Answer:

Work Plan items D and E are closely related and some of the scope of work for these items blend over to the other. What staff intends is that the Project Team review existing

environmental documentation for the Neal Road Landfill and in the process of developing the Project Description, assess if the current environmental document is adequate for impacts the Project may have. Once this analysis is done, discussions with planning and the LEA would determine if additional studies and analysis is required. County departments may want this determination completed prior to or may allow concurrent submittal with an application to revise the Solid Waste Facility Permit. To this end, item D was anticipated to include discussions with County agencies that had discretionary approval of this Project, initial CEQA review, development of Project Description and completion of environmental assessment that could be used for Planning staff to determine if additional environmental analysis and studies were required. Item E was anticipated to include work related to the submittal of applications and follow-up work required to secure approvals on discretionary decisions related to land use and a revised Solid Waste Facility Permit

Question 7:

Will all deliverables for the project be required by October 2009 as stated on page 17 of the RFP or will it only be required that the Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) be obtained as discussed at the pre-proposal meeting? In the latter case, can we assume that the draft bid documents for both infrastructure and buildings could follow the SWFP deadline on October 2009?

Answer:

A question at the December 2nd meeting inquired if all permits including building permits were included in the October 2009 timeframe. The answer was no because construction of buildings was in another phase of the development. The October 2009 timeframe noted in Section 2.4, Schedule, references all deliverables under Phase I, Parts 1 and 2 which include submittal of permit applications (discretionary approvals - not construction permits), final engineered plans for infrastructure and final bid documents for construction of infrastructure. Proposals will list a preliminary schedule for CEQA review and obtaining discretionary permits. Schedule for deliverables will be revised if required due to events or requirements outside the control of the Project Team. It is anticipated that discretionary approvals can be obtained by October 2009, including revised Solid Waste Facility Permit.

Question 8:

If there has been land surveying done at the site, either in support of aerial survey or otherwise, could you provide the name of the firm and indicate whether the County was satisfied with those services?

Answer:

Surveying has been performed as part of the closure projects Phase I and II completed in 2004 and 2006 respectively. Surveying was part of the contractor responsibility to provide "as-built" documentation. The County performs surveying activities with its own crews when the need arises. There are several reputable surveying firms in Butte County. Digitized files of the aerial topography can be made available. Contact Eric Dugger, landfill engineer, at 530-879-2351 for more information.

Question 9:

Page 2 of the RFP lists that Parts 1 and 2 include engineering and bidding for infrastructure; and that Part 3, which is optional, includes bid documents for construction of buildings. The Work Plan (Section 2.3) lists draft construction bid documents for infrastructure in Item C. and final design and construction bid documents in Item F. What is the reason that draft construction bid documents be developed for infrastructure only in Item C and then final construction bid documents for all elements in Item F? Will these be issued as one bid document for both infrastructure and all buildings and project construction or will there be some bifurcation given that Part 3 is described as “optional” construction of buildings?

Answer:

For purposes of this RFP, bid documents for construction should be considered for construction of “infrastructure”. Part 3 indicates that the County may ask the selected team to develop specifications and bid documents for the construction of the buildings, but this would be considered as additional work and should be priced as an option. Accordingly, the Work Plan would reflect that draft bid documents be developed for the construction of the infrastructure so that the County could comment, similar to development of a preliminary site plan. Final products would then be developed to include, final site plan with associated plans and specifications and bid documents for the construction of the infrastructure. If the County pursues the optional work in Part 3 to include developing specifications and bid documents for construction of the buildings, the contract and scope of work would reflect that option either in the initial contract or as a contract amendment. Deliverables and timetables for the optional work would be specified based on negotiations with the selected Project Team. The County has not decided at this point how to phase the project, but is leaning towards the first phase including construction of the infrastructure under one contract and construction of the buildings under separate contract as the second phase. The pros and cons of phasing the project will be discussed with the selected Project Team during contract negotiations.

Question 10:

Are the “Optional Tasks” excluded from the not-to-exceed cost estimate (Section 2.5) ones that the consultant may included that are not listed in the RFP Work Plan (Section 2.3) or does that refer to the fact that Part 3 of Phase 1 is listed as “Optional” on page 2?

Answer:

Yes, proposals should address cost for Part 1 and 2 of Phase 1. Optional work would be negotiated separately. The proposal team should demonstrate its expertise to provide the optional services for Part 3 so the County can discuss and negotiate the optional work with the team if appropriate.

Question 11:

Does the County have standard boilerplate that we should use for construction documents?

Answer:

The selected Project Team will be provided Butte County contract language, special provisions and other information needed for preparation of construction bid documents.

Question 12:

Have there been any traffic studies completed for the area recently?

Answer:

The County is participating with BCAG (Butte County Associations of Government) to study traffic at the Neal Road and Highway 99 intersection. The prime on the study is David Evans and Associates, Inc., 916-781-9878. A traffic forecast and operations analysis document has been completed, but is still in draft form. Public Works understands that traffic data is available at the intersection, but does not include data east of the landfill on Neal Road leading to the Town of Paradise.