

Q1: Will the City consider removing the 5-year stipulation on the Project Manger's experience and instead require that the dates of service for referenced projects be provided?

A: Yes

Q2: In Section C, Proposal Requirements, 3d it says: "All work shall be performed under the supervision of an engineer licensed in the State of California, who has substantial experience with projects of similar size and scope."? These services don't typically require the oversight of a licensed engineer. Is this accurate?

A: That was left over from when the Engineering and the Environmental Services were combined in a single RFP. It is not necessary for the environmental work to be overseen by an engineer.

Q3: In Section C, Proposal Requirements, 3d, says "For the Project Manager, provide at least three references (names and current phone numbers) from recent work (previous five years) similar in size and scope to this Project. Include a brief description of each project associated with the reference and the role and responsibility of the Project Manager." In Section C, Proposal Requirements, 3e References, it includes the exact same request for the Project Manager—does the City want this information repeated in these concurrent sections of the proposal? Or should it be documented in just one of those sections, and if so, which section does the City want this information?

A: It would be acceptable to only document those references in one of the sections. The City does not have a preference as to which one.

Q4: Can you clarify the federal nexus that would trigger NEPA and the intended need for NEPA compliance?

A: NEPA would be needed if we are awarded federal grant funding.

Q5: What would development of the community forest entail—what types of construction are anticipated, and what types of operational activities would occur?

A: The City is seeking guidance from qualified and experienced firms on development ideas, potential phasing, etc.

Q6: Should fieldwork for technical studies cover the entire 582-acre property, or should it be limited to the 30 acres planned for reservoir development?

A: The location and amount of fieldwork may be impacted by the outcome of the Community Forest Technical Report. The City would like to have the entire property evaluated for opportunities, and then decide which ones to follow up on with additional studies or fieldwork.

Q7: Could the City please clarify what the final submittal package should include? Three printed copies, a digital copy, and a separate cost proposal?

A: Per Section C1 of the RFP, we are asking for a digital copy and three (3) paper copies. The project cost should be enclosed in a separate envelope so that we can evaluate the merits of the proposal prior to viewing the proposed cost.

Q8: Since biologic studies might need to be supplemented for the additional proposed work, could we request access to the plans and studies available to assist with the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report?

A: The City sent out a link to a shared drive with all of the relevant information that is available. Please reach out if you need to have a new link sent.

Q9: Is there an existing turnout or diversion structure on the Noyo River that will be used for this project? If so, does the City anticipate any improvements to be made to those facilities in order to implement the Reservoirs Project? What will be the tie in location to the source of water for the Reservoirs Project?

A: Yes, there is an existing diversion on the Noyo River. No, we do not anticipate improvements to it as part of the project. Noyo River water will be pumped up from the Water Treatment Plant (WTP) located on Monsen Way, and the Waterfall Gulch water currently flows via gravity to Summers Lane Reservoir. Necessary improvements at the WTP to facilitate Noyo water pumping are underway. We will need new permits per memo from F&W Division of Water Rights, below:

Thank you for the additional information. Based on the information you provided, it seems likely that a petition for change is needed to make the necessary modifications to the water rights you provided. Utilizing the water from the Noyo River source under water right Permit 11383 (Application 17345) will require a petition for change. This specific change would be adding places of storage to the existing right (diversion to off stream storage). Please note that this permit expired and will need to be licensed and/or require a time extension petition. The permitted rate and/or face value amount is subject to change when licensed based on historical use during the permitted era. Routing the Waterfall Gulch via License 12171 (Application 25418) would be the same process (adding additional storage to the license). Looking at the records for License 12171, a similar change was submitted back in 4/15/2014 (the proposed change was to add Summers Lane Reservoir to the license). Let me know if you have any questions or would like to talk via a phone call.

Q10: Will the biological and/or other technical studies (i.e., those in addition to the already provided geotechnical reports and civil plans) and/or regulatory permit applications/authorizations associated with the Raw Water Line Replacement Project be made available?

A: The Final ISMND for the Raw Water Line Replacement Project is available either on CEQAnet ([CEQAnet.opr.ca.gov](http://CEQAnet.opr.ca.gov)) or the City's website ([city.fortbragg.com](http://city.fortbragg.com)) under Public Works, Current Public Works Projects. The geotechnical and other reports are also available on the City's website.

Q11: Will the City allow 11x17 pages that contain graphic information to be included if they are folded to 8.5x11 size for the printed submittals?

A: Yes

Q12: Does the City desire that the Budget and Schedule of Charges information be provided in a separate sealed envelope (3 copies) and as a separate file submitted electronically, or should this information be integrated into the main submittal?

A: Please provide the cost in a separate envelope and also as a separate digital file so that the proposal may be initially considered on merit only. See also Q7.