



DATE: April 23, 2010

TO: Interested Entities (individuals, consultants, firms and/or research institutions)

FROM: Jennifer Taylor, Assistant Engineer

SUBJECT: **ADDENDUM NO. 1, MONITORING SERVICES FOR VARIOUS PROGRAMS
(RFP 2010-04-30)**

I. Introduction

This memorandum comprises an Addendum to the subject Request for Proposal (RFP) released on April 9th, 2010. This addendum has been written in response to questions and comments submitted by interested entities. If there are additional items which remain unclear or in question the Consultant shall clearly state all assumptions and the impacts that the assumptions have on the Consultant's proposed scope of work, schedule, and cost. This information will be taken into consideration when reviewing the proposal.

Proposals will be received until the hour of:
3:00 o'clock P.M., Friday, April 30, 2010
in the office of the
Finance Department, City of South Lake Tahoe,
1901 Airport Rd Ste 207,
South Lake Tahoe, California 96150-7048

II. Questions and Responses

- 1. At the top of page 7 (Section III, Scope of Work, Task A), it states that for Task A, a detailed cost proposal is required to be submitted. However, under the proposal requirements on page 15 (Section VI, Proposal Requirements), it only requires that the Consultant submit a schedule of billing rates. Please advise us on if you want a detailed cost estimate for Task A.***

The proposal must include a Compensation Schedule ("Schedule of Billing Rates") as identified in Section IV, "Proposal Requirements" (pg 15). In addition, for Consultants proposing on Task A, the proposal must include a detailed cost estimate as identified in Section III, "Scope of Work", "Task A" of the RFP (task list begins on pg 7).

While the scope of work for "Task A" does contain portions of the Draft Monitoring Plan (ENTRIX, 2010 - available on the FTP site to reference for more detail), the scope of work provided in the RFP is intentionally vague. The following text excerpt is repeated from the RFP to explain further:

'The City anticipates the proposing Consultant will offer their expertise to provide a

cost effective strategy to determine the success of the restoration with respect to the identified objectives and desired conditions provided in the RFP. Should the prospective Consultant identify additional or alternative field investigations, procedures, protocols or approaches to assess success of the restoration, which defer from the Scope of Services, listed herein, but meet the objectives and desired outcomes for the Project, the City encourages the Consultant to propose an alternative.

If the Consultant elects to provide an additional or alternative scope of services with the proposal, the alternative(s), if provided, shall be listed as distinct additional tasks in the "Task A" proposal, with identified cost savings or additional costs shown.'

Thus if the Consultant identifies gaps in the scope of work, or non-essential items, the Consultant is encouraged to propose a cost effective strategy based on their knowledge and expertise to address the goals and objectives rather than reiterate the scope of work outlined in the RFP. While the Consultant is expected to consider costs, the City evaluates the "proposal" based on expertise and qualifications, rather than as a lowest responsible bidder, or as a "bid" based on cost.

2. *Regarding Task A, did the design consultant (ENTRIX) perform a HEC RAS for the project, and if so, is related information (cross sectional surveys) available from pre-construction?*

Yes. An electronic copy of the Design Report (ENTRIX, 2008) is now posted and available on the FTP site (<ftp://ftp.cslmail.com/Engineering/public/Upper Truckee SEZ Restoration Project/>). The City will provide the cross section information to the successful Consultant, upon request.

3. *On page 2 (Section II, Background, Task A), it states that the total duration of monitoring services is anticipated to span approximately three (3) to four (4) years, depending on when construction is completed. However, on page 10 (Section III, Scope of Work, Task A, No. 3, Field Investigations) states that field work is expected to begin in June 2010 and continue for a period of at least two (2) years following construction.*

Construction began in 2008 and will continue through 2010 or 2011, depending on the success of the vegetation. Project monitoring, as specified in this RFP, is anticipated to begin in June 2010 and continue for a period of two (2) years following construction.

Thus, if construction begins in 2010, the duration of the post-construction field work will occur from 2010-2012; reporting will continue through 2013, for a total duration of three (3) years. However, if construction is postponed to 2011, post-construction field work will occur from 2011-2013; reporting will continue through 2014 to a total of four (4) years. If construction is postponed, additional "pre-construction" field data may be obtained for the 2010 season.

4. *Can Consultants access the job site to view the Project?*

Access on foot has been obtained in the past from the adjacent neighborhoods; either from Fountain Avenue, off Sierra Boulevard to the north; or Muskawiki Drive, off Pioneer Trail from the east. Due to the time of year this RFP is being circulated, there are some limits to physically viewing the Project, although it is not impossible. It is anticipated that the majority of the site is mostly covered with snow, the river is impassible by foot or vehicle, and there is

snowmelt/groundwater covering most of the floodplain. Vehicle access is also limited during this time of year, as the access road is not plowed during the winter months.

Aerial imagery from Google Earth, MapQuest, and other such maps, or the maps provided on the documents posted to the FTP site should aid the Consultant in understanding existing conditions and the extent of the project limits.

5. *Are there labs on the ELAP (Environmental Accreditation Program) list which can meet the low-level detection limits for water quality analysis (nutrients), and is this really a requirement?*

Yes, the City is requiring any samples generated from the monitoring be analyzed by a laboratory certified through the Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP) as detailed on page 3 of the RFP.

The laboratories certified on the ELAP list may be contacted to verify the Minimum Detection Limits (MDLs) and Reporting Limits (RLs) for the parameters in question. State certification occurs on the employees using the equipment and the equipment itself to establish MDLs and RLs for each laboratory. Depending on the laboratory, they may be able to report down to MDLs, upon request. However, that data will need to be qualified, as the data would be somewhere between their MDL and the RL. Certified laboratories are held to requirements of 40 CFR and would be required to qualify the data if it is not reported at their established RL. This is due to the fact that data measured at the MDL level can be questionable. RL's are typically established for each lab based on their performance (operator and equipment) and are 3-5 times higher than the MDL to account for this uncertainty, and to ensure repeatability.

The Technical Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), identified in the Scope of Work for "Task A", as "Monitoring Documents", should identify the sampling volumes required for the identified laboratory to meet their established MDLs and RLs. Due to the relative clarity of some Lake Tahoe samples, in some cases, a larger sample volume will be necessary for the laboratory to meet the MDL.

In addition, the Chain of Custody may need to include a note alerting the laboratory that special reporting is being requested.

6. *Can you clarify the type of wildlife and aquatic surveys that are included with the Scope of Work for Task A, and any other monitoring data that may be available prior to circulation of this RFP?*

Please refer to Section III and the Scope of Work for Task A to identify the surveys requested as part of this RFP. For clarification, the following background information is provided on activities occurring outside of the scope of work of this RFP.

- During 2008, surveys for avian wildlife covered by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and wildlife identified as special status species, as identified in the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment of 2000 (SNFPA 2000) were conducted in 2008 by Wildlife Resource Consultants, prior to construction during the avian nesting season.
- In 2008, rescue and relocation of aquatic species occurred (ENTRIX, 2008) prior

to the Contractor diverting the Upper Truckee River during construction in 2008. No surveys or rescue occurred in 2009 as construction was inactive.

- In January 2010, the City circulated an RFP for Avian Wildlife Surveys and Aquatic Rescue/Relocation, and selected Garcia and Associates (GANDA). The GANDA scope of services includes relocation/rescue of mussels and fish; and surveys for willow flycatcher and northern goshawk.
- Wildlife surveys are expected to occur in both 2010 and 2011 by GANDA if the currently scheduled construction of 2010 is postponed to 2011.
- Contractor activities (dewatering/diversion) in the existing Upper Truckee River channel are expected to occur during low flows anticipated in late August, or early September of either 2010 or 2011. If construction is postponed to 2011, GANDA is anticipated to perform Aquatic Rescue/Relocation in 2011, rather than 2010.
- The GANDA scope of work does not include surveys for fish, or a rescue and relocation plan. Nor does the scope include avian point count surveys.
- During 2002-2005 various stations located along the Upper Truckee River were established by the City and Liquid Innovations to sample flows. Analysis was conducted for Total Suspended Solids. The data were compiled and a report was provided on sediment loading (2ND Nature, 2006)
- During 2008, turbidity monitoring was conducted by ENTRIX during active construction at stations established by Liquid Innovations. The stations were just upstream and downstream of the project limits.
- During 2008 and 2009 field seasons, Western Botanical Services (WBS) provided field site visits and recommendations regarding the success of the re-vegetation effort and the irrigation operations.
- Special studies were conducted on the airport fill (CDM, 2006), and on the fish populations in 2005 (CDM and GANDA, 2006).

Data from turbidity monitoring of construction in 2008 (ENTRIX), memos from irrigation and re-vegetation efforts (WBS), additional reports for fish (CDM and GANDA) and airport fill (CDM), and the RFP that was circulated during January 2010 is now posted at the following FTP site ([ftp://ftp.csltmail.com/Engineering/public/Upper Truckee SEZ Restoration Project/](ftp://ftp.csltmail.com/Engineering/public/Upper%20Truckee%20SEZ%20Restoration%20Project/)). Other studies mentioned above were previously posted to the FTP site.

The information posted to the FTP likely does not include every study conducted on the Upper Truckee River Airport Reach. The Consultant is further advised that the project, although a Stream Environment Zone Restoration Project, did follow a modified Storm Water Quality Improvement Committee (SWQIC) guidance document for Formulating and Evaluating Alternatives for Water Quality Improvement Projects (FEA). Thus the successful Consultant may determine, during their review of available data to prepare various Monitoring Documents, that other relevant information is available on pre-construction conditions.

Examples of such information from the FEA process that may also be available include, but are

not limited to the following: a project area specific base map in AutoCAD®, maps of existing drainage features (including type, location, and size), identification of drainage problems and flooding areas, quantitative load estimates of priority pollutants, identification of sensitive species and noxious weeds, etc.

7. *What construction activities have occurred and what is the anticipated work in 2010?*

Construction is occurring through a contractual agreement between the City of South Lake Tahoe and Burdick Excavating Company, Inc. (Contractor), executed on July 1, 2008.

Construction in 2008 included roughly the following: removal of approximately 400 trees; installation of a temporary rail car bridge across the low-water crossing of the Upper Truckee River; removal of fill adjacent to the airport and Upper Truckee River; excavation of approximately 4000 linear feet of meandering channel; installation of embankment stabilization and habitat structures for fish and wildlife; installation of irrigation lines and irrigation. The Contractor completed work in 2008 (which was originally planned for 2009), including installation of embankment stabilization and habitat structures.

Construction activities in 2009 were limited to irrigation and warranty work.

The focus of the work during construction in 2010 or 2011 is to put the Upper Truckee River into the new channel alignment constructed in 2008. No grading or land disturbance will be performed by the Contractor between October 15 and July 1; except for irrigation, depending on field conditions within the flood plain and as directed by the City. The general sequencing for construction proposed in 2010 or 2011 is illustrated in the Project Plans (available on the FTP site).