



MOUNTAINS RECREATION & CONSERVATION AUTHORITY
Los Angeles River Center and Gardens
570 West Avenue Twenty-six, Suite 100
Los Angeles, California 90065
Phone (323) 221-9944 Fax (323) 221-9934

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES FRANKLIN/IVAR PARK PROJECT, HOLLYWOOD

Q & A

General Clarifications:

- 1) The due date has been extended to Tuesday 1/22 at 5:00 PM.
- 2) For the "Site inspections during construction" item in the Fee Proposal Summary, please assume 5 visits for purposes of the proposal. MRCA acknowledges that the actual number of visits may vary and cannot be accurately estimated until engineering is completed.

Questions:

The Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) received the following questions in response to its RFP for geotechnical services issued on January 7, 2012 for the Franklin/Ivar Park Project. Bidders that have already submitted may submit a revised proposal if this Q & A materially changes the content of the proposal.

Q: Will MRCA be seeking permits from an outside permitting agency (City or County)?

A: No. The property is owned by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, a State agency which is not subject to City of Los Angeles jurisdiction. The improvements will be in conformance with California Building Code (CBC/CMC/CEC/CPC) standards, and independently plan checked and inspected to verify such compliance.

Q: Are the boring locations fixed as shown on the two exhibits (survey and preliminary grading plan) Or can they be moved slightly to get results needed?

A: Boring locations may be adjusted, in coordination with the structural and civil engineers, to obtain the needed information and best results of analysis.

Q: Can we get access to the site?

A: The site is fenced, locked and not open to the public. If not having access to the site measurably affects your ability to propose, please describe these impacts in the "proposal deviations" section so that MRCA may take this under consideration during review.

Q: The RFP for Franklin/Ivar Park is due on the 21st (Martin Luther King Day). Will the MRCA offices be open that day or would we have to get the proposal in to you before the 21st?

A: The 21st (Martin Luther King Day) is a holiday for the MRCA and our offices will be closed. Therefore, the due date has been moved to Tuesday 1/22 at 5:00 PM. Please note that proposals should be e-mailed to liz.jennings@mrca.ca.gov and do not need to be delivered in person.

Q: The RFP states in the Proposals paragraph on page 1 to ‘Please use Attachment 4’. Should this be Attachment 2?

A: Yes, this is just a typo.

Q: Please provide a link to the posted RFP.

A: <http://www.mrca.ca.gov/projectlisting.html>

Q: On page 4 of 5 of the RFP, you have three lines to provide cost estimates for that includes Review of Construction Plans and Site inspections during construction. We were not given a time frame of grading or the number of possible site visits for foundations and retaining wall backfills, so it will be difficult to come up with a dollar figure. If you need one, we can provide but you should know it will be subjected to change.

A: For the “Site inspections during construction” item in the Fee Proposal Summary, please assume 5 visits for purposes of the proposal. MRCA acknowledges that the actual number of visits may vary and cannot be accurately estimated until engineering is completed.

Q: Are there working hour restrictions for site work?

A: Yes, no earlier than 7:00 a.m.

Q: Is there a water source on-site? If so, what type (e.g., hose, fire hydrant, etc.)?

A: For purposes of the proposal, assume that water will not be available. There is a Caltrans irrigation system, however we have not yet secured permission from Caltrans to tap into this water for the geotechnical investigations.

Q: Are soil cuttings required to be drummed and disposed of?

A: Not necessary.

Q: If other consultants have asked for clarifications, would you please provide a list of the questions and responses?

A: Yes, see this document.

Q: Would you prefer to receive short letter proposals limited strictly to the timeline, fee proposal, and rate schedules?

A: Yes, but firms may also attach a standard qualifications packet and resumes if desired. A lengthy, customized proposal is not necessary—we are cognizant of the time and effort such proposals can consume, and therefore only require enough information to enable fair assessments.

Q: The solicitation says that “proposal deviations will be noted and taken into consideration”. Does this mean to discourage any lengthy discussion of firm experience and personnel qualifications?

A: The section for “deviations” is included because the scope of work as written in the RFP may be deficient or inappropriate for the project—we want to give firms the opportunity to advise us on changes to that scope that could be beneficial. We’ve done

our best to delineate the services needed so that firms can assess whether they are interested in the project and put accurate costs to it, but we're not the experts. If you propose any deviations, please also note the amount of additional (or reduced) fees associated with that deviation. Regarding "lengthy discussion of firm experience and personnel qualifications", please see question directly above.

Q: Do you have an idea of the timeframe (days or months) planned for the construction of the proposed improvements at Franklin/Ivar Park? We need to provide in the "Fee Proposal Summary" the costs for the "site inspections during construction".

A: Roughly the current project schedule calls for construction between July 2014 and June 2015. Since the project is only at the Schematic Design stage, a more refined construction schedule cannot be determined at this time. For the Fee Proposal Summary, please assume 5 visits.

Q: Based on our review of regional geologic maps, we anticipate that the site will be underlain at relatively shallow depths by bedrock. In addition, the bedrock may be affected by a fault that crosses the site in an east-west direction parallel to Franklin. Given these conditions and the proposed development, we feel that it will be necessary to do test pits in the slope area below the freeway off ramp for the proposed grading and the retaining walls. At this time we anticipate using a backhoe or hand-dug test pits for this field exploration. In addition, the shallow bedrock may result in refusal for drilling the proposed boring depths. Other than describing our proposed methods of exploration as discussed in the RFP, is there any additional requirement if we deviate from the RFP Scope of Work?

A: There is no additional requirement beyond describing the deviations from the Scope of Work, and noting the associated additional (or reduced) fees.

Q: The RFP indicates that there will be a quick review process. Given the location of the site within the City of Los Angeles, we anticipate that their geotechnical section will review our reports and the plans. Will there be review by others other than the City?

A: The "quick review turnaround" refers to review by the design engineers and MRCA staff, not to permit submittals. The land is owned by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (SMMC), a State agency, so a City permit review is not required. Once engineering is completed, the plans and reports will be reviewed by an independent plan checker to verify compliance with California codes.

Q: Regarding the infiltration testing, is there water available at the site for the testing or do we need to provide the water that is needed?

A: For purposes of the proposal, assume that water will not be available. There is a Caltrans irrigation system onsite, however we have not yet secured permission from Caltrans to tap into this water for the geotechnical investigations.

Q: Has the proposed method/preferred method of stormwater infiltration been selected? If so, what method of stormwater infiltration is proposed?

A: No, a method of stormwater infiltration has not been selected. A non-mechanical, grassy bioswale is most likely.

Q: The fee proposal summary includes a line item for “Site inspection during construction”. The required time of presence of inspector/soils engineer during construction can be significantly affected by numerous factors such as: Contractor’s speed and efficiency, contractor’s schedule, weather condition, complexity of the job, etc... Therefore, providing a lump sum price for this part of the services is practically difficult and usually the firms provide their master fee/rate schedules for inspection and testing services for construction inspection phase (norm of industry). Please clarify that should we need to submit a lump sum cost for the site inspection during construction, or a rate schedule will be acceptable?

A: For the “Site inspections during construction” item in the Fee Proposal Summary, please assume 5 visits for purposes of the proposal. MRCA acknowledges that the actual number of visits may vary and cannot be accurately estimated at this stage of the project.

Q: The proposed number of borings are 4 (other than perc test one), with two of them at the toe of the slope. We propose to do one additional boring at the higher parts of the slope, if accessibility allows. We will address this deviation/additional work in our proposal. Please clarify if this is acceptable.

A: Yes, this is acceptable. MRCA will request the Geotechnical team to coordinate with the structural and civil engineers to obtain the needed results.

Q: In the RFP dated January 7, 2013, one item listed is to perform a slope stability analysis for the proposed cut and fill slopes. Boring locations have also been provided within the RFP. It appears that the stability of the large (40-50 foot high) slope to the northeast will be a major concern. However, no test borings have been shown within that slope area. Is it proposed to have additional borings performed in the slope area, at some future date, so that a stability analysis, based on the soils beneath the existing slope, can be performed? As currently planned, no subsurface exploration is shown within the slope area.

A: No, currently no additional borings are planned for a future date. The boring locations may be adjusted, in coordination with the structural and civil engineers, to obtain the needed information and best results of analysis. MRCA will request the Geotechnical team to coordinate with the structural and civil engineers to achieve this.

Q: Can boring locations B3 and B4 be moved from the bottom of the slope to better locations to give more information regarding the slope stability?

A: Boring locations may be adjusted, in coordination with the structural and civil engineers, to obtain the needed information and best results of analysis.

Q: Should the proposal cover only soil testing or include additional material testing?

A: Only soil testing is in the scope. If you would like to include the fee list for other testing, that is fine, but not required. The design is at a Schematic level and materials have not been selected.

Q: What is the proposed construction schedule?

A: Roughly the current project schedule calls for construction between July 2014 and June 2015. Since the project is only at the Schematic Design stage, a more refined construction schedule cannot be determined at this time.