

Response to questions:

- 1) Should cost estimates submitted with a proposal fall within the amount outlined in "Attachment A – Preliminary Cost Estimates and Funding Breakdown"?

Answer: Cost estimates should be based on the proposers' ability to meet the scope of work as outlined in the request for proposals. However, Attachment A outlines the grant funds that are budgeted to the project and should be considered when developing a cost proposal.

- 2) Does the City have a list of RFP holders and/or pre-qualified consultants?

Answer: The Request for Proposals should be considered a public document for any firm that can meet the requirements outlined in the RFP; all consultants are invited to respond. The City of Burbank does not have a list of pre-qualified consultants for the Project.

- 3) Confirm the project will be designed and constructed in one phase, from Olive Avenue south to Alameda Blvd.

Answer: The Project will follow the traditional phasing outlined in the Local Assistance Procedures Manual; which includes separate design and construction phases. Design services will be needed during the construction phase for construction engineering and construction administration. Please refer to section C (Submittal of Plans, Specifications, and Estimates) on page 19 of the RFP for details of services needed during the construction phase.

- 4) Task 7 on page 16 describes a 5% conceptual design which seems low for identifying environmental impacts. We would recommend increasing this to a minimum of 15%. Please confirm 5% is the intended level of design for this task.

Answer: Proposing consultants should assume a level of detail for the conceptual design that would allow for the identification of environmental impacts.

- 5) Item D-Project Schedule, page 25 describes a 12-month schedule for the work described in the scope of work. Please confirm that would be the design and plan preparation phase only, not the construction administration phase.

Answer: Yes, the 12-month schedule includes the design and plan preparation phase only.

- 6) Does the City have a desired start construction date? Based on the NTP date of Sept. 24th, 2013 and a 12-month design schedule, plus a 3-month advertise/bid/award it would imply approximately Jan. of 2015 which is during the rainy season. Is Jan. of 2015 the desired start of construction?

Answer: The Project is scheduled to begin construction in March 2015.

- 7) Can the City provide record or design plans for the segment south of Alameda to Victory Blvd?

Answer: Yes, a link to download the design plans for Phase I (Lake-Alameda Greenway) has been posted on the Project website. <http://www.burbankca.gov/south-channel-bikeway>

- 8) Do you anticipate adding water quality features along the path? Did the recently completed segment south of Alameda include any WQ features?

Answer: The Project will conform to any and all federal, state, and local requirements for water quality treatment. Please refer to the design plans for Phase I (Lake-Alameda Greenway).

- 9) In the Construction Cost Estimate provided as an attachment to the RFP, there was a plug number for Design and Environmental Documentation of \$318,000. Based on the extensive scope of work described in the RFP including appraisals, ROE/Easement negotiations, Technical Studies, design, surveying, permitting, has the City identified, and if so, can they share additional funding that may be available for the design phase?

Answer: Cost estimates should be based on the proposers' ability to meet the scope of work as outlined in the request for proposals. However, Attachment A outlines the grant funds that are budgeted to the Project and should be considered when developing a cost proposal. There are no additional funds identified for the design phase.

- 10) Would the City consider an extension to the proposal submittal date?

Answer: This Project has a very aggressive schedule that is needed to ensure that all grant funds are expended prior to their expiration. As a result, we are unable to extend the proposal submittal date.

- 11) The feasibility study describes "potential" access points along the channel bike route at W. Elmwood and W. Cedar Avenues. There is no mention of Ash Avenue south of Elmwood where a residential neighborhood exists. Is it the City's intent to provide access at these three locations where the streets end adjacent to the new path?

Answer: The location of access points at intersecting neighborhood streets shall be vetted as part of the design process based on feasibility of design and availability of cost. It is ideal to provide access at as many points as feasible.

- 12) Can the City provide as-built record drawings for Alameda Avenue Street Improvement Plans?

Answer: City staff will work with the Consultant to obtain any as-built plans needed as part of Task 2 of the Scope of Work.

- 13) Does the City have existing right of way information and if they do, in what format? (GIS or CADD?)

Answer: Right of way information is available in PDF format.

- 14) Item 10 of the detailed project description on page 3 indicates: "At Alameda Avenue, a grade separated crossing under this arterial should provide a direct connection to the

existing pathway on the south side of the street. Consideration should be given to maintaining the existing Channel structure, as well as the Alameda Avenue bridge abutments.”

- a. Has a concept plan been prepared for this grade separated crossing?
- b. Is this crossing intended to be within the limits of the existing open channel?
- c. The map exhibit provided by the City calls for a “*Undercrossing via Tunnel*”. Is the intent to provide a separate tunnel adjacent to the open rectangular channel? Unfortunately there is little or no room for a tunnel on the north side of the channel as there are existing catch basins, a storm drain, and private property to the north. The City’s construction cost estimate shows \$515,325 for the Alameda Undercrossing (this may not be adequate depending on the design.)

Answer: The crossing treatment of Alameda Avenue shall be vetted as part of the design process based on feasibility of design and availability of cost. The preferred alternative would be a separate tunnel adjacent to the channel within the flood control right of way. Additional alternatives to be considered may include a cantilevered structure under the existing Alameda Avenue Bridge within the flood control channel or a signalized at-grade crossing treatment.

- 15) Item 7 b on page 27 indicates: “*Describe the experience of the proposer’s project team in detail, including the team’s project manager, and other key staff members, on similar grade separation study projects. For each project, include the client’s name and contact information.*” Is the client’s name and contact information required only for the key company projects and not for projects on individual resumes? Please clarify.

Answer: Client name and contact information should be provided for projects highlighted in the proposal, usually with similar characteristics. Ultimately, it is the discretion of the proposer which projects are highlighted as comparable in scope.

- 16) Can you please add me to the distribution list for any Addenda?

Answer: Any firm that submitted questions will receive an email notifying them that responses have been posted on the Project website. All other proposers are responsible to checking the site for any updates.

- 17) Please clarify or provide preliminary alignment exhibit indicating the number of title reports required for the project and the number of right-of-way acquisitions and rights-of entry anticipated for the project.

Answer: Please refer to pages 2 & 3 of the RFP and Attachments C & D for the preliminary alignment. Identifying the number of title reports, right-of-way acquisitions, and rights-of-entry required should be assumed as work items for Task 4 of the Scope of Work. Based on preliminary right of way research, it appears that only the abandoned railway bridge parcel will need to be acquired for the Project.

18) Please clarify which areas/storm drain facilities are anticipated to be affected by storm runoff and if these facilities are Los Angeles County or City of Burbank facilities. Also, does the City anticipate pursuing the undercrossing options within flood control R/W as outlined in the planning study provided?

Answer: Due to the Project's proximity to the flood control channel, we assume that the Project will likely affect storm runoff to this County facility. Also, there are City and County catch basins within the Project area that may be affected. Identifying these facilities and the potential effects of the Project should be assumed as work items for Tasks 2, 3, 5, & 6 of the Scope of Work.

19) Does the City have existing master plan hydrology/drainage plan maps and calculations available for review for the project area?

Answer: The City does not have a hydrology master plan. The City has access to as-built plans for existing drainage structures within the Project area. Obtaining as-built plans for existing facilities and hydraulic calculations for this Project should be assumed as a work items for Tasks 2, 5, & 6.

20) Please confirm the number and location of signal upgrades requested for the project proposal.

Answer: The Project does not include any traffic signal upgrades within the Project area. It should be assumed that a signalized treatment may be used where the Project crosses Verdugo Avenue and Alameda Avenue.

21) Please confirm whether or not City wants bridge designs for Spazier and Elm Avenue intermediate access points included as a part of this project proposal.

Answer: These bridge structures were screened out as part of the design of Phase I of the Project and should not be included as part of any proposal.

22) Please confirm if bike path lighting shall be included for the entire project limits.

Answer: Yes, solar powered lighting shall be included for the entire Project limits, adjacent to the bike path.