

City of Eureka



ADDENDUM 1 TO THE

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

FOR

COLD STORAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY

PROJECT NUMBER: 07-06-07096

Submission Deadline January 7, 2015

ADDENDUM 1:
RFQ #07-06-07096 COLD STORAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY

To all general contract bidders of record on the Work titled:

COLD STORAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY

This addendum is issued as supplemental information to the **RFQ #07-06-07096 COLD STORAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY**. This addendum includes the following points of clarification:

1. Revised due date of proposal.
2. Number of pages and attachments required.
3. Process for submitting questions from this point forward.
4. Requirements for references.
5. Insurance requirements.
6. Meeting minutes from the December 18th conference call. Meeting minutes include the questions asked by consultants and the answers provided by the City. The minutes also include a list of consultants that attended the meeting.

Information regarding each of the above items is provided in the following pages.

1. Revised due date of proposal.

The original RFP indicated that the submission deadline is January 7, 2015. This addendum changes the due date to 5pm on Thursday, January 15, 2015.

2. Number of pages and attachments required

On page 12 of the original RFP, the maximum number of pages was limited to 40 pages. This addendum removes the page limit restriction. As of the release of this addendum, there is no page limit for proposals. However, the City encourages consultants to submit concise and well-organized proposals.

As a part of the proposal, the City requests basic work samples, including concept designs and cost estimates for facilities that are similar in nature to the Cold Storage Facility that is the focus of this project. There is no required format for these work samples; work samples may be submitted as attachments.

Accordingly to page 11 of the original RFP, consultants must submit an unbound proposal and four (4) copies, as well as one (1) fee estimate in a separate sealed envelope. This requirement does not change as a part of this addendum. Each of the proposals submitted must be identical in content, including attachments.

3. Process for submitting questions from this point forward.

Questions may be submitted via email to Maggie Gurley (mgurley@ci.eureka.ca.gov) no later than close of business on January 5, 2015. Note that the City will publicly share all submitted questions and answers. By close of business on January 7, 2015, the City will post a response to all additional questions as Addendum #2. Addendum #2 will be placed on the City's website and distributed via email. Note that the City will not release an Addendum #2 if no additional questions are submitted to the City.

Note that questions and answers from the December 18th pre-submittal meeting/conference call are listed in the final pages of this current addendum (Addendum #1).

4. Requirements for references

The original RFP requires information regarding professional references to be included in consultant proposals. Several consultants have asked for clarification regarding formatting requirements. The City has determined that consultants are free to interpret this requirement. The City expects to see references, but the City will not hold consultants to a specific format or number of references. The City recommends that consultants provide at least three references that are relevant to the type of work associated with this RFQ. References may be included as part of the sample work products.

5. Insurance Requirements

On Page 14 of the RFQ, the City requested a minimum of \$2 million in Employer's Liability coverage per accident for bodily injury or disease. However, per this addendum, the City will accept a minimum of \$1 million in Employer's Liability coverage for this project.

RFQ #07-06-07096 COLD STORAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY

MINUTES

December 18, 2014

Time: 1:30pm – 2:30pm

Council Chambers 531 K Street, Eureka, CA 95501

Attendees

Rob Holmlund – City of Eureka, Director of Community Development

Cindy Trobitz-Thomas – Director of Economic Development

Miles Slattery – City of Eureka, Director of Parks and Recreation

Steve Salzman – Greenway Partners

Melanie Barnett – Greenway Partners

Ken Bates - Humboldt Fisherman’s Marketing Association

Linda Hildabrand - Eureka Commercial Fisherman

Jesse Willor - GHD

Henry Pontarelli – Lisa Wise Consulting

Stephen Wahlstrom – Wahlstrom & Associates

Keith Castonguay – Marginal Implications

Philippe Lapotre – Lapotre Architects

Matt Kowta & Aaron Nousaine– BAE

Cal Kerr & Mike Fisher – Northern Economics, Inc.

Ken Davlin - Oscar Larson Engineers

Questions and Answers from the December 18th Meeting/Call with Consultants

1. Greenway/Steve Salzman - What is the source of funding for the study?
 - a. The funding source consists of \$25,000 from EDA and a \$25,000 match from the City.
2. Jesse Willor/GHD –Regarding the “demand assessment and survey tool.” Does City have a small tool survey that captures the intent of what the City is looking for and is there something in mind for that task or is it open to the consultant?
 - a. The format of the survey tool is open to the consultant, but should be designed to sufficiently accomplish the requirements of the scope of work.
 - b. In collaboration with City staff, it is the consultant’s responsibility to define market segments and to determine how the survey will be designed and implemented.
 - c. Ken Bates: This depends on what the consultant puts together but from the point of the fishing fleet, a wider view rather than a narrow view is desired – not only the local fishing fleet but people outside this area as well.
3. Ken Davlin/Oscar Larson Engineers - Do you have a database or a list of potential users and contact information?
 - a. The City does have some contact names and information that can be provided to the selected consultant. However, it will be the responsibility of the consultant to identify other relevant contacts and to build a contact list.
 - b. The city and some of our contacts can provide the consultant with a list but it will be the consultant’s responsibility to build upon that list and ask them who they think we should be talking too. “Snowball

sampling.”

- c. Ken Bates stated that he has a good database of commercial fishing customers. Linda Hildabrand has a good list too and is involved in organic farming and has good connections with local farmers in need of cold storage. However, these lists should not be considered comprehensive of everyone that will need to be contacted during the study. The selected consultant will be responsible to identify other relevant contacts and to build a contact list.
4. Ken Davlin – Is there any consensus yet or idea of the realistic options of operational and management responsibility of such a diverse market segment service grouping? Because that speaks to the reality as to whether or not it can be functional from an economical point of view or not.
 - a. The City is seeking assistance from a consultant to answer these questions. This is the basis of the RFQ. The City expects the selected consultant to work with the City to determine under which ownership/operational models a Cold Storage Facility could be feasible.
 - b. For more information, see deliverable 7 on page 8 of the RFQ.
 5. Steve Wahlstrom - Tell us about the EDA fish plant and how it relates to this project?
 - a. Cindy stated that back in the 1970s, the City of Eureka applied for EDA funding to build the fish plant on the waterfront at the foot of Commercial, which is operated by Pacific Choice, a subsidiary of Pacific Seafood. They lease and operate the facility and are in charge of maintenance etc. Other tenants rent space in the building. Very successful project. However, this facility does not have sufficient cold storage for their own use. Accordingly, the proposed Cold Storage facility would complement the existing fish plant.
 6. Would it be possible for the Cold Storage Facility to be privately funded?
 - a. Yes. The City would support a privately funded and operated facility. But, the study should also look into other funding sources and operational models.
 - b. The City is seeking assistance from a consultant to answer this question. This is the basis of the RFQ. The City expects the selected consultant to work with the City to determine under which ownership/operational models a Cold Storage Facility could be feasible.
 7. Clarify the level of detail expected for the cost estimates. It is the consultant’s responsibility to consider and recommend various sites, but there really isn’t enough of a budget here to fully ID the costs to develop all of those sites. Costs are functional on title searches, lien constraints, and other conditions on property and my assumption is the consultant would have to deal with this on a preliminary basis.
 - a. The City is seeking the most accurate cost estimates feasible given the current scope and budget.
 - b. Generally, the City is seeking “order of magnitude” costs for “representative” sites.
 - c. In producing cost estimates, some line items will need to be “speculative.” Estimates should show ranges and/or orders of magnitude.
 8. Does the City have a list of sites or does consultant find/ supply?
 - a. The City has pre-identified some sites that we believe may be workable. However, the first several tasks of the project will determine facility size and type. Accordingly, it is not possible at this time for the City to confidently identify candidate sites.
 - b. The answer to this question depends on the results of deliverables 1, 2, and 3.
 - c. To answer this question, the consultant will first need to determine the optimum facility design. Accordingly, it is up to the Consultant to determine what the optimum facility looks like and that will determine the parameters required for site identification and/or site selection. At this time, the City cannot provide a list of sites because we do not know what the optimum facility looks like. The City will definitely be involved in site selection process, but it will be the responsibility of the selected consultant to do the bulk of this work.

9. Ken Davlin? - What's the City's protocol for site security?
- a. The answer to this question depends on the results of deliverables 1, 2 & 3, the optimum facility design, and the ownership/operational model. So, it is up to the Consultant to determine what the optimum facility looks like and that will determine the parameters required for site security.
10. BAE Matt & Aaron – Provide a list of who is on the Cold Storage Committee.
- a. Tentative Cold Storage Committee (subject to change)
 - i. Dawn Elsbree: Headwaters Foundation (replaced by Nicole Morrow, Interim Headwaters Director)
 - ii. Denise Vanden Bos: HSU
 - iii. Cindy Bedingfield: Redwood Acres, Agricultural Interests
 - iv. Don Ehnebuske: RREDC (replaced by Virginia Fisher, Interim Executive Director)
 - v. Don Smullin: Eureka Chamber of Commerce
 - vi. Ken Bates: Fisherman Marketing Association
 - vii. Linda Hildebrand: Fishing and Farming
 - viii. Clint Victorine: Beef Industry
11. Aaron BAE - Given the committee was formed in an informal way, can you elaborate on how you will communicate with committee? RFQ states the committee will have to sign off on every deliverable and from an administrative perspective we want to make sure that that could be a collaborative, cooperative and efficient process.
- a. The committee may be invited by the City to some meetings. The City will coordinate with the committee when necessary. The consultant will not be responsible for coordinating with the committee.
 - b. Upon submittal of each deliverable, the City will coordinate with the committee for our internal review process. The City will then provide to the consultant a single set of tracked change comments for each deliverable.
12. Aaron BAE - RFQ states that you would like some work samples, designs and product cost estimates. I am curious as to what type of format is part of the official qualifications or is it supplementary? How much do we supply? Part of submittal – part of the 40 page limit?
- a. On page 12 of the original RFP, the maximum number of pages was limited to 40 pages. This addendum removes the page limit restriction. As of the release of this addendum, there is no page limit for proposals. However, the City encourages consultants to submit concise and well-organized proposals.
 - b. As a part of the proposal, the City requests basic work samples, including concept designs and cost estimates. There is no required format for these work samples.
13. Would you want multiple copies of attachment?
14. Accordingly to page 11 of the original RFP, consultants must submit an unbound proposal and four (4) copies, as well as one (1) fee estimate in a separate sealed envelope. This requirement does not change as a part of this addendum. Each of the proposals submitted must be identical in content, including attachments. Aaron BAE - Page 10 item 7 Related Experience asks for references for all project examples or if you want some limited number and if you want those for subs as well as for contractor?
- a. Consultants are free to interpret this requirement. The City expects to see references, but the City will not hold consultant to a specific format or number of references. However, the City recommends that consultants provide at least three references that are relevant to the type of work associated with this RFQ.

15. Steve Salzman – Given the funding source, budget and scope, how flexible is the budget and scope? Did EDA prepare this scope or did City of Eureka approach EDA?
- a. The scope in the RFP is based on the scope in the City's grant that was submitted to EDA. The granting agency requires that the City maintain the same scope that was submitted in the grant proposal. Accordingly, the consultant must retain the scope in the RFP. In addition, the budget is not flexible. However, it is possible for the consultant to interpret scope items and develop creative approaches as necessary to accomplish the scope within the required budget.
16. Steve Wahlstrom – Is it possible to submit questions via email going forward?
- a. Questions may be submitted via email to Maggie Gurley (mgurley@ci.eureka.ca.gov) no later than close of business on January 5, 2015. Note that the City will publicly share all submitted questions and answers. By close of business on January 7, 2015, the City will post a response to all additional questions as Addendum #2. Addendum #2 will be placed on the City's website and distributed via email. Note that questions and answers from the December 18th pre-submittal meeting/conference call are listed in the final pages of this current addendum (Addendum #1).
 - b. Note that the City will not release an Addendum #2 if no additional questions are submitted to the City.
 - c. The original RFP indicated that the final submission deadline is January 7, 2015. This addendum changes the due date to Thursday, January 15, 2015.
17. Phillippe Lapotre – Anybody considered other items such as controlled substances/medical waste? Focus on waterfront?
- a. These questions should be answered by the consultant during the study.
18. Aaron BAE—On Page 14 of the RFQ, the City is requesting a minimum of \$2 million in Employer's Liability coverage per accident for bodily injury or disease. We currently carry \$1 million per accident. Would the City be willing to consider a lower minimum coverage amount?
- a. Yes, the City will accept a minimum of \$1 million in Employer's Liability coverage.