



CLARIFICATION MEMORANDUM NO. 1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS ENGINEERING CONSULTANT SERVICES

RICKARD RD: GROFF RD TO US 20 IMPROVEMENT

APRIL 24, 2020

The following is a list of questions received and responses by the Agency in regards to the Request for Proposals:

- **Question 1** - *Could you please provide me with any road research records that you have for this road?*

Agency Response to Question 1 – The Agency will not be conducting road research for or providing road records to individual proposers at their request during the RFP advertising period for this project; rather, the Agency will conduct research and provide records to the successful proposer upon award of a contract. In the meantime, please prepare your company’s proposal based on the information given in the Request for Proposals and readily-available public records.

- **Question 2** - *Will Deschutes County want to widen Rickard Rd between Gosney Rd and mile post 5.06 to 32 feet?*

Agency Response to Question 2 - Widening of Rickard Rd between Gosney Rd and Mile Post 5.06 is not part of the scope of this project at this time.

- **Question 3** - *Is Deschutes County looking for a recommendation from a geotechnical consultant for asphalt and base rock thickness? Or will a standard County road section suffice?*

Agency Response to Question 3 – The Agency will not be requiring a pavement design by a geotechnical engineer as part of this project; the Agency anticipates that an appropriate pavement section will be selected by Agency staff and the consultant.

- **Question 4** - *How are you defining a "Page", front and back or just front?*

Agency Response to Question 4 – As the proposals are to be submitted in PDF format, a page would be one side of a printed 8.5 X 11 sheet.

- **Question 5** - *What is the minimum Font Size?*

Agency Response to Question 5 – No minimum font sizes are required, but proposers are encouraged to use appropriate font sizes so that the average reader can read the text of a proposal when printed on 8.5 X 11 paper without the use of a magnifying instrument.

- **Question 6** - *Page size 8.5x11 or can 11x17 pages be used for graphs and schedules?*

Agency Response to Question 6 – All proposal page sizes shall be 8.5 X 11.

- **Question 7** - *Does the Cover sheet count as a page?*

Agency Response to Question 7 – The cover sheet would not be included in the maximum page allowances given in the "Evaluation Criteria" portion of the RFP unless a proposer inexplicably included information that would be evaluated under the given criteria on the cover sheet.

- **Question 8** - *Do you anticipate that the intersection realignment will require ROW acquisition from the BLM property to the north of the Rickard Road ROW? If so, have any preliminary discussions been held with the BLM?*

Agency Response to Question 8 – The Agency intends to keep the intersection realignment at US 20 within the existing right of way but recognizes that a BLM right of way grant may be advantageous. The Agency has not yet contacted the BLM regarding this matter and intends to contact the BLM only when the 30% plans have been completed and the project team has determined that a BLM right of way grant is necessary.

- **Question 9** - *Has any discussion or coordination with ODOT been done regarding the intersection realignment with Hwy 20?*

Agency Response to Question 9 – Yes.

- **Question 10** - *Do you anticipate any ROW acquisition for the vertical curve profile improvements section? Easements or Fee takes?*

Agency Response to Question 10 – No.

- **Question 11** - *We are assuming that Deschutes County will be responsible for ROW acquisition once the legal descriptions are provided?*

Agency Response to Question 11 – That assumption is correct.

- **Question 12** - *Are you aware of any requirements for environmental reviews for the project?*

Agency Response to Question 12 – No.

- **Question 13** - *We are assuming that we will include erosion control plans in the design, but the contractor will be responsible for obtaining a 1200-C permit if required.*

Agency Response to Question 13 – The Agency will obtain a 1200-C permit using the erosion and sediment control plan prepared by the Consultant.

- **Question 14** - *What is the level of public involvement/ knowledge of the project and do you anticipate any negative feedback from local residents?*

Agency Response to Question 14 – The Agency has had numerous interactions with interested members of the public regarding this project, as Rickard Rd is presently used as an “Eastside Bypass” for traffic between Hwy 97 south of Bend and Hwy 20 to the east. The Agency always receives some level of negative feedback when delivering capital improvement projects; the Agency does not anticipate an unusual level of negative feedback with this project.

- **Question 15** - *Are there any other ‘hot-button’ issues that we should be aware of regarding this project?*

Agency Response to Question 15 – No.

- **Question 16** - *The scope of services does not include any contract administration or construction engineering services. Do you anticipate the consultant providing services through the bidding and award process and/or construction oversight?*

Agency Response to Question 16 – The Agency will be performing construction administration and construction engineering for this project. The Consultant will provide bidding assistance and prepare the final right of way survey upon completion of the project.