



ADDENDUM NO. 2

AND QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Water Meter Replacement & AMI Replacement Project

Project No. PWD 25.604

The additions, changes, and/or deletions contained in this ADDENDUM shall be made a part of the proposal solicitation documents for the above-referenced project, and shall be subject to all applicable requirements thereunder, as if originally shown and/or specified. It shall be the responsibility of the contractor to inform any affected sub-bidder of the content of this Addendum.

The Contract documents are modified/revised as follows:

ADDENDUM:

- 1) RFP-1 Process and Timelines, Page 2 is updated as follows in Section 2 Contract for Advanced Metering Infrastructure Solution (AMI Solution), replace paragraph 2 with:
The project phase is expected to start on or around April 2026 with a Substantial Performance date of October 31, 2027. Following project completion, the Contractor will be required to ensure the continued operation of the AMI Solution for up to 20 years.
- 2) WB-A Bid Evaluation and Ranking is updated as follows:
Page 2, Section 6: Installation Services, Minimum Threshold is set to 40.
Page 3, Technical Bid Evaluation and Demonstration/Exception Scoring. The final sentence is struck:
~~**Technical Bid Evaluation and Demonstration Score = (Technical Bid Score + Demonstration Score) x 70%**~~

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

- 1) A change was made in addendum 1 to require a Class A license. The original RFP allowed Class A or the applicable C-class license. What drove the shift to Class A only and whether that change is intended to be permanent for this project?
 - a) After additional internal review, the City determined that the overall scope of work including large-scale meter replacements, installation of new appurtenances, potential excavation, traffic control, site restoration, and work on public water system infrastructure meets the definition of work that requires a Class A (General Engineering) contractor under the California Contractors State License Board (CSLB). The change was made to ensure consistency with CSLB

requirements and to avoid any ambiguity regarding contractor qualifications for public works construction. At this time, this clarification is intended to apply only to this project based on the scope described in the RFP.

- 2) Since the meter manufacturer or distributor bidding on turnkey AMI projects is typically not performing the actual meter installation scope, and the licensed subcontractor would be the one installing the meters, does the City expect the prime bidder to hold the Class A license, or would the requirement be met if the installation contractor holds the appropriate license?
 - a) The City requires that the prime contractor hold the appropriate license. In this case, a valid Class A license because the prime will be responsible for the full scope of work and overall project delivery. While licensed subcontractors may perform portions of the installation work, the prime contractor must independently meet the licensing requirement to be eligible for award. This is consistent with CSLB rules, which require that the entity contracting directly with the City possess the license required for the project's primary scope. It is the prime contractor's responsibility to select qualified, properly licensed subcontractors to perform specialized portions of the work. The City does not have a direct contract with, or direct management responsibility over, any subcontractor. The prime contractor remains the sole responsible party under the City's contract.
- 3) Can any additional information be provided regarding the potential space provided by the City for use by the Contractor?
 - a) The site measures 155' long x 40' wide. Portable power and bathrooms would be needed. The area is fairly level with compacted material but is not paved. There is no covered space available. The site is fenced and has a lockable gate. Temporary lighting would be necessary if working early or late.
- 4) What is the prevailing wage for the installation?
 - a) Refer to Addendum 1, question 39.
- 5) In Bid Evaluation and Ranking (WB-A), it seems as if the Technical Bid and Demonstration maximum score should be 700, so that when added to the Financial Bid (max score 300) scores are out of 1,000 and the Technical Bid and Demonstration are weighted 70% of the total. The bottom of page 3 of WB-A defines Technical Bid Evaluation and Demonstration Score equal to (Technical Bid Score + Demonstration Score) x 70%. This would give a max Technical Bid and Demonstration Score of 490 which would not be weighted 70% total when added to the maximum Financial Bid Score. Could this be clarified?
 - a) The Technical Bid Evaluation and Demonstration/Exceptions scores will be added for a maximum total of 700 points and will not be multiplied by 70%. The total for Technical Bid and Demonstration/Exceptions represents 70% of the total available points.
- 6) Page 2 of WB-A says that a minimum score of 40% is required for each section of the Technical Bid Evaluation, but Section 6: Installation Services shows a minimum score of 60%. Is this meant

to be 40% as well or is that an exception to the minimum score requirement for each section of the Technical Bid Evaluation?

a) The minimum threshold for Section 6: Installation Services should also be 40 points, or 40%.

7) Scope of Work (RFP-2) 4.2.22 states that all uninstalled meters must have end caps. Do meters sealed in airtight packaging from the manufacturer without end caps fulfill this requirement?

a) No. Meters are required to have end caps.

8) Is the date for Substantial Performance October 31, 2027 or December 31, 2027? RFP-1 Process and Timelines states both.

a) The Substantial Performance date is October 31, 2027. The Project Total Performance date is December 31, 2027.

9) RFP-2 Section 2.2.1 states: "All components of the meter reading system shall be FCC approved, where appropriate."

Clarification Requested: May the City confirm whether FCC approval must be obtained prior to bid submission, or whether approval may be finalized prior to deployment?

a) FCC approval is required prior to bid submission.

10) RFP-2 Section 2.2.3 requires full submersibility and UV-protective material.

Clarification Requested: Does the City require continuous full-time submersibility beyond IP68 and formal UV resistance testing?

a) Yes. The City requires continuous full-time submersibility. UV rating / testing has not been asked.

11) RFP-2 Section 2.3.1 allows standalone or third-party networks

Clarification Requested: Can the City confirm if a specific communication protocol is preferred (e.g., LoRaWAN, LTE)?

a) The City does not have a preference for a specific communication protocol.

12) Software SSO & ArcGIS Requirements

RFP-2 Section 2.4.1.3 mandates SAML 2.0 or OIDC.

RFP-2 Section 2.5.1.4 requires ArcGIS compatibility.

Clarification Requested: Are these mandatory, or would API and Google Maps integration be acceptable?

a) The City's preferences are described in these sections, but the City may accept alternative solutions. Exceptions to RFP-2 Scope of Work should be outlined in your response to Section 7 of the Technical Questionnaire.

13) Accessory Compatibility and Local Procurement

Clarification Requested: May the contractor procure locally standard accessories while supplying core components from the manufacturer?

a) Contractors must provide a fully functional total solution as specified in the Scope of Work.

Components to a solution may be sourced per Contractor preference; please identify all relevant parties to your bid as a part of your proposal.

All other items of work in the contract document remain unchanged. Acknowledgement and a signed copy of this Addendum shall be included in the Bid Proposal.

Daniel Villaseñor

Daniel Villaseñor, Management Analyst

Tamara Baptista

Tamara Baptista, Project Manager
Assistant Director of Public Works – O&M

ACKNOWLEDGED:

Company _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Title: _____