

ADDENDUM NO. 2

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

#PWD 25.604 FOR

**UTILITIES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND PROJECT DELIVERY SERVICES
(PLANNING THROUGH CONSTRUCTION CLOSEOUT)**

This addendum is hereby made as part of the project Request for Qualifications documents. It shall be the responsibility of the general consultant to inform any affected sub-bidder of the content of this addendum.

The contract documents are modified/clarified as follows:

1.0 Update all references for the due date to September 10, 2025

2.0 Replace Appendix C – RFQ & Project Schedule with:

APPENDIX C – RFQ & PROJECT SCHEDULE

The anticipated RFQ and project construction schedule is as follows, consultant shall provide schedule based on consultant's approach:

Advertise:	July 12, 2025
Optional Pre-Bid Meeting:	July 17, 2025
Last date of Questions to be submitted:	August 27, 2025
RFQ Due:	September 10, 2025
RFQ review and evaluation:	September 11 – 19, 2025
Invite for Interviews:	September 22, 2025
Oral interviews:	October 6-10, 2025
Scope & Cost Negotiation with First-Ranked:	October 13–21, 2025
Anticipated City Council Award:	November 2025
Contract Award and Notice to Proceed:	December 2025

Contract Estimated Period: December 2025 through June 30, 2030; Two-year contract with three additional one-year extensions.

ADDENDUM NO. 2**3.0 Update Evaluation Criteria:**

Replace Section 7 “Local Presence (10 points),” lowering the points (to 5 points) and remove Item “c”:

7. Local Knowledge (5 points):

- a. Demonstrate local understanding of working within Pleasanton and working with the Hacienda Business Park/large major commercial complexes.
- b. Firm’s experience delivering similar projects within Tri-Valley area.

Update the score tables to match “References (10 Points)”

8. References (10 points):

- a. Provide as a reference the name of at least three (3) municipal agencies in California you currently are or have previously consulted for in the past seven (7) years.
- b. Each key team member shall include references from previous clients/projects which they have worked for in the past seven (7) years.

Update score tables to reflect the listed reference points changes from the Evaluation Criteria above.

No.	Written Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1	Completeness of Response	Pass/Fail
2	Qualifications & Experience	20
3	Organization & Approach	20
4	Scope of Services to be Provided	15
5	Schedule of Work	5
6	Conflict of Interest Statement	Pass/Fail
7	Local Present	5
8	References	10
	Subtotal:	75
No.	Interview Evaluation Criteria	Weight
9	Presentation by team	10
10	Q&A Response to panel questions	15
	Subtotal:	25
	Total:	100

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Weighted scores for each Proposal will be assigned utilizing the table below:

No.	Evaluation Criteria	Rating (0-5)	Weight	Score (Rating * Weight)
1	Completeness of Response	N/A	Pass/Fail	Pass/Fail
2	Qualifications & Experience		20	
3	Organization & Approach		20	
4	Scope of Services to be Provided		15	
5	Schedule of Work		5	
6	Conflict of Interest Statement	N/A	Pass/Fail	Pass/Fail
7	Local Presence		5	
8	References		10	
9	Presentation by Team		10	
10	Q&A Response to Panel Questions		15	
Total:			100	

4.0 Appendix A Numbering

Page 14, Appendix A, please renumber Contract Professional Services from 11 to 12. Renumber Insurance Requirements 12 to 13.

5.0 Question and Answer

- 1) **Question:** Task 3, page 8, of the RFP. Having a dedicated webpage for this program is a great idea. Will it be housed on the City website or a standalone website? Depending on the answer, we would need to potentially bring in a subconsultant to manage the standalone website. We can also defer this discussion until after the City has made a selection on this RFQ.
Answer: The city would host the website, but the consultant would develop the content. If a sub-consultant is needed to build a custom website, a Task Authorization would be issued.
- 2) **Question:** RFQ, Appendix A – Proposal Requirements, page 14 of 35: Two sections, “Cost Proposal” and “Contract for Professional Services” are numbered as 11. Please confirm that we can consecutively number each section for a total of 13 sections in our proposal.
Answer: Yes; confirmed.
- 3) **Question:** Construction Manager is mentioned as one of the key roles, yet Attachment 2 says the Program Manager will assist with procuring the construction management consultant. Please clarify the role of the “Construction Manager” on the program management team.
Answer: As outlined in Task 8, the Program Manager will facilitate the procurement of the Construction Management (CM) firm that will support the

ADDENDUM NO. 2

program during implementation, design, and construction phases. The intent is to identify the CM firm(s) and the specific Construction Manager who will be involved in the program implementation phase. The City recognizes that CM firm availability may vary from year to year and by project, and that outside firms may be needed to meet specific project demands.

It is expected that established partners will be identified in the proposal as the “go-to experts” for providing input during the program development and early design phases. A key part of standing up the program is establishing the implementation phase of projects and coordinating construction impacts. A CM plays an essential role in ensuring that project impacts, durations, and packaging are optimized to attract competitive bids from available contractors.

The implementation plan must integrate the construction impacts of the utility CIP program with other City projects to avoid conflicts. A CM firm can provide a broader perspective, and having an experienced person or firm involved—especially during implementation plan development—ensures that planning decisions benefit from high-level expertise in impact mitigation, scheduling, and coordination.

- 4) **Question:** Can the selected Program Management firm provide construction management on projects it doesn't design?

Answer: Yes, the City does not see a conflict with the same firm providing Program Management and Construction Management. The City wants to see a separation between Engineering Services and Construction Management and Inspection Services. See Attachment 2, “City Project Objectives,” for more details.

- 5) **Question:** When we procure the necessary design team(s), will that design consultant be contracted directly with the City?

Answer: That has not been determined, and the Qualifications statement should address how the Consultant wants to approach the issue of whether the contracts will run under the primary consultant providing program management or under a contract with the City. See page 30, “Project Design & Bid” section, for more details.

- 6) **Question:** Would an 11” x 17” sized page be allowed for the organization chart?

Answer: No, please keep it per Appendix A, “Proposal Requirements” as stated on page 11.

ADDENDUM NO. 2

All other items of the Request for Qualifications document remain unchanged.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Adam Nelkie", is positioned above a horizontal line.

Adam M. Nelkie

Assistant Director of Public Works/City Engineer