

**Addendum No. 1
Connecting People to Coyote Valley**

To: Request for Proposals Recipients
From: Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority
Date: February 6, 2025
Re: Addendum 1 to RFP 2025-02

Addenda No. 1 consists of:

Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority has received the following questions in response to its Request for Proposals (RFP) for Connecting People to Coyote Valley.

1. Would the teams that emerge from these RFP processes be interfacing with an existing team leading the Coyote Valley Conservation Areas Plan?

Work led by the master plan's prior consultant team concluded in December 2024. The teams that emerge from these RFPs processes will form a new consultant team for the Coyote Valley Conservation Areas Master Plan. That said, the teams that emerge from these RFPs will be interfacing closely with an existing team composed of Authority, POST, and City of San José staff, as well as the Authority's technical advisors.

2. The RFP identifies consultant team qualifications on page 10 that include geotechnical engineering, structural engineering, and cost estimating. The scope of work also suggests the need for architecture. Should architectural design be represented on the team?

Architectural design and engineering for small structures should be represented on the project team. Architectural design is expected to be limited to small structures typically associated with open space preserves such as shade structures, restrooms, etc. That said, the team should be prepared to conduct siting and high-level conceptual design of more substantial structures that may be explored during conceptual planning, such as interpretive or educational facilities, agricultural structures, etc. Detailed design and engineering for any larger structures would be put out to bid separately.

3. Given that the roads in Coyote Valley are not owned/controlled by the SCVOSA, what road work/traffic engineering do you anticipate coming out of Phases 3-8?

The Authority is coordinating all street design work that takes place via CVCAMP with the San Jose Department of Transportation (SJDOT) and Santa Clara County Roads Department. Conceptual designs generated by CVCAMP will be reviewed by either or both departments, depending on what jurisdiction the street falls within. Authority-led work on street design would conclude with conceptual design. Pending funding and capacity, detailed design, engineering, and construction of these conceptual plans would be led by SJDOT or County Roads. The exception to this would be if conceptual planning results in the City and/or County determining portions of existing street right-of-way are surplus and those lands are transferred to the Authority.

Addendum No. 1
Connecting People to Coyote Valley

- 4. Can the CPCV design team assume that the consultants hired for the parallel CPLL scope of work will be available for questions and project support?**

Yes, close coordination between the CPCV and CVLL teams will be key to the project's success and will be facilitated by the Authority. Time for coordination should be included in both teams' scope and budget.

- 5. Can the CPCV design team assume that the community engagement process is facilitated by the CVCAMP Community Engagement Team? i.e. the CPCV team may invent or design processes and graphics, but the logistics of scheduling meetings, inviting stakeholders etc. would be done by others with attendance by the design team.**

Yes, the Community Engagement Process will be planned and facilitated by the CVCAMP Community Engagement Team. The CPCV team will primarily play a support role, creating content needed to communicate the project and attending engagement events as needed.

- 6. Formatting questions: Is there a required size for the RFP— 8.5 x11 or 11x17? Is there a required page orientation—portrait or landscape? Are the page limits assuming single-sided or double-sided pages?**

- Please use 8.5 x 11-inch layout.
- Page orientation can be either portrait or landscape.
- Page limits assume a double-sided page counts as two pages.

- 7. Task order projects requiring construction documents: Do we need to have a complete team for all disciplines including structural engineering, irrigation, etc. or can we add team members based on future scopes? For example, we would not have an irrigation designer for the masterplan but would potentially need one for the task orders.**

Yes, please form a complete team needed to complete the scope as outlined on pages 8-9.

- 8. Does it disqualify a CPCV design team to have a member of the science advisory panel on the team?**

At this time, Science Advisory Group work has been limited to defining broad project goals and objectives and reviewing site assessment-related deliverables. Members of the group have not engaged in or advised on contracting nor have they had a role in preparing or assisted in preparing the CPCV and CVLL RFPs and are not participating in the RFP selection process. As such, the Authority would not disqualify a CPCV or CVLL team if a Science Advisory Group member were proposed as staff for the team. However, if the selected team included a current member of the Science Advisory Group, the Authority would require them to step down from their role on the Science Advisory Group to avoid future conflict of interest.

- 9. For the final master plan that combines work from both the CPLL and the CPCV teams, who will lead the document organization and production?**

The CPCV team will be primarily responsible for leading master plan document organization and production.

Addendum No. 1
Connecting People to Coyote Valley

- 10. Is there a schedule or planned timeline for task 3? We see that it will be completed in 2025, but we wanted to know if there was any additional information about number and timing of reviews, etc.**

The timeline and schedule will be discussed and finalized with the selected teams. That said, the Authority would like Phase 3 (Restoration Scenarios & Program Lists) to be completed in July 2025. The Authority anticipates that the most complex and time-intensive deliverables in Phase 3 will be associated with Task 3.3: Preliminary Habitat Restoration Scenario Refinement. Deliverables associated with that task are the responsibility of the CVLL Team.

Two-weeks should be budgeted for each round of Interagency CVCAMP Planning Team review of major deliverables produced by the consultant team. The number of review rounds will depend on the complexity of the deliverable and the nature/extent of Interagency Team feedback on the first draft. Generally, two rounds of review should be scheduled for major deliverables.

Please Note: The following questions were submitted for RFP-2025-03 Coyote Valley Landscape Linkage and are shared here because the answers are also relevant to RFP-2025-02:

- 11. Are consultants who are currently contributing to CVCAMP conflicted out of proposing on these RFPs?**

Consultants no longer under contract with the Authority who contributed to prior phases of CVCAMP *and* who do not have a conflict of interest because they have not been engaged in or advised on contracting nor prepared or assisted in preparing the CPCV and CVLL RFPs, may submit a proposal. However, Consultants currently working for the Authority are expected to continue working for the Authority as provided under their existing contracts with the Authority. The Authority will facilitate coordination between the team hired via the RFPs and consultants currently under contract with the Authority.

- 12. Would the Authority consider extending the proposal deadline given the complexity of the RFP?**

No. The Authority does not plan to extend the deadline.

- 13. What is the Authority's expected budget for Phase 3 and for Phases 4-8 of the project?**

The Authority's anticipated budget for Phase 3 of the Coyote Valley Conservation Areas Master Plan (CVCAMP) is approximately \$250,000. Coyote Valley Landscape Linkage Team work is anticipated to cost approximately 75% of that total. The anticipated budget for Phases 4-8 of CVCAMP is approximately \$2,500,000, pending further refinement and Authority Board approval of future fiscal year budgets. The Coyote Valley Landscape Linkage Team component of the Phase 4-8 work is expected to cost approximately half of that total.

- 14. Would it be possible to provide the draft opportunities and constraints report?**

The Opportunities & Constraints Report is in draft form and not yet available for review. The report will be provided to selected consultants as part of on-boarding.

Addendum No. 1
Connecting People to Coyote Valley

- 15. The Team Organization and Resumes section on page 13 asks for “resumes for all team members who may work on future projects as part of this RFP” – Does OSA want a resume for every single staff person who may work on projects under the RFP, or just key personnel? Also, should these resumes be provided for anyone who may work on projects under the RFP for all phases (3-8)?**

Please include resumes for key personal; Resumes are not required for every single person who may work on the project. However, the team’s proposed rate schedule should include all titles/positions the team anticipates may work on the scope, and the names of individuals currently assigned to those positions.

- 16. On page 13, the RFP indicates that the description of Relevant Experience is limited to 10 pages – Would discussion of the experience and qualifications of individual staff proposed for this work fall within this 10-page limit, or does staff experience fall under “Team Organization and Resumes” and outside the 10-page limit for Relevant Experience?**

Qualifications of individual staff should be included with the Team “Organization and Resumes” section. The “Relevant Experience” section is primarily meant to highlight three to six projects of the team’s choosing that demonstrate the *team’s* work on similar projects, including information, photos, graphics, that would not typical be found on a resume. If relevant, examples that demonstrate past partnerships between the prime consultant and any subconsultants(s) are especially helpful.

- 17. Page 14 states “The Vendor shall provide a list of at least three (3) clients (include names of contact persons, telephone numbers, brief description of the work performed) for whom services similar to those required by this RFP have been performed” – Should all three references be for the prime consultant? Are references for subconsultants required?**

The RFP defines the “Vendor” as the Prime Consultant. As such, references are only required for the prime consultant. In addition to the references provided, the Authority may also contact project sponsors regarding Vendor and subconsultant work on projects included in the Relevant Experience section.

- 18. Page 14 states “The Vendor must provide a statement that indicates agreement to the terms of the contract (Attachment 1), including an agreement to meet the insurance requirements – Are all subconsultants required to meet the insurance requirements?**

The agreement will be between the Prime Consultant and the Authority, not subcontractors. The Prime Consultant is responsible for all subcontractors and the insurance that the Prime Consultant acquires should cover work by its agents, employees and independent contractors or subcontractors.

Addendum No. 1
Connecting People to Coyote Valley

- 19. The Proposed Rate Schedule section on page 14 states “A summary of potential direct expenses and non-labor related charges should also be included”, but on page 19, Appendix B states “As explained in the Response Format and Required Information Section of the RFP, the Authority requests Vendors submit a preliminary scope, schedule and budget only for Phase 3.” Should the summary of potential direct expenses only include those that may be necessary for Phase 3, or for Phases 4-8 also?**

The rate schedule should include rates for potential direct expenses associated with the scope defined on pages 8 and 9. This rate schedule will apply to all phases of CVCAMP.