

**Addendum No. 1
Coyote Valley Landscape Linkage**

To: Request for Proposals Recipients
From: Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority
Date: February 6, 2025
Re: Addendum 1 to RFP 2025-03

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 the Coyote Valley Landscape Linkage.

1. 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.

2. Would the Authority consider extending the proposal deadline given the complexity of the RFP?

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

3. 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.

4. How are you defining watershed restoration for this project? Is it focused on stream and wetland restoration?

Watershed restoration for this project refers to the restoration of the Fisher Creek watershed in the project area, which includes both stream and wetland restoration, and Laguna Seca.

5. 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
Coyote Valley Landscape Linkage

- 6. Under Scope of Work, page 9 states that one of the required tasks may be “Support environmental permitting and other associated deliverables, such as Section 106 consultations” – Will the CVLL team need to include cultural resources expertise, or would any necessary technical work on cultural resources be performed by Albion Environmental as suggested in the RFP?**

The Authority expects technical work to be performed by its on-call archaeological consultant, Albion Environmental. In-house archaeological expertise within the CVLL team is not required; however, familiarity with working on habitat restoration projects in archaeological sensitive areas is beneficial.

- 7. 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.

- 8. 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.

- 9. 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.

**Addendum No. 1
Coyote Valley Landscape Linkage**

- 10. 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.

- 11. 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.

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

- 12. 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.

- 13. 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.

- 14. 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.

Addendum No. 1
Coyote Valley Landscape Linkage

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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.