

**CITY OF RIO VISTA REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR HSIP CYCLE 11 PROJECTS**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

1. Do you want separate proposal for each project?  
ANSWER: No
2. Do you want tabs to separate the sections that will not be in the page count?  
ANSWER: Yes
3. Do the cover and back count against the 35 pages?  
ANSWER: No
4. Is the cover letter included in the 35 pages?  
ANSWER: No
5. Do resumes need to be double spaced?  
ANSWER: No
6. Can we please get a copy of the grant document?  
ANSWER: Yes, they will be uploaded to the website.
7. In the RFP under Qualifications it states, "2. Summarize the firm's demonstrated capabilities, including length of time that your firm has provided the services being requested in the .Can we please get the rest of the sentence?  
ANSWER: 2. Summarize the firm's demonstrated capabilities, including length of time that your firm has provided the services being requested in the proposal.
8. In the RFP under Qualifications it states, "2. Summarize the firm's demonstrated capabilities, including length of time that your firm has provided the services being requested in the proposal". Please confirm that number 2 is for the company and not each specific project we list.  
ANSWER: Confirmed
9. Please confirm that in the Qualifications section items 4, 5, 6, and 7 are supplemental information for the projects we identify in #3.  
ANSWER: Confirmed
10. Do the projects examples we provide need to be completed?  
ANSWER: The firms work must be completed, project construction does not need to be complete.
11. In what section do you want the schedules placed?  
ANSWER: Project Summary
12. Will the City consider accepting electronic proposals in lieu of hardcopies?  
ANSWER: No

13. Would the City reconsider the 12 pt. font w/double spacing requirement? While the 35-page limit is ample, the font size and spacing make the page-limit much more stringent.  
ANSWER: No
14. What is the overall project budget?  
ANSWER: \$491,040.00
15. What amount of HSIP funding has been awarded to the City?  
ANSWER: \$491,040.00
16. What is the overall project schedule? When is construction anticipated to begin?  
ANSWER: Overall schedule not developed. Anticipated construction January 2025.
17. What design milestones would the City prefer (i.e. 50%, 90%, 100%)?  
ANSWER: Pre-design meeting and then 90% and 100%
18. Will the City prepare the required Local Assistance forms?  
ANSWER: Consultant to prepare, in conjunction with City assistance.
19. Will the City prepare the Caltrans Encroachment Permit for the N Front St pedestrian improvements?  
ANSWER: Consultant to prepare, in conjunction with City assistance.
20. Are overhead utilities anticipated to be placed underground to accommodate proposed improvements?  
ANSWER: No
21. Airport Road is in need of paving, will paving of Airport Road be included in this project?  
ANSWER: No
22. The RFP states a Class II Bi-Directional Bike lane is to be installed on Norman Richardson, please clarify the intent is to install Class II bike lanes on each side of the roadway as currently exists on Poppy House Road.  
ANSWER: To be reviewed and determined during design
23. The STA Active Transportation Program identifies Airport Road for a future Class I mixed use pathway whereas the RFP calls for Class IV bi-directional bike lanes. Please clarify the intent is to install Class IV bi-directional bike lanes along Airport Road.  
ANSWER: Current project is for Class IV bike lane for this segment. Possible conversion to Class I mixed use in the future.
24. The existing utility poles along Airport Road appear to be in conflict with the Class IV bike lane. Is the intent to keep the utility poles in place or will the poles be in the buffer area between the bicycle lane and the travel lane?  
ANSWER: Intend to keep utility poles in place and be in the buffer area between the bicycle lane and travel lane. To be reviewed and determined during design

25. RFP mentioned boulders in the Class IV buffer area. Do you mean bicycle separator post or channelizers?

ANSWER: Boulders are intended to be an inflexible barrier. To be reviewed during design.

26. Airport Rd and Church Road

a) Per MUTCD, RRFBs are not allowed to be installed at a stop controlled intersection.

i) Is the intent to add flashing stop signs at this intersection?

ANSWER: Flashing stop signs exist. To be reviewed during design.

ii) Is the intent to include the RRFB at the Airport/Norman Richardson (where Airport Rd is uncontrolled) instead of at Church Road?

ANSWER: To be reviewed during design.

b) Please confirm the limits of sidewalk extension. There are no nearby facilities to tie into.

ANSWER: Sidewalk extension to include minor lengths for transitions to existing conditions. To be determined during design.

27. N Front Street and SR84

a) The RFP calls for (4) curb ramps, RRFBs, crosswalk striping, yield markings, signage, and sidewalk extensions.

i) Please clarify the intent of adding the proposed improvements. Are the new improvements intended to connect residents in the mobile home community and surrounding area north of SR12 (along SR84) to the City's waterfront area and Fishing Pier?

ANSWER: Concurrent path of travel improvement project to connect mobile home community to curb ramps.

ii) Please provide more information on the limits of sidewalk extension for this area as no sidewalks are currently installed other than at the Logan/N Front St intersection.

ANSWER: Sidewalk extension to include minor lengths for transitions to existing conditions. To be determined during design. .

iii) What drove the City to include these improvements (resident complaints?) Is this project going to supplement a future project that may have additional path of travel improvements?

ANSWER: Yes, the project is to supplement future path of travel improvements.