



March 21, 2024

**ADDENDUM NO. 3**  
**Request for Proposals**  
**Verdugo Wash Master Plan**

**NOTICE TO ALL PROPOSERS**

Notice is hereby given to all potential Proposers that this is an addendum to the Request for Proposals for Verdugo Wash Master Plan, originally issued on November 14, 2023, and revised and reposted with Addendum 1 on January 11, 2024, and revised and reposted with Addendum 2 on February 28, 2024, and in response to the questions and requests for clarifications received by the third deadline of March 15, 2024, as identified in the revised RFP dated February 28, 2024. This Addendum (Addendum 3) is attached to and made part of the above-entitled RFP from the City of Glendale.

As identified in the revised RFP dated February 28, 2024, page 8, Section II.D Interim Inquiries and Responses; Interpretation of Correction of RFP:

"Request for Clarification regarding Addenda 2 must be received on or before 4:00 PM (PST), March 15, 2024. *Thereafter, further questions, clarifications and objections shall be submitted on Form K – Table of Exceptions as part of the proposal process.*" (*Italics added.*)

No additional addendums will be issued. Noted exception(s) on Form K may be considered and negotiated prior to contract award.

**Instructions:**

- Each Proposer shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 3 on **Form J (Addenda Acknowledgement)** in their submitted Proposal.

**CHANGES TO RFP SPECIFICATIONS**

The RFP deadline is extended from April 15<sup>th</sup> to April 30<sup>th</sup>, by 4:00 PM (PCT).

No changes to the RFP specifications.

**RESPONSES TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION**  
**SUBMITTED ON OR PRIOR TO MARCH 15, 2024**

(grouped according to individual email content)

Q1. Please confirm which forms/info are required from subconsultants:

- Form B - Previous Experience Form (for any projects included in the team's submission)
- Form E - Insurance Requirements Affidavit. NOTE: Subconsultants should sign the Affidavit, but can note to See Form K to indicate objections.
- Form F - Disclosure Campaign Finance Ordinance
- Form G - Public Records Exempt Information, as applicable
- Form D contents: standard hourly rates, identifying each rate by name and position of staff member on the project

A1. Yes, all of the above.

Q2. Question about the required forms for the Verdugo Wash RFP submission – If we include all the required fields, can forms A-K be graphically reformatted?

A2. Yes, the forms can be graphically reformatted, though the preference would be, other than possible font and spacing updates, to maintain the current form formats.

Q3. Addenda 2, General Clarifications indicates that the “Scope of Work Overview” should be attached to “Form C - Proposer’s Qualifications Statement.” This attachment is not mentioned in the RFP. Are there any other instructions pertaining to this attachment that could be helpful to understand your expectations? Is there a page limit?

A3. The consultant’s proposal can be attached to Form C and, to be clear, the consultant’s proposal (Proposal) is not an RFP “form”, but a response to the RFP. The Proposal should also be listed in Form I as an attachment(s) so that City staff can confirm the City has the complete submission. There are no express page “limits”; however, clarity and conciseness are appreciated. The Proposer should indicate in Form I how many pages are contained in each of the attachments submitted.

The Proposal should include a cover letter highlighting an understanding of the project, and the Proposal itself should demonstrate consultants’ approach to completing the proposed scope of work, describe experience and qualifications, include employee resumes, etc., which together should demonstrate Proposer’s qualifications.

Q4. Since Form C should be completed by all subconsultants, shall we, as the Proposer, attach our "Scope of Work Overview" after our own completed Form C or after all of our subconsultant’s completed Form Cs (i.e., directly before Form D)?

A4. See A3 above. The Proposer’s Form C should be attached first, followed by the subconsultants’ completed Form C’s. The Proposal materials should follow the completed Form C and be listed on Form I.

Q5. Addendum 2, A1 advises that a comprehensive list of key staff and subconsultants should be listed as an attachment to “Form D - Price Proposal Amount,” and called out

on "Form C – Proposer's Qualifications Statement." Where on Form C shall this list of key staff be "called out?"

A5. See A3 above. A comprehensive list of key staff and subconsultants should be listed as an attachment to "Form D - Price Proposal Amount." Each subconsultant firm/company must also complete "Form C – Proposer's Qualifications Statement."

Q6. Addendum 2, A12 suggests attaching the Project Schedule from Task 1.2 to "Form C – Proposer's Qualification Statement." Yet, Task 1.2 (on RFP page 27) actually mentions Form D instead of Form C. Since "Form D – Price Proposal Amount" seems more relevant for including the Project Schedule, due to Form C focusing on business structure and operational information, could you clarify if the Project Schedule should be attached to Form C or Form D?

A6. The Project Schedule should be generally described in the RFP Proposal following Form C. However, because the Project Schedule details are linked to Task 1.2 – Budget and Schedule (referenced in the format in Form D – Price Proposal Amount to be used to detail tasks, hours, expenditures, and an explanation of progress made on each task and overall project budget), it makes sense to provide the Project Schedule details and specifics following Form D to be attached to Form D – Price Proposal Amount.

Q7. If a separate Resume attachment is allowed like the example given at the top of Form I, "Employee Resumes – 15 pages," where shall it be attached? Is there a page limit for the total number of Resumes?

A7. See A3 above. Yes, separate resume attachments can either be submitted as part of the Proposal (e.g., exhibits to the Proposal), or submitted separately. In either instance, they should be listed on Form I – Proposal Attachments so that City staff is sure to account for them. To be clear, Form I is a list of attachments only; the example of Employees Resumes at the top of Form I is an example of the attachments that would be included on the list. Individual resumes should not exceed three to four pages, and information should not be duplicated elsewhere in the Proposal.

Q8. We noticed there is no liability limit and no waiver of consequential damages. Does the City intend to include these at a later date?

A8. The insurance limits for Professional Liability, Worker's Compensation, Commercial General Liability, Automobile Liability are identified in the updated Exhibit 2 – Insurance Requirements for the RFP, dated February 28, 2024. With respect to consequential damages, Proposers must set forth the basis for requesting a deviation from the Professional Services Agreement on Form K.

Q9. Does "Form E – Insurance Requirements Affidavit" require attachments such as completed insurance certificates?

A9. Yes, within fourteen (14) days of being selected as the consultant the consultant will need to provide the required insurance certificates and endorsements. See RFP dated February 28, 2024, page 9 and 21, and Form E, page 98.

Q10. We're a corporation without a corporate seal, which isn't legally required in California. Can the City accept our submission without one?

A10. A corporate seal is used to stamp or emboss an important business document to show that it is authorized and approved by the board of directors of the company. California Corporations Code section 207(a) authorizes a corporation to adopt, use and alter a corporate seal at will. While California does not mandate use of the Corporate Seal, if the Corporation has a Seal, then it is preferable to use it as an efficient means of indicating the execution of the document is authorized. See Page 80 of Form A.

Q11. Regarding the RFP's requirement for wet signatures on page 16, could you clarify if this applies to all forms signed by subconsultants or only those signed by the Proposing (prime) firm? Preferably, we'd request the latter to reduce the complexity of collecting wet signatures from subconsultants for the submission.

A11. The City consents to the use of digital signatures under the following conditions:

- The parties must consent to do business electronically.
- The signature must be associated with the record.
- The signing person must have had the intent and authority to sign and bind the organization.
- The transaction must be linked to a method of confirming the sender's identity (e.g., AdobeSign, DocuSign).

Q12. A12 from Addendum #2 indicates that 'No description is required for Project Understanding or Scope of Work Approach'. Page 17 on the RFP Method of Selection Indicates that Project understanding and Creativity in approach are weighted in the Qualifications evaluation. Can you please clarify if Project understanding and approach will be considered as part of the evaluation criteria?

Verbatim from Addendum #2

“Q12. Where shall we describe our Project Understanding, Scope of Work Approach, Proposed Project Schedule, and our Proposed Subconsultant Team? The forms do not mention this, though we see it is part of the evaluation criteria listed on Section V.A. (page 17 of the RFP).

A12. No description is required for Project Understanding or Scope of Work Approach; these are topics for staff's evaluation of the RFP proposal. The Proposed Project Schedule is noted in Task 1.2 and should be attached to Form C – Proposer's Qualification Statement; note – the term of the initial contract is 36 months, as noted in 1.C Term of Services and Contract (page 4). The Proposed Subconsultant Team should be also identified as one of the attachments to Form I – Proposal Attachments, and also called out in Form D – Price Proposal Amount and Form F.”

A12. Thank you for delving further into the questions and answers in Addendum #2, A12, above. We understand your question and apologize for any confusion the prior answer created. The Proposal should contain the proposer's understanding of project, the proposer's scope of work approach to the project and the proposer's project work schedule based on what the City is seeking in the RFP. See also A3.

Q13. We have a follow up question regarding completion of Form E: Insurance Requirements Affidavit by subconsultants:

If subconsultant firms are required to sign a document affirming they will meet the requirements, may they include a comment on the Affidavit that they will meet it "WITH EXCEPTION/S; SEE FORM K FOR DETAIL", and include their exceptions on Form K? If so, please indicate where this comment should be located on the Form E. OR would you recommend they complete the Affidavit, unsigned, and include their exceptions on Form K. OR may we provide the Affidavit from subconsultants that are completed but not signed, followed by detail in Form K. Otherwise please advise.

A15. If consultants or subconsultants sign Form E, they can add "With Exceptions: See Form K for Detail" on Form E. Please be mindful that while the City will consider proposals with objections, those proposers that sign the Form E Insurance Affidavit without objection will receive greater weight in the evaluation process.

Q14. What is the anticipated budget for this project?

A14. \$6,000,000 has been budgeted for the Master Plan. See Addendum 1, Q&A #19 and Addendum 2, Q&A #14.

Q15. Is the City open to capping portions of the Wash and using it for real estate and economic development potential?

A15. No. Not at this time.

Q16. Should the Verdugo Wash be expected to carry more water in the future due to climate change and/or growth in regional urban development?

A16. The Verdugo Wash Visioning Plan includes a hydrology and freeboard analysis that evaluates the 1 in 100 year storm event and includes an additional contingency for climate change. Consultant proposals should use this benchmark data in designing proposed wash improvements.

Q17. Does the City have specific goals for transportation mode shift (e.g., automobile to bike/pedestrian) along the corridor?

A17. The Visioning Plan offered a high level concept of what is possible, with an overview of how the Verdugo Wash could accommodate open space, active transportation, and sustainability features. While the initial concepts serve as a baseline, the Master Plan should address the potential transportation mode shifts along the corridor. See Appendix B: Mobility Considerations - Access Point Candidate Study in the Visioning Plan. <https://www.verdugowash.com/>

Q18. Are there specific communities with limited English proficiency that the public outreach should reach? If so, which languages should be priority?

A18. Yes. See RFP dated February 28, 2024, page 36. "All engagement and outreach materials shall be translated for multilingual audiences (e.g., Armenian, Korean, Spanish, Tagalog), as needed or requested by the public."

Q19. In addition to overhead power lines, does the Verdugo Wash right-of-way contain any other utilities?

A19. Documentation on utilities shall be provided at the start of the project, once the contract is awarded. See Addenda 1, Q&A 76.

Q20. What are the Cities' highest priorities for new bike/pedestrian or vehicular bridge locations?

A20. See Appendix B: Mobility Considerations in the Visioning Plan.

Q21. What are the Cities' highest priorities for bridges that need to be redesigned to accommodate the future multimodal use of the corridor?

A21. See Appendix B: Mobility Considerations - Access Point Candidate Study in the Visioning Plan.

Q22. Is a cover letter / transmittal letter allowed? Can this be included as an attachment?

A22. Yes, a cover letter is allowed and encouraged to be part of the Proposal. The cover letter should be identified in Form I as an attachment, even though it is one of the first pages in the submitted Proposal.

Q23. Can Form D be supplemented with an attachment which includes / outlines suggested provisions for reimbursable expenses?

A23. Yes. Provisions addressing reimbursable expenses should be outlined as part of the proposal submittal and can be added as an attachment to Form D for City staff's consideration as part of the Proposal.

Q24. Per engagement and outreach materials shall be translated for multilingual audiences (e.g., Armenian, Korean, Spanish, Tagalog). Can this be an expense on an as-needed basis based upon the need or request as noted?

A24. See A18.

Q25. If there is another addendum, will you accommodate another deadline extension?

A25. This Addendum #3 is the final addendum to the RFP, any additional questions, clarifications, or objections may be included on Form K – Table of Exceptions, as part of the proposal submittal. See page 1 of this Addendum No. 3. **The deadline to submit proposals is extended from April 15, 2024, to April 30, 2024.**

Q26. For Form B, Can we add more than 3 projects for each consultant?

A26. Yes, the City may consider more than three projects for the principal consultant, provided they are comparable in scope and cost to the Verdugo Wash Master Plan, however, proposers should not add more than three projects for each subconsultant. The portfolio of work should not exceed the identified 75-page limit.

Q27. Regarding Form F, can we edit the form to ensure all requested information is included? Or can we provide an additional page?

A27. "Form F – Disclosure – Campaign Finance Ordinance – Contractors and Subcontractors" cannot be "edited", but it can be supplemented with additional information.

Q28. Regarding Form K, may we compile a list including all subconsultants, or would you rather receive a Form K from each firm individually? If compiled, shall the Prime sign it on behalf of the team?

A28. Each separate consultant or subconsultant that has objections to the RFP should separately fill out and sign a Form K Table of Exceptions.



*The following questions are in reference to Sections 5.1.1 & 5.1.4 from the RFP:*

*“5.1.1 After completing the Master Plan Framework refinement described in above Task 5.1, use the City’s traffic model to prepare a draft Traffic Study that analyzes the effects on traffic flow for the areas immediately adjacent to and that provides access to the Verdugo Wash along Glendale’s surface streets in comparison to existing traffic conditions. Also, the study shall discuss how the introduction of the Verdugo Wash linear park could potentially reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and average daily trips.”*

*“5.1.4 Transportation Study must include Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis per requirements of SB743 and City’s Transportation Analysis Guidelines”*

Q29. Will the City staff provide the transportation modeling and VMT analysis? Or will the City authorize the City’s consultant to work directly with the Project consultant to conduct the transportation modeling and the VMT analysis?

A29. Yes, the City will run the TRANSCAD modeling for the Project and selected consultant will prepare the VMT analysis. In the event additional modeling is required, the City has a transportation consultant that can prepare more complicated modeling based on the Project needs. .

Q30. What will be the cost of various model runs so that they can be incorporated into the Project fee?

A30. See A29 above. In the event that additional modeling beyond the City’s scope and capability, City will work with the selected consultant to determine the potential cost.

Q31. According to the City of Glendale Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, Section 2.1.3, VMT Methodology, Metrics and Significant Impact Thresholds -Table 2 under “other land Uses, what thresholds and impact criteria will be used for Recreational Facilities?

A31. The City will determine the thresholds that trigger specific impact criteria for each project on a case-by-case basis. These thresholds define the levels at which certain impacts become significant and require mitigation measures.

In this specific case, the project is characterized as recreational but also serving as an alternative mode of transportation within the Active Transportation Program (ATP). This dual function may influence how thresholds are defined and impacts are assessed.

The following question is in reference to Sections 5.1.2 from the RFP:

*“5.1.2 The Traffic Study shall also analyze the proposed project’s transportation impacts per the significance criteria included in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Traffic Study shall be structured to be used as substantial evidence to support the CEQA analysis.”*

Q32. In addition to the CEQA & VMT analyses, is the City requiring non-CEQA analysis including Intersection and roadway segment Levels of Service (LOS) calculations for various Project alternatives/scenarios? If so, can the City identify which arterial(s), e.g., Verdugo Road, La Crescenta Avenue, and major intersections along those arterial(s) will require LOS analysis?

- A32. Yes, some LOS analysis may be required. The scope of CEQA and non-CEQA project's impacts will be determined based on a stable project description in the Master Plan and then the City's Traffic Engineer staff will determinate what, if any, LOS analysis will be necessary. The specific scope of CEQA and non-CEQA/Transportation Analysis review and the requirements will be guided by these outcomes.

Please note that the RFP submittal deadline is being extended from April 15, 2024, to **APRIL 30, 2024.**

Regards,



BRADLEY CALVERT, AICP  
Director of Community Development



Vilia Zemaitaitis, AICP  
Deputy Director of Community Development