



1503 N. IMPERIAL AVE., SUITE 104
EL CENTRO, CA 92243-2875
PHONE: (760) 592-4494
FAX: (760) 592-4410

November 16, 2020

SUBJECT: Request for Proposals Addendum 5

To Prospective Respondents:

As part of this Addendum No. 5, ICTC has posted an updated Instructions to Proposers (ITP) document on the Project website reflecting changes in response to Proposer questions and requests for information and clarification received to date. Please check the Project website for the Amended Instructions to Proposers incorporating these items as well as Addenda updates and revisions as appropriate.

ICTC has received several questions related to Book 1 – Contract.

Response: Book 1 – Contract is the Draft Design-Build Contract based on the Caltrans Design-Build Contract Template. As such, the Contract is based on the experience Caltrans has gained while delivering its statewide design-build program.

While ICTC generally agrees with some of the comments and associated suggested revisions we have received, at this time, we continue to review the Draft Design-Build Contract to adapt it to the Calexico East Port of Entry Project and look forward to discussing specific comments and revisions with the Best Value Proposer during Contract negotiations.

Until that time, ICTC does not anticipate posting an updated Design-Build Contract on the Project website.

The following are clarification and updates based upon questions posed by potential respondents. As appropriate, Book 2 – Project Requirements is updated and revised as noted in the Response to the questions or comments:

1. Will there be a Hydraulic Analysis Report and/or Scour Report, as deliverables, required for the All-American Canal in connection with the bridge widening plans? (as per Book 2 Section 9.3.2)?

Response: Book 2 Section 9.3.2 on Page 9-4 – Add a fifth open bullet (○) to the list following the solid bullet (●) item “For scour analysis for the bridge:”

Any required scour analysis can be presented in a brief memorandum noting assumptions and protection requirements. As noted in the Instructions to Proposers, the existing sheet pile protection wall at the Canal bank shall be extended to accommodate the bridge widening work.

**CITIES OF BRAWLEY, CALEXICO, CALIPATRIA, EL CENTRO, HOLTVILLE, IMPERIAL, WESTMORLAND,
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND COUNTY OF IMPERIAL**

2. Book 2, Section 6.3.2 – Submittal Review Times. The second paragraph states ten working days for review times as a default for when times are not specified, but the table 6-2 under other reports states 20 working days. Please revise table 6-2 from 20 working days to 10 working days in the Other Reports category.

Response: Book 2 Section 6.3.2 on Page 6-2 – In Table 6-2: Design Submittal Review Times, in the next to last row “Other Reports, Plans, and Memoranda with review times not established in the Project Requirements,” change “Twenty (20) Working Days” to “Ten (10) Working Days.”

3. Book 2, Section 6.3.2 – Third Paragraph: ICTC does not guarantee review times of third parties. Please change this paragraph to state that all third party reviews will run concurrent with ICTC and will have the same review times as outlined in table 6-2.

Response: Book 2 Section 6.3.2 Page 6-2 – Add the following to the end of the third paragraph.

ICTC will work with third party reviewers to provide concurrent reviews. To the extent possible, third party reviews will have the same duration as ICTC’s.

4. Book 2, Section 6.3.3 – Review Process. Paragraph three states that there is no limit on resubmittals. Please change this paragraph to limit resubmittals on two resubmittals and add that reviewers cannot add new comments after their initial review and any resubmittal is only intended to address initial comments from reviewers.

Response: Book 2 Section 6.3.3 Page 6-3 – Add the following sentence to the end of the third paragraph.

To the extent possible, resubmittals will be limited to two resubmittals. Subsequent reviews following the initial submittal will focus on reviewing items noted in the previous review and to the extent possible will avoid incorporating new or additional review comments or comments from reviewers not involved with the initial submittal review.

5. Book 2, Section 6.3.3 – Fourth Paragraph: change the words “ICTC’s satisfaction” to “comply with the contract standards in Table 6-1 or to ICTC’s satisfaction”

Response: Book 2 Section 6.3.3 Page 6-3 – Revise the first sentence in the fourth paragraph from “...ICTC’s satisfaction.” to “...comply with the standards in Table 6-1: Submittals and Review Process Standards and Requirements or to ICTC’s satisfaction.”

6. Book 2, Section 6.3.3 – Fourth Paragraph: Add a sentence. “Any third party comments that create conflicts with ICTC comments or other third parties comments shall be resolved by ICTC without impacting the Design Builder”

Response: Book 2 Section 6.3.3 Page 6-3 – Add the following sentence to the end of the fourth paragraph.

To the extent possible, ICTC will resolve conflicting third party comments without impacting the Design-Builder.

7. Book 2, Section 6.4.1 – Table 6-3. Please amend the table to state that if roadway or structures have multiple packages the metering will apply to individual packages and will not be treated as a single roadway or structures package.

Response: Book 2 Section 6.4.1 Page 6-5 – Add the following sentence to the first paragraph following the continuation of Table 6-3: Design Submittal Requirements:

If roadway or bridge submittals include multiple packages the Table 6-3 Design Submittal Requirements shall apply to the individual submittal packages.

8. Book 2 Section 6.4.3.2 Resubmittals. First paragraph, second line to change “prior” to “initial” and change “in a manner satisfactory to the commenting party” to “in a manner that is in accordance to the contract requirements or in a manner satisfactory to the commenting party”.

Response: Book 2 Section 6.4.3.2 Page 6-7 – Delete the second sentence in the second paragraph and replaced as follows. “Each resubmittal shall address all comments received from the initial submittal in a manner in accordance with the Contract requirements or in a manner satisfactory to the commenting party.”

9. Book 2, Section 9.3.2 – Can ICTC confirm that scour and hydraulic analysis of the All-American Canal is/is not required? The project Preliminary Foundation Report in the Project Report states that scour is not expected. However, in Book 2 Section 9.3.2 a scour analysis is listed as required. If a scour analysis is required, is a separate Bridge Design Hydraulic Report required in addition to the project Drainage Report?

Response: See response to Question No. 1.

We thank you for your interest in this Project.