



## RCEA RFP 23-501 Addendum #1: Q&A

*This document contains the questions received prior to the 9/11/2023 deadline for submission of questions, along with the corresponding answers.*

- 1. Does RCEA know which sites require a new electrical service or an existing electrical service upgrade? Or is this expected to be determined as part of the scope of work?**

RCEA is in the process of applying for new, dedicated metered service from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) using their Rule 29 interconnection application for all ten sites.

- 2. Does RCEA anticipate the successful proposer to coordinate directly with PG&E for new services and service upgrades?**

No, RCEA will coordinate directly with PG&E for new service applications and service upgrades.

- 3. Has RCEA selected a charger to be used at each site? If no charger has been selected, please indicate the anticipated ampacity and level for the charger at each site.**

Chargers will be ChargePoint Level-2 chargers CT-4000 series or equivalent.

- 4. Will RCEA be coordinating with the Authorities having jurisdiction for each site and obtaining building permits?**

Yes, RCEA will be coordinating with Authorities having jurisdiction for each site and obtaining building permits.

- 5. Is a variance in the project schedule allowable if there are project delays associated with PG&E or local jurisdiction approval or the property owners?**

Yes, variance in the deadlines noted in the Scope of Work may be allowed if delays are completely outside the control of the Consultant and not caused by any delays or lack of diligence on the part of the Consultant.

- 6. The estimated engineering cost listed in the grant budget summary does not seem to be adequate for the scope of work provided. Is there additional funding available should the engineering costs exceed the estimate within the grant budget summary (Item\_03ci\_ARV-22-008\_Redwood\_Coast\_Energy\_Authority\_ada (ca.gov))?**

This RFP does not restrict proposals to any budget limit. Per the RFP, cost is only one component in RCEA's evaluation criteria and will not be the sole determinant in proposal selection.

- 7. Who will coordinate all the site visits and ensure we have keys to open the electrical equipment at each site?**

RCEA will coordinate with site hosts for any site visits and access to equipment.

- 8. Is it possible to tell us if Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) already have their chargers?**

RCEA has not procured equipment for this project. RCEA will purchase the chargers prior to the start of construction.

- 9. Does RCEA anticipate including ADA compliant signage and path-of-travel between the charging stations and associated facilities?**

RCEA will need to comply fully with ADA requirements. Each site will require ADA compliant signage and path of travel to the charging stations themselves.

RCEA's chargers are for public use and located in public places, and as such are intended to serve the driving public and not to serve the associated facilities directly. RCEA expects the Consultant to interpret the current ADA requirements and advise on the need for accessible path-of-travel between charging stations and the associated facilities at sites where the public's use of each facility varies.

**Was a load study prepared for the project? If so, will a copy be provided to the successful team. If not, will it be requirement for the project?**

No load studies were prepared for this project. It is not anticipated to be a requirement for the project because RCEA is in the process of applying for new, dedicated metered service from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) using their Rule 29 interconnection application for all ten sites.

- 10. Please confirm that no switch gear upgrades will be required.**

RCE does not anticipate the need for switch gear upgrades at any sites. RCEA is in the process of applying for new, dedicated metered service from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) using their Rule 29 interconnection application for all ten sites.

**11. Please confirm that interconnection applications are not required/or will be prepared by the RCEA.**

Rule 29 interconnection applications will be prepared by RCEA for all ten sites.

**12. Please confirm that CEQA EIR will not be triggered for the project.**

The local jurisdiction for each site is the CEQA lead agency. The lead agency will make the CEQA determination.

RCEA does not believe that CEQA EIR will be triggered for this project. RCEA anticipates that the projects will be exempt under section 15301 as minor alterations to existing facilities.

**13. Section III – Scope of Work, under Project Coordination items (b,d, and f) indicate a requirement to coordinate RCEA and stakeholder meetings “as necessary”, as well as providing clarifications and modifications to the plan set after 100% plan set completion “as needed”. Please provide a standard number of anticipated meetings, and additional plan set revision cycles (post 100% design completion) for bid purposes that meets the intent of the proposed Scope of Work. If the “as needed” services are in addition to the T&M not to exceed bid amount, please confirm.**

RCEA does not know the number of anticipated meetings. Proposers are encouraged to state a number of meeting hours and billing rate that are included in their proposal for the “as needed” Scope of Work items identified. It will be RCEA’s discretion to increase the not to exceed amount if RCEA’s needs exceed the amount included in the Consultant’s scope and budget to compensate the Consultant in accordance with agreed upon billable rates.

**14. Will RCEA provide topographic survey data for developing the Site Plans and Parking details required to meet ADA compliance (Scope of Work Section III.A.c)? If not, should topographic survey work be included in the RFP response? If no topographic survey data is anticipated to be required for this project, please explain how accessible route requirements established in CBC Section 11B-812.5 will be met.**

RCEA does not have topographic survey data for sites nor does RCEA have a determination for the need for topographical surveys at any of the sites.

RCEA’s chargers are for public use and located in public places, and as such are intended to serve the driving public and not to serve the associated facilities directly. RCEA expects the Consultant to interpret the current ADA requirements and advise on the need for accessible path-of-travel between charging stations and the associated facilities at sites where the public’s use of each facility varies.

**15. The proposed EV Charging station installations include hospital and university locations. What is RCEA’s approach to project permitting and coordination with DSA and OSHPD? Please confirm if coordination with the Authorities Having Jurisdiction (including submitting applications, review, and providing responses) will be covered by RCEA, or if the proposed Scope of Work should be amended to include such services. If no AHJ coordination is anticipated, please provide assumptions related to this determination.**

RCEA's site investigation and discussions with site hosts at the hospital locations lead RCEA to believe that none of the locations where EV chargers will be installed are governed by the Office for Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) or its successor agency, the Department of Health Care Access and Information, such as at or near administrative facilities.

RCEA expects the Consultant to advise on the need to permit and coordinate with the Division of State Architects. RCEA will coordinate with authorities having jurisdiction and expects the Consultant to be able to meet Division of State Architect requirements and assist in submitting applications, review, and providing responses.

- 16. The RFP indicates that the project is grant funded via the grant agreement titled Alternative and Renewable-Fuel Vehicle ARV-22-008 ("ARV-22-008 Grant"). Is additional supplemental funding available to support project design and implementation if costs exceed the available grant funding, or is project implementation funding limited to the terms and budget established in the ARV-22-008 Grant? Furthermore, is the \$49,310 dollars allotted in the grant for "Civil Engineering Subcontractor" a reliable not to exceed amount for purposes of providing bids in response to this RFP-23-501, or will proposals with bids in excess of the grant budgeted amount be considered?**

This RFP does not restrict proposals to any budget limit. Per the RFP, cost is only one component in RCEA's evaluation criteria and will not be the sole determinant in proposal selection.

-End of Q&A-