

ADDENDUM NO. 2
TO THE RFP DOCUMENTS for
A-Frame Transmission Line Replacement Project
CITY OF HOMER, ALASKA

Addendum Issue Date: September 11, 2025

Proposal Submittal Date: September 24, 2025

Previous Addenda Issued: One

Issued By: Leon Galbraith, P.E.
City Engineer
City of Homer

Notice to Proposers:

You must **acknowledge receipt of this addendum** by including the Addenda Acknowledgement Form with the proposal.

Proposers are required to acknowledge each addendum separately on the Addenda Acknowledgement Form. Any proposals received without acknowledgment of addenda may be rejected prior to evaluation.

The RFP Documents for the above project are amended as follows (all other terms and conditions remain unchanged):

The following questions have been received by City of Homer and are answered as follows:

1. Q. Is the City open to including an additional stage/deliverable on the front end of the project? We propose a “Pre-Design/Planning” stage before the 35% where we would perform survey, Geotech, and a site investigation as soon as possible (ideally snow free conditions) and develop an Alternatives Analysis Memo to compare the different viable installation alternatives based on the site findings.

A. Yes, we are open to the design scope including a preliminary study of alternatives.
2. Q. In the event the City is open to entertaining the “Pre-Design/Planning” stage and Alternatives Analysis Memo described above, then there is the potential that multiple alternatives may be proposed with varying levels of design effort needed. At this stage, proposing firms can propose on the design but will need to budget conservatively if a more technical solution is needed for the successful installation. Would the City be open

to limiting the fee proposal to cover the pre-design/planning stage and the design/services during construction fee can be developed after the preferred installation method is selected? This path would allow firms to tailor the design and services during construction fee to the selected method which has the potential to result in project design savings for the City.

A. No, the submitted design proposal should include all deliverables for the full project under a single design task order with associated fee.

3. Q. We understand that there is a PRV vault at the top of the hill, a PRV station mid-hill, and another PRV station at the bottom of the hill. What are the limits of scope for this project? Are we to replace pipes inside the PRV vaults/stations, or are we routing the pipe to/from isolation valves outside of the vaults/stations?

A. The scope of the project is focused on replacing the existing water main only. The existing PRV stations should be protected in place to the extent feasible and new pipe connected to existing isolation valves where possible.

4. Q. Geotech investigation on the hill will be challenging and will likely require the use of handheld equipment. At the top and bottom of the hill there are flat spots that can be investigated. Would the City be open to providing an operator and excavator equipment for easy access test pit locations to save on project costs?

A. Yes.