ADDENDUM NO. 4
TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR A PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT WITH REGARDS TO THE EXPEDITED PURIFIED WATER PROGRAM

Project No. 91304001

Notice is hereby given that the following revisions, additions, and/or deletions are hereby made of, and incorporated into, the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for a Public-Private Partnership between the Respondent and the District with regards to the District’s Expedited Purified Water Program (PROJECT).

SECTION 4.3 Procurement Schedule

REPLACE Procurement Schedule with the table below:

Following is the procurement schedule for the RFQ process and anticipated milestones for the RFP process and subsequent steps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Latest Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Issuance of RFQ</td>
<td>January 15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RFQ Pre-Submittal Conference</td>
<td>February 11, 2016 at 10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deadline to submit questions and requests for clarification</td>
<td>February 22, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Last day for DISTRICT to issue addenda</td>
<td>February 29, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Latest Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5       | Deadline to submit completed SOQ | March 11, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.  
April 1, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.  
April 15, 2016 at 2:00pm |
| 6       | DISTRICT notifies Respondents if they have made the shortlist (“proposed shortlist”) | April 18, 2016  
May 9, 2016  
May 23, 2016 |
| 7       | Deadline to appeal DISTRICT’s evaluation results | April 27, 2016  
May 18, 2016  
June 1, 2016 |
| 8       | Appeal hearing conducted by DISTRICT | May 6, 2016  
May 27, 2016  
June 10, 2016 |
| 9       | DISTRICT issues appeal decision(s) and final shortlist of Respondents | May 16, 2016  
June 13, 2016  
June 30, 2016 |
| 10      | DISTRICT conducts Pre-RFP Workshop with shortlisted Respondents | Week of June 6, 2016  
Week of July 11, 2016  
Week of July 25, 2016 |
| 11      | Issuance of RFP | June/July 2016  
July/August 2016  
August/September 2016 |
| 12      | DISTRICT selection of project delivery method and Stage1 counterparty(ies) | December 2016  
February/March 2017 |

**ATTACHMENT E PART V: FINANCIAL INFORMATION**

*REPLACE* C. FINANCIAL CAPABILITY EVALUATION TEMPLATE with:

**GENERAL QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>P3 RFQ Section</th>
<th>Question/Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25.          | Section 3.1.1. | **Question:**  
Would the District accept a 30% design as part of the RFP if it resulted in a GMP at the proposal stage for the P3 option? i.e., shortening the Stage 1 process. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>P3 RFQ Section</th>
<th>Question/Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> This District will consider this and more details will be outlined in the RFP stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> The inflation calculator at the link provided in the RFQ only works up to $10M. May another source be used for converting to 2015 dollars, such as <a href="http://www.usinflationcalculator.com/">http://www.usinflationcalculator.com/</a> for calculating the inflation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Respondents may work around this limitation in the inflation calculator by dividing the input value by 1000 and then multiplying the output value by 1000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Section 3.3.</td>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> Is there a PLA that will be part of this Project? Is there an opportunity to discuss arguments against a PLA? NO PLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Please see response to Question 10 from P3 Addendum #2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Section 3.1.</td>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> When will Draft contracts be available to proposers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The District anticipates providing a draft termsheet for the P3 Project to shortlisted Respondents prior to release of the RFP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Section 2.2.</td>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> Would the district accept a P3 proposal for the plant expansion only, with the offsite / pipelines /recharge basins / injection wells procured as a separate project under the Design/Build track?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The District would consider a P3 proposal for the SVAWPC Expansion Project only. A Respondent making such a proposal should identify the specific benefits to the District of a P3 Project definition that only includes this component. It should be noted that a limited scope in the submittal may impact the score/ranking of such a respondent, unless the respondent can demonstrate why such a proposal would be superior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question No.</td>
<td>P3 RFQ Section</td>
<td>Question/Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 30.         |               | **Question:**
              |               | Would the district be interested in a project that produced more than 45,000 a/f/y? If yes, what would be the maximum volume the district would be interested in?  
              |               | **Response:**
              |               | While the District welcomes creative ideas from Respondents, a project with production capacity in excess of 45,000 is beyond the current scope of procurement.  
| 31.         | Section 4.3.  | **Question:**
              |               | Is it possible that the District would consider an extension to the deadline to submit a completed SOQ for the P3 process? The complexity of the dual process is making solidifying a P3 team more difficult and if we could get another two weeks it would improve our submittal.  
              |               | **Response:**
              |               | Please see revised Section 4.3. Procurement Schedule.  
| 32.         | Section 5.C.  | **Question:**
              |               | In Section 5C (page 30), the language provides guidance on the submittal by Volumes 1 and 2. On page 56, it requires that the Appendix 1 SOQ Transmittal Form be attached. Should this be form be attached to Volume 1 or 2?  
              |               | **Response:**
              |               | The requirements of Part I Section C "Execution and Certification" are satisfied by execution and certification of Appendix 1: Proposer Form. Respondents should include the executed and certified Appendix 1: Proposer Form as part of Volume 2.  

**THIS ADDENDUM NO 4, WHICH CONTAINS 4 PAGES, IS ATTACHED TO AND IS A PART OF THE RFQ FOR PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP SERVICES FOR THIS PROJECT.**

Katherine Oven, P.E.  
Deputy Operating Officer  
Water Utility Capital Division  
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