

CAPITAL PROGRAM SERVICES
5750 ALMADEN EXPRESSWAY
SAN JOSE, CA 95118-3686
TELEPHONE (408) 630-3004
FACSIMILE (408) 979-5631
www.valleywater.org
scvwdplanroom@valleywater.org

Notification of this Addendum is transmitted via email to all firms on the current RFQ Participant List.

This Addendum is posted on the District website at

http://www.valleywater.org/design-build.aspx.

March 17, 2016

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.

ltem No.	Activity	Latest Date	
1	Issuance of RFQ	January 15, 2016	
2	RFQ Pre-Submittal Conference	February 11, 2016 at 10 a.m.	
3	Deadline to submit questions and requests for clarification	February 22, 2016 March 14, 2016	
4	Last day for DISTRICT to issue addenda	February 29, 2016 March 21, 2016 March 24, 2016	

Item No.	Activity	Latest Date March 11, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. April 1, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. April 15, 2016 at 2:00pm	
5	Deadline to submit completed SOQ		
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: Financial Capability Evaluation Template v.2 posted on the District's website. http://www.valleywater.org/Design-Build.aspx.

GENERAL QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question No.	P3 RFQ Section	Question/Response
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.

Question No.	P3 RFQ Section	Question/Response
		Response: This District will consider this and more details will be outlined in the RFP stage.
26.		 Question: The inflation calculator at the link provided in the RFQ only works up to \$10 M. May another source be used for converting to 2015 dollars, such as http://www.usinflationcalculator.com/ for calculating the inflation? Response: 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.
27.	Section 3.3.	Question: Is there a PLA that will be part of this Project? Is there an opportunity to discuss arguments against a PLA? NO PLA. Response: Please see response to Question 10 from P3 Addendum #2.
28.	Section 3.1.	Question: When will Draft contracts be available to proposers? Response: The District anticipates providing a draft termsheet for the P3 Project to shortlisted Respondents prior to release of the RFP.
29.	Section 2.2.	Question: 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? Response: 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.

Question No.	P3 RFQ Section	Question/Response
30.		 Question: Would the district be interested in a project that produced more that 45,000 af/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