



**Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA)**

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND PROPOSALS  
Design Services for the MTA Bus Charging Infrastructure Project**

**Addendum #2**

06/13/2025

**Questions (Q) & Answers (A):**

1. Q: For 3.v. – Qualifications, Related Experience and references of the proposing company, can we show more than the 3 references for over projects? Are you looking for the reference sheet in addition to us showing our project experience, or is the project experience to be shown only on the reference sheet 2E form?

A: Yes. The reference sheet should be provided in addition to your demonstration of project experience in your proposal.

2. Q: Can we show project references and/or references on the Attachment 2e from our subconsultant?

A: Attachment 2E should be completed based on the prime consultant's experience. Any subconsultant experience should be included in the Qualifications, Related Experience, and References section of the proposal.

3. Q: Please confirm that the scope includes the design of a new canopy and solar array only at Ukiah. There will be no new canopy at Fort Bragg?

A: A new canopy will be installed in Ukiah. There will not be a canopy at Fort Bragg.

4. Q: Are there any current geotechnical reports available from MTA or would the Consultant have to acquire it themselves?

A: Consultant will be responsible for generating geotechnical reports.

5. Q: Are there surveys for both sites?

A: No.

6. Q: At the Ukiah site, is the intent to extend the existing canopy or is intent to construct the new canopy as a separate structure? Figure 3 callout says "location of new extended solar PV canopy" while Section B Ukiah objectives says "the new canopy structure will be adjacent to the current solar canopy structure."

A: The intent is to construct a new canopy structure adjacent to the existing canopy.



7. Q: If extending the existing canopy, are the original canopy calculations available? Is the Consultant expected to retrofit the existing canopy to add on the extension?

A: See response to Question 6.

8. Q: Are the original canopy as-built plans available?

A: No.

9. Q: Can MTA confirm that the respondent should be an Owner's Engineer and that MTA is not soliciting design-build proposals from developers?

A: The awarded proposer will be the owner's engineer throughout the project. MTA is not soliciting a design-build proposal.

10. Q: Does MTA have a ZET transition plan for their fleet that can be shared?

A: Yes. See the Zero Emission Bus Rollout Plan available at <https://mendocinotransit.org/procurements/>

11. Q: Could MTA please share details of any incentives or utility programs that MTA is currently pursuing or has secured that will affect this project (e.g. PG&E EV Fleet applications or grant/incentive programs)

A: Visit <https://www.pge.com/en/clean-energy/electric-vehicles/ev-fleet-program.html> to learn more about the program that MTA is engaged in.

12. Q: Does MTA intend to leverage any Federal grants or incentives for this project? Is the project contingent on receipt of those grants?

A: No.

13. Q: Does MTA want the design for future chargers to include conduits, pull boxes, foundations and/or bollards at the future charger locations, or just electrical capacity and stubouts at the switchboard?

A: MTA's intention for designing future chargers is to incorporate conduits, pull boxes, foundations, and/or bollards at the designated charger locations, along with all necessary information to procure and install these chargers without requiring additional design services.

14. Q: Should proposers assume the area lighting and lighting control systems for all parking areas should be reviewed and potentially updated as part of this project?

A: Yes.

15. Q: At the Ukiah site, will the canopy structure, PV system, and generator be installed in the same construction project as the EV chargers?

A: It is MTA's intent to install all equipment at the same time.



16. Q: Please confirm if the canopy design at the Ukiah site should match the existing canopy structure that includes a watertight roof with PV modules attached on the roof?

A: MTA is looking for a more contemporary design for the new canopy structure, which should feature photovoltaic panels on the roof.

17. Q: MTA mentions “canopy aesthetic design”. Should we assume a canopy similar in structure and aesthetics to the existing canopies?

See response to Question 16.

18. Q: Should we assume the base design to be solar ready, with optional scope for full PV design/integration with existing solar?

A: Yes.

19. Q: Should proposers include scope to obtain permits from MCAQMD for the generators or will MTA obtain them?

A: The awarded Consultant is responsible for obtaining all necessary permits to begin construction on both sites.

20. Q: Does the MTA require a soundwall, enclosure, and/or lighting for the generator at either of the sites?

A: No, unless required by authorities having jurisdiction over the project.

21. Q: Has the MTA determined how many hours/days of generator backup will be required, and will design of external fuel storage be required?

A: MTA intends to work alongside the awarded Consultant to determine this information.

22. Q: MTA mentions providing “requested information it has in its possession” to the Consultant. Does the MTA have recent topographic survey, easement, underground utility, or geotechnical reports that we can assume sufficient to design the project? Or should we include those due diligence services in our proposal?

A: Consultant shall include all due diligence services necessary in its proposal to satisfy the requirements in the scope of services.

23. Q: Does MTA have an estimated budget for this scope of work or for the construction projects?

A: Estimated budgets have been developed for planning purposes.

24. Q: What should we assume as MTA’s design review turnaround for review of the progress design drawings sets?

A: 1 week.



25. Q: Does MTA want the proposer to include Record Drawings in the proposer's scope of work or will MTA use the redline markups from the Contractor for as-builts?

A: Yes. Refer to the Scope of Services in the RFQ under "Consultant Deliverables".

26. Q: Does the Authority have archived drawings, as-built documentation, utility maps, or easement records for the Ukiah and Fort Bragg facilities — particularly showing underground utilities or previous infrastructure improvements? If available, can these be shared during the proposal or design phases?

A: No.

27. Q: Are there any specific performance expectations, capacity goals, or target offsets MTA wants the solar PV system to achieve?

A: MTA intends to collaborate with the awarded Consultant to establish optimal performance expectations for MTA.

28. Q: Should the consultant consider battery storage integration or net-metering configurations in the solar canopy design?

A: Net Metering.

29. Q: Does MTA have preferences for generator fuel type (e.g., diesel, natural gas, battery) or requirements for sound attenuation, enclosures, or placement?

A: MTA plans to work with the awarded Consultant to identify the best choice between diesel and battery electric options.

30. Q: Have service drop locations, utility gear responsibilities, or required capacities been confirmed with PG&E for both sites?

A: Yes. Preliminary discussions have begun with PG&E. MTA intends to collaborate with the awarded Consultant to finalize this discussion with PG&E.

31. Q: Will ChargePoint provide CAD files, installation manuals, or warranty documents to support design compliance?

A: Yes.

32. Q: Proposed improvements (e.g., solar canopy, paving modifications) may trigger LID/stormwater requirements, should LID/stormwater mitigation be provided in the design for either site?

A: LID/stormwater mitigation is not currently anticipated for either site; however, if required by local or regional regulations, the Consultant should be prepared to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures into the design.



33. Q: Will MTA provide any existing ALTA, topographic, or utility surveys, or should consultants include survey services in their proposal?

A: Consultant shall include all due diligence services necessary in its proposal to satisfy the requirements in the scope of services.

34. Q: Are geotechnical investigations, soil reports, or environmental assessments available for either site?

A: No.

35. Q: Is the consultant expected to produce full construction phasing plans to coordinate with site operations during construction?

A: The Consultants' design should include concept-level phasing and staging plans, while the general contractor will provide the final, detailed construction phasing plan for approval prior to mobilization.

36. Q: Will the consultant be required to support equipment commissioning or performance testing at project closeout?

A: Yes, on an as-needed basis.

37. Q: Should detailed construction drawings for signage, bollards, and protective elements be included?

A: Yes. Refer to RFQ page 9, "Consultant Design Assumptions and Considerations."

38. Q: Can MTA provide the required insurance coverage levels and types referenced in Appendix C?

A: See Appendix B.

39. Q: Should the cost proposal include breakdowns by labor category, subconsultant, and reimbursable costs?

A: The cost proposal should include all elements of cost, both direct and indirect, as well as profit.

40. Q: Will MTA pay for plan check and permit fees, or should the consultant include those costs in the proposal?

A: MTA will reimburse the Consultant at cost for required governmental permitting and plan check fees.

41. Q: Does MTA consider any part of the design scope subject to prevailing wage requirements under California Labor Code?

A: Yes, as determined by the labor classifications included in the proposal.



42. Q: Are there specific digital format standards (e.g., CAD layers, file naming, submission media) required for final record drawings?

A: MTA would like to receive the final record drawings in PDF format.

43. Q: On the reference sheet it asks for Name, Phone No. Email, Address, etc. Then it asks for Contact Name/Title. Is this duplicated or are you asking for the contact name/title of the firm that is submitting the client reference?

A: The "Contact Name/Title" refers to the person at the client organization who can speak to the work your firm performed—it is **not** the contact at your own firm submitting the reference. All information requested in "Attachment 2E References" pertains to the organization and/or individual at the client organization who is knowledgeable about the work that your firm carried out.