

WATER, SEWER, SOLID WASTE RATE STUDIES

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Addendum #1

August 4, 2025

1. The District requests one printed copy of the proposal and one electronic copy on a USB drive. Would the District be willing to accept the electronic copy via email?

The District requires that a printed hard copy be submitted by the deadline. The electronic copy may be emailed but is not a substitute for the official printed copy.

2. The bottom of page 13 of the RFP states "Note: This entire packet should be returned with the proposal." Can you provide more information about what should be included to satisfy this requirement?

Please disregard this statement. It was inadvertently left in from a previous version of the RFP.

3. Section 10.11 of the sample contract includes a space for the consultant to place a stamp or seal. To confirm - proposers are not required to be professional engineers (P.E.), correct? We are a rates consulting firm made up of economists and don't typically include a P.E. on our team.

This is the standard contract attached to all RFPs. This consulting service does not require a PE. The consulting firm should ensure that qualified staff will perform the necessary tasks required to meet the Proposition 218 requirements.

4. We understand based on the RFP that the four (4) requested meetings with staff can be conducted either on-site or virtually. Can you confirm whether the two (2) requested meetings with the Board are expected to be conducted on-site?

Staff recommends that the Proposition 218 meeting be conducted in-person to be available to answer questions for the Board and public. The other meetings may be attended via conference option. The District utilizes Microsoft Teams.

5. Would the District like assistance from the selected consultant with printing and mailing of the notices of public hearing? Or will the District handle printing and mailing in-house?

The District would prefer assistance with printing and mailing the required Proposition 218 public hearing notice. If this will not be provided by the consultant, this should be

clearly stated and reflected in the proposal and cost to enable the District to make a fair comparison between the proposals.

6. The scope of services included in Exhibit “A” references storm drainage operations in item 1.1 as one of the utilities to be studied, but they are not mentioned elsewhere in the RFP. Can you confirm that storm drainage rates are not to be included in the utility rate studies?

Please disregard this statement. It was inadvertently left in from a previous version of the RFP. The District may decide to proceed with storm drain rate analysis later, but it is not included in this RFP.

8. Is the January 2026 effective date a firm deadline?

This is a target deadline, but a comprehensive, defensible report for each enterprise is more important than the deadline.

9. Based on the Coziahr vs Otay Water District and other recent cases, tiered rates may not be justifiable. Is this absolutely required by the District or only if it is justified?

Tiered rates may not be justified in this case. That is up to the consultant to recommend based on their assessment of the District’s user base and costs. The District is not married to a specific approach.