

Mendocino Council of Governments

ADDENDUM No. 1

Request for Proposals

State Route 20 (SR 20) Willits Multimodal Circulation & Intersection Improvement Study

Response to Questions:

Pursuant to the RFP issued by the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) on October 7, 2026, the deadline to submit written questions was October 16, 2026. This Addendum addresses questions received through that date.

Q 1: “Section H – Budget requires proposers to provide a detailed breakdown of fully weighted hourly billing rates, including labor, overhead, fringe benefits, and profit. As this information is considered confidential and proprietary, would the Agency accept fully weighted hourly billing rates that incorporate all required cost components without disclosing the individual rate calculations? Please confirm whether this approach would be acceptable for both the prime consultant and subconsultants.”

Response: Section IV.H requires prime consultants and subcontractors to provide fully weighted hourly billing rates for each proposed staff position. Average fringe benefit, overhead, and profit rates may be used in calculating these rates, provided the methodology is clearly explained. A fully weighted hourly billing rate must still be provided for each proposed staff position, incorporating all applicable cost components. This requirement applies to both the prime consultants and subcontractors.

Q 2: “If the detailed breakdown of fully weighted hourly billing rates is mandatory under Section H – Budget, would the Agency allow the prime consultant and subconsultants to submit this information separately as confidential and proprietary financial documentation, rather than including it in the publicly submitted proposal? If so, please clarify the preferred method for submitting this information and whether it would be protected from public disclosure.”

Response: Yes. Prime consultants and subcontractors may submit the methodology and supporting cost information used to calculate their fully weighted hourly billing rates as a separate attachment with the proposal by the established deadline. The attachment must be clearly identified as part of the cost proposal and must satisfy the requirements of Section IV.H, as clarified in Response 1.

During evaluation and negotiations, MCOG will restrict access to authorized personnel. However, labeling information confidential or proprietary does not guarantee exemption from disclosure under the California Public Records Act; any disclosure request will be reviewed under applicable law.

Q 3: “As reference in Section II of the RFP, can you share the scope, limits, and schedule of the planned State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) project on SR-20? Is the study expected to coordinate its recommendations with that project?”

Response: Yes. The following is Caltrans’ response to this request, “According to the Ten-Year Project Book, there are three planned SHOPP projects that appear to be on the study corridor: two stormwater projects (SHOPP IDs 25271 and 25398) as well as a bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure project (SHOPP ID 25930).” Additionally, yes, the study is expected to coordinate its recommendations with the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP).

Project Book

SHOPP ID	District	County	Route	Begin Mile	End Mile	Activity	Planning or Post-Planning?	Advertised Year	Project Cost (\$K)	Project Description	Activities	Units	Quantity
25271	1	Mendocino	020	27.51	L35.956	Stormwater	Planning	2030/31	TBD	The scope of this planned project is under dev.	Total Maximum Daily Load Mitigation	Acres	200
25398	1	Mendocino	020	27.51	L35.956	Stormwater	Planning	2032/33	TBD	The scope of this planned project is under dev.	Total Maximum Daily Load Mitigation	Acres	88
25930	1	Mendocino	020	R32.7	L35.6	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	Planning	2034/35	TBD	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 020 with primary work on Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure.	Bike and Pedestrian Signage	Each	3
											Class I Bike Paths	Linear Feet	8,150
											Class II Bike Lane	Linear Feet	8,200
											Class IV Separated Bikeways	Linear Feet	15,136
											Crossing Islands	Each	4
											Curb Extensions/Bulb-Outs	Each	3
											Proactive Safety Improvements	Annual Fatal & Serio.	0.203
											Sidewalks	Linear Feet	3,535

Q 4: “Will MCOG, the City of Willits, or Caltrans provide existing traffic counts, signal timing, collision data, right of way and base mapping, and City GIS layers?”

Response: Yes. MCOG, the City of Willits, and/or Caltrans will provide existing traffic counts, signal timing information, collision data, right-of-way and base mapping, and City GIS layers, as available.

Q 5: “What level of effort is expected for the stormwater system review, and is a specific deliverable anticipated?”

Response: Per the City of Willits, a planning-level stormwater drainage assessment is expected, rather than detailed engineering design. The consultant should review available Caltrans records, coordinate with City staff and community members to

identify recurring flooding and drainage deficiencies, and evaluate potential improvements.

The anticipated deliverable is a conceptual drainage improvement plan identifying specific problem areas and feasible improvements, including a map of problem locations and proposed solutions. Recommendations should be actionable and suitable for consideration in future Caltrans SHOPP projects, with the level of detail consistent with the study's scope and available budget.

Q 6: "What level of operational analysis under Tasks 3 and 5 is expected for the road diet and intersection control alternatives (for example, planning level screening or HCM based analysis versus microsimulation)?"

Response: A planning-level analysis is expected. Proposers may propose additional analysis at their discretion, depending on available time and budget.

Q 7: "Please confirm the expected level of detail for conceptual layouts (for example, planning level sketches on aerial imagery versus scaled layouts)?"

Response: A planning-level detail for conceptual layouts is expected.

Q 8: "In reference to Tasks 1 and 4 of the RFP scope, will MCOG or the City provide meeting venues for workshops and TAG meetings, or should these be budgeted as consultant direct costs? Is virtual attendance acceptable for some of the monthly TAG meetings?"

Response: Consultants should budget workshop venues under Task 4 as direct costs. TAG meetings will be held virtually unless otherwise specified.

Q 9: "Are there page limits for the technical proposal? Do resumes, project descriptions, and references count toward any limit?"

Response: No, there are no page limits for the technical proposal. No, resumes, project descriptions, and references do not count toward any limit.

Q 10: “RFP VI. I. states, “products used or developed in the execution of any contract resulting from this request will remain in the public domain upon completion of the contract.” Does this apply to a consultant's pre-existing tools, templates, and methods?”

Response: No, this does not apply to the proposer’s pre-existing tools, templates, and methods.

Q 11: “Can the bilingual public meeting for the Draft Study under Task 5 be counted as one of the public workshops under Task 4?”

Response: Yes. Given the smaller project area, the Task 5 bilingual Draft Study public meeting may count as one Task 4 public workshop.

Q 12: “Can the bilingual draft-study public meeting required under Task 5 serve as one of the three public workshops required under Task 4, provided the required two in-person and one virtual workshop formats are satisfied?”

Response: Yes. Given the smaller project area, the Task 5 bilingual Draft Study public meeting may count as one Task 4 public workshop.

Q 13: “Should the cost proposal be included in the same electronic PDF and in each of the three required print copies, or must it be submitted as a separate electronic file and/or separately sealed print package? RFP reference: Section IV.H, p. 13; Section VI.A, p. 15”

Response: Proposers may submit the detailed calculations supporting their fully weighted hourly billing rates as a separate attachment with the proposal by the submission deadline. The attachment should be clearly identified as part of the cost proposal. Alternatively, this information may be included in the same PDF as the technical proposal and in each of the three required print copies. Both options must satisfy the cost documentation requirements of Section IV.H.

JD DeFrieze, Senior Planner
Mendocino Council of Governments
jdefrieze@dbcteam.net
Dated 10-21-26