



CIVIC CENTER • 18125 BLOOMFIELD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 3130 • CERRITOS, CALIFORNIA 90703-3130
PHONE: (562) 860-0311 • CERRITOS.GOV



November 19, 2025

**REGIONAL STORMWATER CAPTURE FACILITY
PROJECT NO. 22505, RFP NO. 1565-25**

ADDENDUM NO. 2

The RFP as noted on the following pages are hereby amended as attached. Addendum No. 2 shall become an integral part of the RFP and shall be acknowledged in the space provided and attached to the bid for the project. The other contents of the plans and specifications shall remain unchanged.

Sincerely,

Jared Lee, P.E.
Assistant City Engineer

Attachment

cc: Cindy Nava, City Clerk

FRANK AURELIO YOKOYAMA
MAYOR

LYNDA P. JOHNSON
MAYOR PRO TEM

JENNIFER HONG
COUNCILMEMBER

MARK E. PULIDO
COUNCILMEMBER

SOPHIA M. TSE
COUNCILMEMBER

November 19, 2025

**REGIONAL STORMWATER CAPTURE FACILITY
PROJECT NO. 22505, RFP NO. 1565-25**

ADDENDUM NO. 2

This addendum forms a part of the RFP for the above-identified project and modifies the original plans and specifications as noted below. Portions of the RFP not specifically mentioned in this addendum remain in force.

No additional addendums will be issued for this project.

- Geosyntec Consultants submitted the attached email, dated November 14, 2025:

Question 1: "How many physical copies of the Fee Proposal are required?"

Response 1: Per Section VII, page 7 of the RFP, provide three hard copies (3) and one (1) digital copy of the proposal. The not-to-exceed fee proposal and hourly fee schedule shall be enclosed in a separate sealed envelope. Refer to Section VII, for additional information.

Question 2: "Can we submit a separate section for the scope of work? It is required in the selection criteria as the following: Consultant's demonstrated understanding of the scope of work per Section VIII (Selection Procedures) of the RFP, but it is not a section specified under Section VI (Proposal Content) of the RFP.

Response 2: Yes

Question 3: "For firm projects and the Project Managers experience, does recently completed mean construction has been completed or can we provide an expected construction completion date?"

Response 3: Projects that are currently under construction but are substantially complete may be included under project experience.

Question 4: "Is the Fee Proposal based on lump sum or time and materials?"

Response 4: An hourly rate schedule with estimated hours by task should be provided, rather than lump-sum costs.

- Tetrattech submitted the attached email, dated November 14, 2025:

Question 1: "How many hard copies of the fee proposal and hourly fee schedule need to be submitted?"

Response 1: Per Section VII, page 7 of the RFP, provide three hard copies (3) and one (1) digital copy of the proposal. The not-to-exceed fee proposal and hourly fee schedule shall be enclosed in a separate sealed envelope. Refer to Section VII, pages 7 and 8 for additional information.

Question 2: "Will the City kindly provide information for the landfill (depth, limits, etc.)?"

Response 2: The Preliminary Design Report contains preliminary information about the landfill. The consultant will be responsible for conducting any additional studies needed during the design phase.

Question 3: "Will the City be able to provide access to the open channel to perform the topographic survey of that area?"

Response 3: The consultant will be responsible for obtaining all required approvals from the appropriate agencies for any work conducted within the channel.

- Question 4: "The Geotechnical report indicates that 8 soil borings were drilled at the site yet, boring logs for only 3 shallow borings are provided. Are the logs for the other soil borings available?"
- Response 4: Refer to memo prepared by NorCal Engineering in the Preliminary Design report for additional information.
- Question 5: "The Geotechnical report indicates that the surficial soils (within the upper 8 to 10 feet are fine-grained with low infiltration potential which seems to indicate that shallow infiltration is not practically feasible at the site. However, the project is being advanced as a project with an infiltration component. Is that still the case?"
- Response 5: The consultant will be responsible for reviewing the existing Preliminary Design Report and recommending any necessary design changes during the design phase.
- Question 6: "If infiltration is being considered at larger depths (depths larger than 10-feet), the Geotechnical report indicates that groundwater was encountered at a depth of 13.5 feet in one of the borings, apparently precluding also infiltration at depth since the required 10-foot distance from the invert of the facility to the expected high groundwater elevation could not be met. So again, is this project still being considered as an infiltration project?"
- Response 6: The consultant will be responsible for reviewing the existing Preliminary Design Report and recommending any necessary design changes during the design phase.
- Question 7: "The Geotechnical report recommends a Factor of Safety of 2 yet the listed reduction factors do not seem to be in agreement with that recommendation. Furthermore, the infiltration tests do not seem to indicate if a gravel pack was placed within the borehole or if a correction was made to the infiltration rates to account for the presence of the gravel pack."
- Response 7: The consultant will be responsible for reviewing the existing Preliminary Design Report and recommending any necessary design changes during the design phase.
- Question 8: "Three borings seem to have encountered landfill materials; do we have a precise delineation of the extent of the landfill including footprint and depth of refuse? Are there construction plans for the landfill?"
- Response 8: The City does not have construction plans for the landfill.
- Question 9: "The RFP includes a provision for the replacement of the problematic landfill subsurface. Is a clean closure being contemplated? The preliminary layout of the project seems to indicate that some structures will be built on the landfill footprint. Is a complete closure of the landfill required or a partial removal?"
- Response 9: A clean closure of the landfill is anticipated within the project boundaries to accommodate the subsurface storage basin. Closure limits will be determined during design phase.
- Question 10: "With respect to environmental permits, we can see that the Preliminary Design Report identified the need for a Section 404 permit from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Can we assume that a Section 401 permit (or WDR permit) from RWQCB will also be required? What about a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW?"

Response 10: The consultant shall be responsible for securing all permits and agreements from LA County Flood Control District (LACFCD) and other agencies as determined during the project design phase.

Question 11: "Will the City be handling the AB52 consultation with interested Tribes as required under CEQA?"

Response 11: The consultant will be responsible for obtaining all Environmental (CEQA, NEPA, etc.) clearances as needed as part of the project's environmental review process.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2

BIDDER'S CERTIFICATE

I acknowledge receipt of November 18, 2025 Regional Stormwater Capture Facility, Project No. 22505, RFP NO. 1565-25, Addendum No. 2 and accept the aforementioned conditions.

Date

Bidder's Name

From: [Mario Gallardo](#)
To: [Amandeep Mann](#)
Cc: [Curtis Fang](#); [Haley Bauer](#); [Lauren Amimoto](#)
Subject: City of Cerritos Regional Stormwater Capture Facility Project - RFP Questions
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 10:18:56 AM

Hello,

Geosyntec Consultants Inc. would like to respectfully submit the following questions regarding the City of Cerritos Regional Stormwater Capture Facility Project (RFP No. 1565-25):

1. How many physical copies of the Fee Proposal are required?
2. Can we submit a separate section for the scope of work? It is required in the selection criteria as the following: Consultant's demonstrated understanding of the scope of work per Section VIII (Selection Procedures) of the RFP, but it is not a section specified under Section VI (Proposal Content) of the RFP.
3. For firm projects and the Project Managers experience, does recently completed mean construction has been completed or can we provide an expected construction completion date?
4. Is the Fee Proposal based on lump sum or time and materials?

Lastly, could all Geosyntec staff CC'd on this email please be copied on future addenda? We were not aware of the release of the first addenda and would like to ensure our proposal is as compliant as possible.

We appreciate the opportunity to collaborate with City staff and contribute to the success of the City's infrastructure initiatives.

Best regards,

Mario Gallardo
Marketing Specialist

1111 Broadway
6th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607



Geosyntec
consultants

engineers | scientists | innovators

From: [Anderson, Austin](#)
To: [Amandeep Mann](#)
Cc: [Torreyson, Aric](#); [Wright, Jason](#); [Hausic, Dani1](#)
Subject: Questions - Regional Stormwater Capture Facility, Project No. 22505, RFP 1564-25
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 10:55:24 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Hello Amandeep,

Tetra Tech proposes the following questions listed below for the **City of Cerritos - Regional Stormwater Capture Facility** proposal. If you have additional questions, or need clarification on our submitted questions, please reach out at your earliest convenience.

Please confirm you have received our questions by responding to this email when time permits.

Questions:

1. How many hard copies of the fee proposal and hourly fee schedule need to be submitted?
2. Will the City kindly provide information for the landfill (depth, limits, etc.)
3. Will the City be able to provide access to the open channel to perform the topographic survey of that area?
4. The Geotechnical report indicates that 8 soil borings were drilled at the site yet, boring logs for only 3 shallow borings are provided. Are the logs for the other soil borings available?
5. The Geotechnical report indicates that the surficial soils (within the upper 8 to 10 feet are fine-grained with low infiltration potential which seems to indicate that shallow infiltration is not practically feasible at the site. However, the project is being advanced as a project with an infiltration component. Is that still the case?
6. If infiltration is being considered at larger depths (depths larger than 10-feet), the Geotechnical report indicates that groundwater was encountered at a depth of 13.5 feet in one of the borings, apparently precluding also infiltration at depth since the required 10-foot distance from the invert of the facility to the expected high groundwater elevation could not be met. So again, is this project still being considered as an infiltration project?
7. The Geotechnical report recommends a Factor of Safety of 2 yet the listed reduction factors do not seem to be in agreement with that recommendation. Furthermore, the infiltration tests do not seem to indicate if a gravel pack was

placed within the borehole or if a correction was made to the infiltration rates to account for the presence of the gravel pack.

8. Three borings seem to have encountered landfill materials; do we have a precise delineation of the extent of the landfill including footprint and depth of refuse? Are there construction plans for the landfill?
9. The RFP includes a provision for the replacement of the problematic landfill subsurface. Is a clean closure being contemplated? The preliminary layout of the project seems to indicate that some structures will be built on the landfill footprint. Is a complete closure of the landfill required or a partial removal?
10. With respect to environmental permits, we can see that the Preliminary Design Report identified the need for a Section 404 permit from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Can we assume that a Section 401 permit (or WDR permit) from RWQCB will also be required? What about a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW?
11. Will the City be handling the AB52 consultation with interested Tribes as required under CEQA?

Kind Regards,

Austin

Austin Anderson | Project Assistant IV | Tetra Tech

Tetra Tech | Leading with Science™ | WTR Southwest
1230 Columbia St, Suite 1000, San Diego, CA 92101 | tetratech.com

This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.



Please consider the environment before printing. [Read more](#)



TETRA TECH