



ADDENDUM NO. 2

Date: February 2, 2026

From: City of Grand Junction Purchasing Division

To: All Proposers

RE: Professional Engineering Services for the Juniata Enlarged Ditch Seepage Reduction Design, *RFP-5784-26-KF*

Proposers responding to the above-referenced solicitation are hereby advised that certain requirements have been **clarified, modified, or supplemented** as of the date of this Addendum, as outlined below.

1. Question: We have been involved in numerous ditch lining and piping projects, and the level of detail for the survey can range greatly depending on the desired outcome. How detailed should the survey be? One level of detail is required for design and analysis, while considerable more detail is required for accurate cut-fill balance of earthwork quantities. Any guidance on the level of detail for the survey would be helpful to enable consultants to bid comparably.

Answer: The survey should be detailed enough to develop earthwork cut/fill and other quantities for use in bidding and construction. The Federal grant will prohibit the use of certain foreign-made drones.

2. Question: Is there a road that parallels the ditch to allow for access for survey and site investigations?

Answer: There is a road or foot path that parallels most of the ditch.

3. Question: Does the City have any documentation of easement or right of way for the ditch? If not, does the consultant need to provide any boundary, easement, or right-of-way services?

Answer: The City does not have this documentation. The consultant will need to obtain this information or generate it as needed.

4. Question: Project Extents: Can you provide a KMZ of the project extents? We are trying to determine whether the project stops at the flow splitter structure near the reservoir or continues past it. The RFP notes 12,000 linear feet, but based on the mapping, it appears to be a little more.

Answer: The existing GIS data may not include sufficient detail to define the project limits. The project stops at the flow splitter structure near the reservoir.

5. **Question:** If piping the ditch is an outcome, does the City expect the pipe to be covered (i.e., with dirt)?

Answer: The City anticipates that the pipe will be covered with soil.

6. **Question:** Is the City expecting a portion of this piping to be pressurized?

Answer: This is a possibility, depending on the final design.

7. **Question:** Are there any concerns currently with sediment aggradation within the ditch?

Answer: Historically, some sediment removal has been required.

8. **Question:** The following questions are requesting additional information on the role of the consultant in supporting permitting for the project. These questions are intended to understand the level of effort to provide a basis for costing services. The effort required to research the permits compared to developing the studies and reports to support NEPA is significantly different.

a. The RFP includes permitting as part of Task 2 and Task 4. Where would you like the consultants to include the scope and fee for those services?

Answer: Task 2 includes developing the documentation, studies, reports, and other information necessary to support the required permitting and grant applications. Task 4 includes the work required to research and determine the scope of permitting, approvals, regulatory requirements, and grant eligibility for the project.

b. Can you provide any background on coordination with the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) on the expected NEPA planning process?

Answer: No coordination with BOR has been completed by the City.

c. Has BOR indicated it will serve as the lead agency for NEPA compliance?

Answer: No discussions on this subject have taken place.

d. Has the BOR commented on any need for replacement or mitigation of wetland or riparian areas lost due to piping or lining of the ditch? If so, would the development of a mitigation plan be included in this scope of work?

Answer: No discussions on this subject have taken place.

e. Has BOR indicated if this project will qualify for a Categorical Exclusion (CatEx) or an Environmental Assessment (EA)?

Answer: No discussions on this subject have taken place.

- f.** Has the City consulted with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) about whether the ditch is considered Waters of the United States (WOTUS)? If it is considered WOTUS, has the USACE commented on whether the ditch piping or lining would be subject to the recapture provision?

Answer: No.

- g.** Our understanding is that the ditch has been previously identified as potentially eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Has the City consulted with the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding this project and expected mitigation for ditch piping or lining?

Answer: No.

9. **Question:** Can the city confirm that the consultants are to prepare a 100 percent design, including construction plans and specifications?

Answer: Yes. The task-based fee summary will need to clearly delineate and define the project milestones, including the 90% and 100% design submittals, for grant tracking purposes.

10. **Question:** How many user turnouts are located within the reach of the ditch in question?

Answer: None. There are irrigation laterals from other ditches that cross the Juniata Enlarged Ditch.

11. **Question:** Will the City of Grand Junction be coordinating access for the private properties crossed by the ditch?

Answer: The consultant will need to coordinate with landowners and obtain signed Permission to Enter (PTE) forms for access to private property.

12. **Question:** Will the establishment of project control points that can be used by the contractor during construction be required?

Answer: Yes, and the control points should be durable and recoverable in the future.

13. **Question:** Will a detailed survey and as-builts be required at the diversion structure and headgate on Kannah Creek and at the proposed pipeline termination and headgate at Jaunita Reservoir?

Answer: This will be determined by the consultant, if this information is necessary for them to complete the scope of work.

No further questions will be accepted at this time.

This addendum amends the original solicitation for the referenced project as outlined above. All other terms and conditions of the solicitation remain unchanged.

Proposers must acknowledge receipt of this addendum by completing the acknowledgment section on the **Solicitation Response Form** (Section 7.0).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,



Kathleen Franklin
Senior Buyer/Purchasing Agent
City of Grand Junction