

RFP NO. AIRPA001
Addendum No. 2
Answers to Submitted Questions
January 15, 2019

1. Is it the County's objective to maintain or limit the number of FBO's to two? If yes, for how long?
 - A. The County has created a Terminal Area Plan and RFP process that would support two FBO's on the property. While it is not the County's objective to maintain or limit the number of FBOs, the County does not envision or contemplate more than two at this time.

2. Has the County conducted any studies to determine the financial viability of two competing FBOs that have made similar financial investment as required by the RFP? If so, please provide a copy of the studies.
 - A. The County's financial analysis is exempt from the Public Records Act. (Gov. Code section 6254(k); and see *Michaelis v. Superior Court* (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 1065.) Any proposal not meeting the required financial investments set forth in the RFP will not be considered.

3. The RFP states on page 5 that "the new development should complement and expand on the provision of aeronautical services offered by the existing FBO." What aeronautical services has the County identified that the existing FBO is not offering that the County wants the new development to offer?
 - A. The County encourages respondents to be creative in providing services that will benefit all users of the Airport.

4. Can you provide a copy of the current FBO's lease agreement?
 - A. The current FBO is engaged in a series of lease agreements and other agreements with the County. They are attached as Exhibit M. Attention is directed to Section 1.4.1 of the RFP, which states as follows:

"The County intends to enter into negotiations with Lynx on a new or extended lease agreement for that area labeled as "East FBO" (see EXHIBIT A) which will be an area for development mirroring that on the Available Property. Staff anticipates simultaneous negotiations and contract execution for both FBOs resulting in similar lease terms and conditions. The County believes that new lease terms on both properties will best achieve the County's goals listed in Section 1.1.2 of this RFP.

5. Do the fuel volumes represented in the RFP consist of only FBO reported volume or are there any hangars who have the ability to self-fuel?
- A. Table 1.1 within the RFP (page 9 of the RFP) was incorrectly labeled as reporting fuel volumes for both FBO and self-fueling operators. Please note the deletion and addition below.

Annual Fuel Sales (Table: 1.1)

FBO Fuel gallons combined FBO and reported self-fueling from 2009 through 2018:

Annual Summary of Fuel Sales			
Year	Avgas	Jet	Total
2009	103,915	1,298,508	1,402,423
2010	90,845	1,471,015	1,561,860
2011	106,239	1,479,384	1,585,623
2012	85,201	1,561,385	1,646,586
2013	77,428	1,800,833	1,878,251
2014	74,149	1,802,253	1,876,302
2015	91,091	1,921,042	2,012,136
2016	95,332	2,151,365	2,241,697
2017	95,801	2,101,465	2,197,266
2018	90,227	2,135,131	2,225,358

///

///

///

Replace With:

Annual Fuel Sales (Table: 1.1)

FBO Fuel gallons combined FBO and reported self-fueling from 2009 through 2019:

Fuel Volumes - FBO + Self-Fueling - 2009-2019			
Calendar Year	Gallons AvGas	Gallons Jet A	Total Gallons
2009	484,165	1,334,183	1,818,348
2010	235,037	1,525,719	1,760,756
2011	122,847	1,521,783	1,644,630
2012	105,932	1,597,462	1,703,394
2013	90,604	1,889,157	1,979,761
2014	79,066	1,913,047	1,992,113
2015	128,245	2,029,115	2,157,360
2016	122,789	2,295,188	2,417,977
2017	118,598	2,297,478	2,416,076
2018	98,207	2,231,537	2,329,744
2019	106,972	2,056,369	2,163,341

Since adopting a self-fueling policy in 2011, the County has only entered into two self-fueling agreements. In addition, the California Highway Patrol has the right to fuel their aircraft pursuant to an agreement that pre-dated the self-fueling policy.

///

///

The FBO Fuel gallons without reported self-fueling from 2009 through 2019 is set forth below:

Fuel Volumes - FBO Only - 2009-2019			
Calendar Year	Gallons AvGas	Gallons Jet A	Total Gallons
2009	103,916	1,298,508	1,402,424
2010	90,846	1,471,015	1,561,861
2011	106,239	1,479,384	1,585,623
2012	85,202	1,561,385	1,646,587
2013	77,418	1,800,833	1,878,251
2014	74,049	1,802,253	1,876,302
2015	91,094	1,921,042	2,012,136
2016	90,332	2,151,365	2,241,697
2017	95,801	2,101,465	2,197,266
2018	90,227	2,136,203	2,226,430
2019	87,493	1,977,313	2,064,806

Respondents should note that the Airport completed a \$15 million runway improvement project in 2019 – the Airport’s most significant construction project in decades. Construction on the runways spanned from April 2019 through October 2019. The most significant impact occurred during a 70-day period from mid-April through late June where the Airport’s longest runway was only 4,146 feet long. Although the Airport continues to plan for capital projects through the FAA’s Airport Improvement Program, no anticipated future projects will be as operationally disruptive as the 2019 project.

6. Can you please clarify what the actual FBO reported volume is excluding the self-fueling customers for the same time period that was provided in the RFP?
 - A. See the response to #5 above.

7. What is the current fuel flowage fee?
 - A. \$0.08/gallon

8. Please provide 2019 YTD Avgas and Jet A fuel volumes.
 - A. See updated tables within response 5 above.
9. What is the weight bearing capacity of both ramps?
 - A. Attached as Exhibit N are excerpts from the most recent Pavement Condition report that includes information on the structural section and weight bearing capacity of the ramps.
10. Does the Airport have a schedule of lease rates?
 - A. The current hangar lease rates are attached as Exhibit O.
11. Are the county owned and managed hangars identified on page 9 100% leased?
 - A. Yes. As indicated on page 9 of the RFP, the County maintains an active waiting list.
12. Since the County is competing with the existing FBO and will be competing with the Successful Respondent, please provide the methodology used to set and adjust the rents for the county owned and managed hangars.
 - A. The Airport's General Aviation Leasing/Rents and Fees Policy describes how the Airport sets and adjusts rents for County owned facilities. This policy can be found at the following web address:
<https://www.countyofnapa.org/2459/Airport-Policies-PMCDs>
13. How many of the 95 tie-down spaces are rented?
 - A. This number varies, but typically less than five are rented on a monthly basis.
14. The RFP states on page 6 that the Airport "maintains an active waiting list for T-Hangars and box hangars and there is a significant interest for additional corporate hangars." Please provide a copy of the waiting list for T-Hangars and box hangars and identify the entities that have expressed interest in additional corporate hangars.
 - A. The waiting list for County-owned T-Hangars and Box Hangars is attached as Exhibit P. While Airport staff fields requests regarding corporate hangar development, there is no established interest list.
15. Please identify the weight bearing capacity of the existing apron areas of the Airport.
 - A. Please see the response to question number 9 above.

16. What is the development opportunity for the far "EAST Side"? Would hangars and other development be considered as a part of the minimum standards, or separately?
- A. The instructions within the RFP are to submit a proposal for the leasable area identified as "WEST FBO". Proposals will be scored specifically on the development proposal within this leasable area. After selection of a "Recommended Proposer" the County may choose to engage in discussions on other leasable areas at the Airport.
17. Can a new fuel farm be developed at a separate location from the existing site on the western side?
- A. No. The County is requiring any new fuel tanks/facilities to be located within the existing Fuel Farm area.
18. Can the fuel farm expansion be added to the existing site? Or is additional land development required?
- A. See the response to question 17.
19. What is required to supplement the fuel farm?
- A. As described in Section 3.3, the Successful Respondent must expand the existing Fuel Farm for their sole use to meet the minimum product storage requirements within the Airport's Minimum Standards (Section 3.4). In addition to the requirements outlined in the Minimum Standards, Respondents were provided an opportunity to attend a site visit of the existing facilities. The As-Built drawings of the existing Fuel Farm have been attached as Exhibit Q.
20. Who fuels the County owned hangars now? Are there existing agreements/contracts? Will those be put out to bid in the future?
- A. Lynx FBO Network is the sole commercial fuel provider fueling aircraft housed in County owned hangars. Please reference Exhibit M for the County's fuel management agreement with Lynx.
- Any future FBO agreement will allow for the ability to conduct commercial fueling activities.
21. Is the successful respondent able to use 3rd parties to meet minimum standard requirements (i.e. charter, MRO)?
- A. Yes.

22. Are there airport plans available to scale or Autocad plans?
- A. See various plans attached as Exhibits R, S, T, and U. The County does not have Autocad plans available for all of these items.
23. Will the Airport be providing all digital land surveys/topos of the existing site before the end of January 2020?
- A. Please see Exhibit T.
24. Are there plans of existing utilities, sewer, storm water, etc.?
- A. Plans are attached as Exhibit U.
25. When is the setback [new expansion area] expected to be available to the successful respondent?
- A. It is the County's intention to work with existing tenants as described in 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of the RFP to unencumber the leases associated with the terminal building and self-fueling facility allowing for the conversion of the area to apron space as soon as possible. For leasehold access to the terminal building, the setback requirements would remain until June 2028 at the latest. For the self-fueling facility, the setback would remain until June 2029.
26. Will the County consider utilizing AIP funds for construction or reconstruction of aprons on either of the two FBOs leased premises?
- A. No. The County has an established ACIP list for projects that focus on runway/taxiway projects that benefit all users of the Airport.
27. Please provide clarification on new apron timing. Section 3.2 and Milestone Requirement Table 3.1 show different dates – October 2022 versus December 2025.
- A. Please review Exhibit A of the RFP, Draft Terminal Area Plan. The October 2022 date references the darker shaded area labeled "New Apron." The December 2025 date references the lighter shaded area labeled "Existing Apron."
28. Will the Airport be providing a Master Plan for the County required improvements to the site in CAD/Revit to the proposers? (They only address issuing an addendum in January 2020 showing storm drain improvements/topo)

- A. No, this information will not be available by the RFP submittal date. The County will work with the Successful Respondent and all other affected leaseholders on project coordination.
29. Will the Airport be providing Civil Engineering Drawings (in CAD/Revit) for the new roadway relocation, self-service fuel relocation, other improvements, etc.? When?
- A. This information will not be available by the RFP submittal date. The County will work with the Successful Respondent and all other affected leaseholders on project coordination. Only some of the plans will be available in CAD/Revit format, otherwise plans will be provided in PDF format.
30. Will the County be installing recycled water piping for the project to the two FBO sites?
- A. No.
31. If another contractor is demoing the existing General Aviation Terminal on both FBO lots what condition are they leaving after? Will it be Apron Material?
- A. The Successful Respondent should assume the area below the existing terminal area will be native material, free of deleterious materials and graded flat. No, the area will not be constructed with apron material.
32. What will the alignment of the new fence be?
- A. The details of exact fence and gate locations will be determined during the construction plan review process. For the purposes of Respondent's proposals, please review Section 3.12 of the Airport's Development Standards.
33. Will there be only one Access Gate in the Non-Exclusive Taxi lane? Who will need to provide, if shared?
- A. It is anticipated that each FBO will have an exclusive gate for their operations on either side of the non-exclusive taxilane.
34. Please provide floor plans with square footage for 2000 Airport Rd.
- A. Plans are attached as Exhibit S.
35. Are there requirements for lease of 2000 Airport Rd. beyond the minimum standards?
- A. No, the Successful Respondent will be required to temporarily lease space at 1950/2000 during the Pioneering Period, which is further described within Section 3.6 of the RFP.

36. Can the successful respondent select the specific areas to lease in 2000 Airport Rd. during the pioneering period?

A. The County will work with the Successful Respondent to find mutually agreeable space within 2000 Airport Rd. for use during the pioneering period. As noted on Exhibit A of the RFP, Draft Terminal Area Plan, there is an area currently labeled for Airport Administrative offices currently reserved for County office space once the existing terminal building has been demolished.

37. Is the respondent allowed to take down ANY 5,000 SF of space within these buildings? If the respondent is taking down 5,000 SF, who is responsible for security and maintenance of the remaining SF? Common areas/grounds?

A. The Successful Respondent will work with the County to find mutually agreeable space within 2000 Airport Rd. for use during the pioneering period. As noted on Exhibit A of the RFP, Draft Terminal Area Plan, there is an area currently labeled for Airport Administrative offices.

For the purpose of RFP proposals, Respondents should not assume any security or maintenance responsibilities of the facility outside of the temporary leasehold.

38. Is there a property condition assessment report for 2000 Airport Rd.?

A. Beyond an assessment and budget for the building's HVAC system attached as Exhibit V, no other condition reports are available.

39. Since the use of 1950 and 2000 Airport Road is temporary, will the County be taking care of the necessary capital improvements and/or the overhaul or replacement of the HVAC system? If not, will the County compensate the Successful Respondent for the unamortized value of these capital improvements once the Successful Respondent is no longer utilizing 1950 and 2000 Airport Road?

A. Respondents should factor the cost of any temporary improvements into their bid values. The County will not be compensating the Successful Respondent for the unamortized value of any improvements to 1950 and 2000 Airport Road made by the Successful Respondent.

40. If the respondent is only required to lease 5,000 SF of a 74,000 SF facility, are we to only address the HVAC upgrade/overhaul of an area large enough to accommodate that 5,000 SF?

A. Respondents are not required to make HVAC repairs/upgrades to the entire facility.

41. Please provide details of the HVAC system within 1950 and 2000 Airport Road and any reports that outline why the HVAC system "needs to be overhauled or replaced."

- A. Please see Exhibit V.
42. What is the size of the Air Handling equipment that needs to be repaired or replaced in the Admin Offices?
- A. Please see Exhibit V.
43. Will the Airport be providing CAD files and/or existing conditions as-built files for the 1950 & 2000 buildings (Pioneering Period Building)?
- A. See Exhibit R & S.
44. Is the respondent required to make any exterior improvements to the 1950 & 2000 buildings?
- A. No.
45. Who has the Airport contracted with to do the environmental review on the update to the Draft Terminal Area Plan?
- A. Coffman Associates.
46. The RFP states on page 5 that the Successful Respondent's design "will be subject to an architectural design review and approval process." If this review and approval process results in higher costs than planned through the RFP process, will the Successful Respondent have the option to withdraw their proposal and receive their proposal deposit back?
- A. The architectural design review and approval process will occur after execution of a lease. Accordingly, the respondent will not have the option to withdraw their proposal and receive their deposit back during the design review and approval process.
47. The RFP states on page 11 that the Exemplar Agreement expressly prohibits assignment with another FBO provider at the Airport. However, does Section 1.4.2 of the RFP open the door for the County to reconsider this position if in the future the Airport is unable to support two FBOs?
- A. The wording in section 1.4.1 (page 11 of the RFP) regarding the Exemplar Agreement was meant to emphasize that the Successful Respondent and the Existing FBO would not have the ability to consolidate, sell to, or otherwise combine at their discretion.
48. Section 7.4.i. of the RFP requires the Successful Respondent to pay the Airport 150% of the difference between the Minimum Annual Guarantee of property taxes and taxes submitted. Why is the Successful Respondent penalized greater than the Minimum Annual Guarantee (e.g., 150% vs 100% of the difference). Further, why is the Successful Respondent required to cover (and be penalized) for the non-payment of property taxes by a based aircraft owner?

- A. Based aircraft generate Airport activity and property taxes. While the County's scoring criteria are focused heavily on revenue to the airport (40%) and capital investment at the airport (25%), the County is also interested in encouraging respondents to either base their own aircraft at the Airport or market their facilities to aircraft that will be based at the Airport. [See section 5.3.1. and 7.4.i.] The Minimum Annual Guaranteed Taxes requirement is intended to allow respondents to differentiate themselves in this area.

The requirement to pay 150% of the difference in any given year, if any, of any shortfall between the taxes submitted and the Minimum Annual Guaranteed Taxes collected on the leasehold, as opposed to just the difference (e.g., 150% vs 100% of the difference), discourages respondents from attempting to "game" the RFP by shifting dollars from their rent proposal to Minimum Annual Guaranteed Taxes in Section 7.4.i.. Moreover, it will ensure the Successful Respondent is appropriately encouraged to meet the Minimum Annual Guaranteed Taxes represented in their proposal and facilitate the basing of aircraft at the Airport throughout the life of the lease.

- 49. Since the calculation of the Minimum Annual Guarantee of Revenue to the County General Fund includes the estimated value of "based aircraft," is this only "based aircraft" owned and controlled by the Respondent. Respondents would have little to no control of whether a non-owned based aircraft would remain on the respondent's leased premises (especially since there will be competition), remain on the Airport, or be sold at a later date by aircraft owner.

- A. Please see the response to question 48 above.

- 50. Section 7.2.ii. of the RFP states, "Respondent may include fuel flowage revenue...." Is payment of fuel flowage fees optional?

- A. The payment of fuel flowage fees is not optional. The minimum fuel flowage fee is currently \$0.08/gallon. Section 7.2.ii is in reference to the option for Respondents to include a total minimum annual guarantee of fuel flow revenue in order to enhance their proposal.

- 51. Section 7.5.2.i of the RFP requires provision of "a list of all general aviation service facilities currently being operated by Respondent." Can this list be limited to the 10 most comparable facilities?

- A. The County encourages Respondents to provide the most relevant examples and information within the established format requirements, i.e., page limits of the RFP.