

Responses to Pre-Proposal Field Meeting and Written Questions

South Yuba Rim Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project, Phase 2: Fuels Reduction Contractor Services

RFP No. YWI-RFP-2026-04 | CAL FIRE Grant 5GG25128

Posted September 25, 2026 by Yuba Watershed Institute

About this document

The non-mandatory pre-proposal field meeting was held September 18, 2026, and written questions closed September 21, 2026. The questions raised at the meeting and received in writing are answered below, grouped by topic and reworded where needed for clarity. Where more than one proposer asked the same thing, the question appears once.

Several answers change the RFP or its exhibits. Those changes are made by Addendum No. 1, issued with this document, which attaches a redlined copy of the affected RFP sections and exhibits and revised georeferenced maps. Where an answer describes a change, the Addendum is the operative instrument. Proposals must acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 1 and of these responses on the Cost Proposal Form at Exhibit E (RFP Section III.B).

The schedule is unchanged. Proposals remain due October 2, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time, by email to lynne@yubawatershedinstitute.org with the subject line “RFP Response — South Yuba Rim.”

The controlling copy of the RFP packet is the packet posted at www.yubawatershedinstitute.org/rfps on September 3, 2026, as amended by Addendum No. 1. The revised documents attached to the Addendum replace the September 3 versions for all purposes.

Section references are to the RFP packet released September 3, 2026. “Project Manager” means the YWI Project Manager.

A. Treatment design and prescriptions

1. Why were some areas assigned hand thinning rather than mastication?

Treatment methods were assigned unit by unit. Hand thinning, piling, and burning was selected in some units because of landowner preference, a desire to limit soil compaction from heavy equipment, or both. It also removes the cut fuels from the site by burning rather than rearranging them on the ground, as mastication does. The treatment method for each unit is fixed for bidding (see Question 4).

2. What is the difference between the Fuel Break, Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI), and Ecological Restoration prescriptions, and why is the project not all Fuel Break?

The three treatment types, and the prescription for each, are set out in Exhibit C, Section 2. Exhibit A shows which prescription applies to each unit. In summary:

- **Fuel Break.** Trees up to 18 inches DBH may be cut (most cut trees expected to be 10 inches or less); larger trees only if dead, dying, diseased, or hazardous, with Project Manager approval. Target spacing of 20 to 35 feet between trunks (8 to 15 feet between crowns) and 8 to 35 feet between shrubs. Remove downed logs over 10 inches and dead and downed material over 1 inch within 300 feet of homes and 200 feet of the fuel break centerline, with up to 20 percent of logs retained where they are not a hazard. Prune residual trees to 10 feet or half the live crown ratio, whichever is less.
- **WUI.** Trees up to 18 inches DBH may be cut (most expected to be 14 inches or less). Remove downed logs and dead and downed material, and most shrubs, within 300 feet of homes. Beyond 300 feet,

retain up to three large logs and two large snags per acre. Same pruning standard as Fuel Break. No numeric spacing target.

- **Ecological Restoration.** Cut trees and brush under 12 inches DBH within the drip line of residual trees and in dense clusters; no cutting of trees over 12 inches. Leave all snags over 10 inches DBH (except within 100 feet of roads or structures, or in mortality patches) and all downed wood over 10 inches. No pruning or spacing standard.

The Species Retention list in Exhibit C, Section 3 applies to all three.

The treatment types were assigned in the project's CEQA document (the PSA/Addendum, May 2025), which was prepared before detailed treatment unit layout. YWI must implement the treatment types as analyzed in that document and does not plan to amend it. In practice the Fuel Break and WUI prescriptions differ only modestly; Ecological Restoration is the most restrictive of the three, mainly in its 12-inch cutting limit and its retention of snags and large downed wood.

3. Can cut material be used to build beaver dam analogues or to fill gullies to control erosion? Can firewood be left along the road for the landowner?

Not under this contract. Those uses are outside the Scope of Work and outside the activities analyzed in the project's CEQA document, and they will not be compensated. Cut material must be treated as required for the Bid Item in which it lies.

YWI has no objection if a participating landowner and the Contractor separately arrange, outside this contract and at their own cost and time, for some cut material to be set aside for the landowner's own use, including as firewood. Any such arrangement is solely between the landowner and the Contractor, must not interfere with or delay the contract work, must not leave material where it conflicts with the prescription or the Exhibit D measures, and is responsible for its own permits. Work in or near a stream channel typically requires permits (for example, a Lake or Streambed Alteration notification to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife).

For the contract work itself, the YWI Project Manager is the Contractor's sole source of direction. Landowner requests about the contract work should be referred to the Project Manager rather than acted on in the field.

4. Are the treatment units and activities fixed, or can they be adjusted?

For bidding, the units, acreages, and treatment activities are fixed as shown in Exhibits A and B, and all proposals must be priced on that basis. After award, the Project Manager may direct adjustments consistent with the prescription (Exhibit F, Section 2.06), provided they do not substantially change the total contract cost. Any change that materially increases the Contractor's cost or time requires a written change order. If final GPS-measured quantities for a Bid Item vary by more than 10 percent from the estimate, either party may request an equitable adjustment to the not-to-exceed amount (Exhibit F, Section 2.02).

5. How many lop and scatter units are there?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 1

Two. Exhibit B, Bid Item 3 states one unit in error. The 4.5-acre estimate covers both units, and the estimated quantity on the Cost Proposal Form (Exhibit E) is unchanged. One unit is along Miser Road at Shady Creek, adjacent to the Birchville Road and Miser Road mastication unit; the other is off Birchville Road at the west end of the Birchville map, adjacent to a cut and drag unit. Both are shown on Exhibit A.

Addendum No. 1, Item 1 corrects Bid Item 3 and clarifies that the provision for dragging cut material from the first 50 feet of the northwestern boundary into the adjacent mastication unit applies only to the Miser Road (Shady Creek) unit, since the Birchville Road unit has no adjacent mastication unit.

6. In the hand treatment areas, may we use low-impact equipment such as remote-controlled (RCU) machinery?

Submitted by email, September 18 · See Addendum No. 1, Item 2

No. Bid Items 1 (Hand Thin, Pile, Burn), 3 (Lop and Scatter), and 6 (Cut and Drag) are hand treatments. Equipment is limited to hand-operated tools such as chainsaws, string trimmers, pole saws, and loppers (Exhibit B, Bid Item 1). Remote-controlled mulchers, tracked carriers, and similar self-propelled equipment are mechanized equipment and are not permitted in these units, whether for cutting or for moving material. The hand treatment method was selected in these units in part to avoid soil compaction and ground disturbance, and many participating landowners do not want equipment on their land (see Question 1). The only exception is Bid Item 5, where Scotch broom and other resprouting shrubs may be crushed mechanically or manually, as directed by the Project Manager.

Addendum No. 1, Item 2 adds this limit to Bid Items 1, 3, and 6 in Exhibit B.

B. Piling and burning

7. In the hand thinning units, is all cut material piled, with the same contractor returning to burn the piles?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 5

Yes. Bid Item 1 is a single Bid Item that includes cutting, piling, and burning, so the contractor awarded Bid Item 1 is responsible for burning the piles it builds. That contractor may subcontract the burning with YWI's prior written consent (Exhibit F, Section 2.20), provided the burn is overseen by an OSFM Certified Prescribed-Fire Burn Boss and enrolled in the California Prescribed Fire Claims Fund (RFP Section III.E.6; Exhibit F, Section 2.17).

Bid Item 1 is paid in two milestones per unit: 50 percent on approval of cutting and piling, and 50 percent on approval of burning (Exhibit B). See Question 25 on invoicing by sub-unit.

Piles are to be burned before the close of operations for the season unless the Project Manager approves carryover in writing (Exhibit F, Section 2.23). Addendum No. 1, Item 5 revises Exhibit B, Work Sequence and Timing, to match that provision; see also Question 8.

8. Exhibit B requires all piles created during treatment to be burned by February 28, 2027. March through early June often provides better pile burning conditions and more available burn days, especially after a wet winter. Would YWI consider extending the pile burning window to June 15, 2027?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 5

YWI cannot extend the pile burning window to June 15, 2027. Under the project's CEQA document (PSA/Addendum and MMRP), March through June overlaps with limited operating periods for nesting birds, California spotted owl, special-status bats, and ringtail that apply to prescribed burning, including pile burning.

Instead, Addendum No. 1, Item 5 revises Exhibit B to match Exhibit F, Section 2.23: piles that cannot be burned by February 28, 2027 because of weather or burn-day availability may be carried over, with the

YWI Project Manager's written approval, and burned when operations resume in fall 2027, with unit prices unchanged. Bid Item 1 payment remains 50 percent on completed cutting and piling, with the balance on completed burning.

9. Is there a pile specification?

Yes. The piling guidelines are in Exhibit B, Bid Item 1, and also apply to material hand-piled under Bid Item 6 and to the existing piles prepared under Bid Item 2 (see Question 11). In summary: piles generally no larger than 8 by 8 by 8 feet and never larger than 20 by 20 by 20 feet (see also Exhibit D, Section 3); located where they will not threaten residual trees or infrastructure, and away from downed logs and stumps; compact, dirt-free, and covered; built with a kindling core of fine slash; large air spaces cut out; built to achieve 90 percent consumption whenever burned; no piles within a Class I or II WLPZ or within 5 feet of a Class III bank; and a catchment berm at least 6 inches tall on the downhill side of piles on slopes over 30 percent.

10. Can the Bid Item 1 contractor burn piles as it goes, rather than waiting until all piles are built?

Yes, provided each burn meets the burning requirements: the burn plan and Incident Action Plan are in place, the air district has authorized burning that day, public notifications have been made at least three days in advance, and the Project Manager has been notified at least three days before ignition (Exhibit D, Section 3; Exhibit F, Sections 2.10 and 2.17). Piles must still meet the 90 percent consumption standard. Piles that fail to burn sufficiently must be further treated at the Contractor's cost (Exhibit D, Section 3). The 50 percent burning milestone is paid once burning in a unit, or in a sub-unit approved under Question 25, is approved.

11. In the westernmost (French Corral) mastication unit, does the mastication contractor need to coordinate with the contractor burning the existing piles (Bid Item 7)?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 3

Yes. Bid Item 7 is the burning of existing piles within the westernmost mastication unit, at roughly 100-foot intervals over about 6,000 feet (roughly 60 piles). As released, Exhibit B said the piles would be re-sized, cleaned, and moved away from residual trees by a mechanical contractor, but did not say which Bid Item that work belongs to. Addendum No. 1, Item 3 resolves this: the pile preparation is part of Bid Item 2 and is included in the Bid Item 2 per-acre price for that unit. Bid Item 2 proposers should price it accordingly.

The work will generally consist of lifting and shaking pile material to remove soil, consolidating and re-sizing piles, moving material away from residual trees, and covering the piles, so that they meet the piling guidelines in Bid Item 1 and the Fuel Break prescription. The Bid Item 7 contractor burns them. Pile work precedes burning, and both contractors take direction on sequence from the Project Manager.

12. Do the existing piles in that mastication unit need to be covered, and can they be prepared by hand instead of mechanically where appropriate?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 3

Yes, the piles must be covered. The piling guidelines in Exhibit B, Bid Item 1 require piles to be adequately covered to ensure successful burning, and that standard applies to the existing piles once the Bid Item 2 contractor has prepared them. Covering is the Bid Item 2 contractor's responsibility and is included in the per-acre price. The covering must keep the ignition core of the pile dry through wet

weather, and the covering material must comply with air district requirements for burning covered piles.

The Bid Item 2 contractor may prepare the piles mechanically or by hand, at its option, where hand preparation is appropriate. The standard for the finished pile is the same either way. Addendum No. 1, Item 3 adds these provisions to Bid Items 2 and 7.

13. Burn plans are usually done before bidding so the burn contractor knows what it is pricing. Is that the case here?

No, burn plans have not been prepared for this project. The Contractor prepares the burn plan (CAL FIRE template, including fire behavior modeling by a qualified fire behavior technical specialist), the Incident Action Plan, any required smoke management plan, and the public notifications, and these costs are included in the unit prices (Exhibit D, Section 3; Exhibit F, Sections 2.10 and 2.17). The burn plan requirement applies to pile burning under Bid Items 1, 6, and 7 as well as to broadcast burning under Bid Items 4 and 5. YWI will provide available information to support burn planning, including unit maps and GIS layers, access routes, and known water sources.

14. When is broadcast burning likely to happen?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 5

YWI expects broadcast burning under Bid Items 4 and 5 to occur in fall 2027, likely as early as September 2027 if conditions and burn authorizations allow. Conditions after the anticipated November 2026 start are expected to be too wet to meet broadcast burn prescriptions. Preparation work under Bid Items 4 and 5 (control line, cutting, crushing, and prepping residual trees) may be done in the first season and invoiced at the 50 percent milestone once approved (see Question 25). Broadcast burning in fall 2027 is a resumption of work under Exhibit F, Section 2.23; unit prices remain firm, and demobilization and remobilization are included in the unit price. Actual burn dates depend on weather, fuel moisture, burn permits, and air district authorization. Addendum No. 1, Item 5 adds the expected window to Exhibit B so proposers can price it.

15. What water sources are available for the prescribed burning?

A hydrant is located in the Jackass Flats neighborhood, near the confluence of Jackass Flats and China Flat, close to the Bid Item 4 broadcast burn unit. It is on private property. Its use is not guaranteed and depends on the Contractor consulting with the landowner and obtaining the landowner's approval before drawing any water; the YWI Project Manager will make the introduction. The Contractor is responsible for water supply and fire suppression readiness as part of its Incident Action Plan (Exhibit D, Section 3). YWI will help coordinate access to identified sources.

16. Can the local volunteer fire department assist with the broadcast burning to reduce contractor costs?

YWI cannot commit the resources of any fire agency. Proposers may propose to work with local fire agencies (for example, North San Juan Fire Protection District) for holding, patrol, or water support. Any such arrangement must be described in the proposal, is subject to YWI's written consent as a subcontract (Exhibit F, Section 2.20), and must operate under the Contractor's burn plan, Incident Action Plan, and burn boss. The Contractor remains fully responsible for the burn.

C. Site access, boundaries, and maps

17. Will property boundaries be flagged?

No. Only treatment unit boundaries will be flagged (pink flagging, Exhibit D, Section 7). Unit boundaries may or may not coincide with property boundaries. Property boundaries are shown on the Exhibit A maps. The Contractor must work only within the assigned unit boundaries, is liable for trespass beyond them, and must protect any survey monuments and corner markers (Exhibit F, Section 2.03).

18. To reach the westernmost mastication unit north of French Corral, can the operator track the masticator along the road shoulder on private land to avoid damaging the paved section?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 4

The landowner along that section is not a project participant and has not signed a right-of-entry agreement, so YWI cannot authorize access across that property. Any such access is for the Contractor to arrange directly and in writing with that landowner, and the Contractor is responsible for any trespass or damage (Exhibit F, Sections 2.03, 2.15, and 2.21). A copy of any such permission must be provided to the Project Manager before use.

YWI's designated access route reaches the north end of the unit without crossing a paved section, though it is longer: from Pleasant Valley Road, turn west on Troost Trail (approximately 39.315841, -121.154328) and follow it up to the north end of the mastication unit. Equipment moved on any paved road must be trailered or otherwise operated so as not to damage the surface; the Contractor repairs any damage (Exhibit F, Section 2.15). Addendum No. 1, Item 4 adds the designated route to Exhibit B.

19. What are the slopes in the westernmost mastication unit?

Slopes in the unit are gentle to moderate. YWI's slope analysis of the unit, using the USGS 10-meter elevation model, shows a median slope of about 12 percent, with 95 percent of the unit under 25 percent slope. The steepest ground, in a few small spots along drainages, approaches 40 percent. No part of the unit exceeds 50 percent, so the mechanical treatment slope review in the project's MMRP (SPR GEO-8) does not apply. The RFP sets no slope limit for mastication; proposers should judge operability from the terrain, and the equipment described in the proposal will be considered in evaluation (Exhibit B, Bid Item 2).

20. Watercourse classes are not visible on the georeferenced PDF maps, and possibly not on the RFP maps. Can they be added?

See Addendum No. 1, Attachment

Yes. The Exhibit A maps in the RFP packet show watercourse classes in the legend, but the georeferenced PDF maps posted separately did not. Revised georeferenced PDF maps for the Birchville, China Flat and Jackass Flats, and Noodle areas, showing and labeling watercourse classes (I, III, and IV) by unit, are posted with Addendum No. 1 and replace the earlier versions. Watercourses and their buffers will also be flagged on the ground (Exhibit D, Sections 1 and 7), and ground flagging governs where maps and conditions differ.

D. Schedule and wildlife

21. Can treatments continue past the February 28 completion date?

No. February 28, 2027 is the completion date for all Bid Items, and proposals should be planned on that basis. Work not completed by that date because of weather, burn-day availability, or other circumstances beyond the Contractor's control pauses and resumes in fall 2027 under Exhibit F, Section 2.23, with the completion date reset by YWI in writing, unit prices unchanged, and remobilization included in the unit prices. A contractor in that position is not in default.

The reasons are in the project's CEQA document. Within a quarter mile of potential California spotted owl nesting habitat, no work may occur from March 1 through August 15; YWI will identify the units where this applies in the Notice to Proceed. Elsewhere, work after February 28 would fall within the nesting-bird season and would require additional nest surveys and possibly nest buffers, which add cost and schedule risk. Because any resumption in fall 2027 falls after August 15, these periods do not affect the fall 2027 work.

22. Aren't bird nest surveys required starting February 1?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 5

The project's CEQA document addresses nesting birds in two ways. For special-status nesting birds, it calls for a limited operating period from February 1 through August 31 where feasible, with surveys where it is not. For common nesting birds (SPR BIO-12), the active nesting season is defined by a qualified biologist or RPF. YWI's understanding is that few species nest in the project area in February. YWI's project biologist will determine what surveys, if any, are required for work between February 1 and February 28. Any required nest surveys will be arranged by YWI through the project biologist at no cost to the Contractor. If an active nest is found, the Project Manager will establish a buffer and direct work elsewhere. Nesting-bird compliance is YWI's responsibility, not the Contractor's; the Contractor's obligations are to attend the biological resource training, honor flagged buffers, and stop work and notify the Project Manager if a nest or other sensitive resource is found (Exhibit D, Sections 5 and 6).

Addendum No. 1, Item 5 corrects the limited operating period statements in Exhibit B and Exhibit F, Section 1.01, which as released implied that all work would be scheduled outside the February 1 to August 31 nesting-bird period and listed a red-legged frog period of October 15 to April 15 that would have covered the whole operating window. In the MMRP, the red-legged frog measure is a buffer around suitable aquatic habitat, not a project-wide operating restriction.

23. Why must the work be finished by 2029?

The CAL FIRE grant that funds this work has a performance period ending February 15, 2029, which is also the outer termination date of the contract (Exhibit F). All work, final inspection, invoicing, and grant closeout must be complete by then. YWI's schedule targets completion of most work in the 2026 to 2027 season, with broadcast burning in fall 2027, which leaves margin before that date.

E. Contract, payment, and proposals

24. Can the awarded amount be shared in the Notice of Intent to Award?

Yes. On request, YWI will share the awarded amount for each Bid Item with the Notice of Intent to Award.

25. For the smaller Bid Items (such as 3, 4, and 6), is payment made only after all work is complete, or can YWI inspect during the work and pay for acres completed to date, on a pre-arranged schedule or per completed acre?

Submitted by email, September 21 · See Addendum No. 1, Item 6

Payment is by monthly invoice for each completed treatment unit, at the per-acre price for the acres in that unit as measured by GPS. A Bid Item does not need to be complete before its finished units are invoiced. The Project Manager inspects within 10 business days of the Contractor's notice that a unit is ready, approved amounts are paid within 30 days, and there is no retention (RFP Section I, Payment; Exhibit F, Section 2.05). Payment is not made for partially completed units, because final inspection and GPS measurement are made only on completed work.

To make progress payments practical, Addendum No. 1, Item 6 adds two provisions to Exhibit B. First, the Contractor may propose, in its work sequence and schedule (Exhibit F, Section 2.10), to divide a unit into logical, measurable sub-units; sub-units approved in writing by the Project Manager may be inspected and invoiced as each is completed. There is no minimum acreage, but sub-units should be large enough to inspect and measure by GPS efficiently, and unit prices are firm regardless of how the work is divided. Second, Bid Item 4 (Broadcast Burn, Simple) is added to the 50/50 milestone structure already used for Bid Items 1 and 5: 50 percent of the unit price on approval of the completed control line and preparation, and 50 percent on approval of the burn. Without that change, the whole Bid Item 4 payment would have waited on a burn that is not expected until fall 2027.

26. Bid Item 1 (Hand Thin, Pile, Burn) is about 117 acres. Can it be divided so that smaller, local contractors can propose on part of it?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 9

Yes. YWI has always expected that the hand work could be shared among more than one contractor, and Addendum No. 1, Item 9 makes that explicit. Bid Item 1 remains a single Bid Item with a single per-acre price, but its 13 units are organized into two geographic groups shown on the Exhibit A detail maps: Group A, the China Flat and Jackass Flats units (approximately 59.5 acres), and Group B, the Birchville and Noodle (French Corral) units (approximately 57.5 acres). A proposer may propose on all of Bid Item 1 or on one group only, and indicates its choice on the Cost Proposal Form (Exhibit E). A proposal on a group must cover all units in that group at one per-acre price.

YWI may award Bid Item 1 in whole to one contractor or by group to different contractors, on a best-value basis. Cost scoring under RFP Section IV.B compares per-acre prices, so proposals on the whole Bid Item and on a single group are scored on the same basis. Proposers who can take on the whole Bid Item are encouraged to propose on all of it; a whole-Bid-Item proposal is not disadvantaged by this change. Proposers may also team or subcontract, subject to YWI's written consent (Exhibit F, Section 2.20). The other Bid Items are unchanged: a proposal on any other Bid Item must cover all of its units.

27. Is there a preferred proposal format? Can we see a successful past proposal? Do you need operational cost breakdowns, or more detail on method and approach?

Submitted by email, September 21

The required format and order are set out in RFP Sections III.D and III.E: a single PDF of no more than 10 pages (cover letter, Cost Proposal Form, insurance, licensing documents, and addendum acknowledgments do not count toward the limit), organized as (1) Cost Proposal, (2) approach, staffing, work plan, and schedule, (3) experience, qualifications, and references, (4) local workforce, (5) insurance, and (6) licenses and certifications.

No operational cost breakdown is required. Cost is evaluated only on the per-acre price for each Bid Item entered on the Cost Proposal Form (Exhibit E). Approach, staffing, work plan, and schedule is worth 30 of 100 points, so the approach section should address, for each Bid Item proposed, the equipment and crew, a work plan and schedule, the crew lead, and, where applicable, burn planning, smoke management, public notification, watercourse and erosion protection, safety, and fire suppression readiness (RFP Section III.E.2).

YWI does not share proposals submitted by other contractors.

28. After July 1, 2027, when prevailing wage requirements apply to fuel reduction work by nonprofits, would they apply to this project, since total project cost is over \$500,000, even though all work is on private land?

See Addendum No. 1, Item 8

No. YWI has determined that this project is not subject to California prevailing wage requirements (RFP Section I). Assembly Bill 338 extended prevailing wage requirements to publicly funded fuel reduction work over \$500,000. According to the Department of Industrial Relations' guidance on AB 338 (February 19, 2026), those requirements do not apply to (a) work performed on private land, or (b) a grant agreement between a nonprofit and the state that was fully executed before July 1, 2027, unless it is renewed after that date. All work under this RFP is on private land, and the CAL FIRE grant agreement funding it was executed in February 2026. Either condition alone exempts the project, including any work done in fall 2027. Addendum No. 1, Item 8 writes this basis into RFP Section I. YWI's reservation of the right to negotiate a pricing adjustment remains, in case a change in law, a funder determination, or a renewal or amendment of the grant agreement on or after July 1, 2027 causes prevailing wage requirements to apply.

29. The RFP requires a California business license, but California does not issue one.

See Addendum No. 1, Item 7

Correct. California issues no general statewide business license; business licensing is administered locally, and Nevada County does not issue business licenses for its unincorporated areas, so the requirement as written could not be met by every proposer. Because it sat in the pass or fail list in RFP Section IV.A, a qualified proposer could have been rejected for failing to produce a document that does not exist.

Addendum No. 1, Item 7 revises RFP Section III.E.6 to accept, at the proposer's option, any one of: an active license issued by the Contractors State License Board; a current business license or business tax certificate from the city or county of the proposer's principal place of business; a certificate of status or current Statement of Information showing good standing with the California Secretary of State; a filed Fictitious Business Name statement; or, if none of those is available, a signed statement to that effect identifying the proposer's jurisdiction. Business status documentation is removed from the pass or fail list in Section IV.A, and where it is missing or incomplete in an otherwise responsive proposal YWI will allow three business days to provide it, on the same terms for every proposer. Proof of insurance, and OSFM Certified Prescribed-Fire Burn Boss certification for personnel who will conduct burns under any Bid Item that includes burning, remain pass or fail conditions. Exhibit F, Section 2.13 is conformed. No contractor's license classification is required to propose; the Contractor remains responsible under Exhibit F for holding whatever licenses its operation requires.

Questions

Questions about these responses or Addendum No. 1 may be sent to Lynne Westerfield, Project Manager, at lynne@yubawatershedinstitute.org. Because the question period has closed, YWI will answer only questions that are needed to clarify these responses or the Addendum, and will post any such answer for all proposers.