

## ADDENDUM # 1



### CONTRA COSTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Project: ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY BUILDING RENOVATION PROJECT CRITERIA ARCHITECT RFQ/P  
Campus/Location: Diablo Valley College, Pleasant Hill, Ca

Date: 12/20/2022

You are hereby notified of the following changes, clarifications and/or modifications to the original Request for Qualifications/Proposal (RFQ/P), and/or previous Addenda. This Addendum forms a part of the Request for Qualifications/Proposal package and modifies the original RFQ/P documents dated 12/2/2022. This Addendum shall supersede the original RFQ/P and previous Addenda wherein it contradicts the same and shall take precedence over anything to the contrary therein. All other conditions remain unchanged.

Acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in your cover letter. Failure to acknowledge may subject proposers to disqualification.

---

#### A. Deletions, Additions, Changes, Revisions, Questions

1. Question:

Please confirm if subconsultants selected under the Criteria Document team are precluded from participating in the Design-Build portion of the project. If yes, would the District consider changing the requirement to allow subconsultants to be a part of both the Criteria Document team and the Design-Build team?

Response:

Participants of the Criteria Document team are precluded from participating on the Design-Build Entity Team for the project. The District cannot change this requirement.

2. Question:

Page 13, Section Fee proposal 2. states "The fee proposal should include a staffing plan and a workplan to articulate the level of detail and process used to develop an understanding of the project specific needs..." Can you please define staffing plan and what you expect to see here beyond what is usually provided in a workplan?

Response:

In addition to a workplan, the District is looking for a staffing plan which outlines the level of resources/staffing (labor) for each phase of the project as outlined in the fee proposal table. This staffing plan shall be broken down by person with their hourly rate for each phase and the totals shall match the fee proposal breakdown.

## ADDENDUM # 1

3. Question:

Can you please confirm that you do not want individual team member resumes from our Sub-Consultants? If you *would* like to see Sub-consultant team member resumes, can you please confirm where you would like us to include them in the proposal?

Response:

Confirmed. Individual resumes for subconsultant personnel not required. Please reference the RFQ/P Part 4, Section 4.0, Tab 5, 1.b.

4. Question:

Would the District like minor edits/modifications to the Criteria Architect agreement included in the proposal? If so, where would the District like those place?

Response:

The District is not accepting any edits to the contract at this time. The firm shall provide a statement of compliance in its cover letter, located in Tab 2, of the proposal response. Any additional project specific scope items will be reviewed and noted during contract negotiations with the selected firm to catch minor proposed changes at that time.

5. Question:

In order to meet the \$2M per occurrence limit for Commercial General Liability as stated in Exhibit F of the Agreement, would the District accept a CGL limit of \$1M per occurrence/\$2M aggregate and the addition of a \$5M Umbrella/Excess policy (this policy "follows form" for CGL/Auto/Employer's liability and is designed to provide additional coverage limits)?

Response:

Yes, the District can accept the proposed \$1M per occurrence/\$2M aggregate with the additional provision of a \$5M umbrella/excess policy to supplement the general liability. Please note that this supersedes the provisions for General Liability Insurance in Attachment A, Exhibit E, Section B.5.

6. Question:

Would the District accept automobile liability coverage for non-owned and hired/borrow automobiles only if the proposer firm does not own any company vehicles?

Response:

If the proposer firm does not own any company vehicles, then coverage for leased, hired, or borrowed autos would need to be in place. A statement from the firm verifying that there are no owned vehicles must be provided.

## ADDENDUM # 1

7. Question:  
Does the District have a signage & wayfinding program?

Response:  
Yes. Please reference RFQ/P Attachment F.

8. Question  
Is the intention that the project tracks LEED Silver Certification for both the criteria docs and the swing space?

Response:  
The project is not intended to track LEED Silver points for the swing space. However, the main project should be at the very least LEED Silver and meet our districtwide sustainability goals of ZNE buildings. The criteria architect's scope includes looking at options in meeting our sustainability goal of ZNE. Please reference Attachment B.

9. Question:  
Tab 6, Item 3c. - do you want references for each team member? Subs team members?

Response:  
Provide only for the key members of your project team that will be assigned to this project.

10. Question:  
Will the District provide an inventory of furnishings & equipment that need to be moved for the swing space, or is there another scenario where we would need to include this effort in our fee proposal?

Response:  
The intention is to have the Criteria Document team inventory the existing equipment, survey the faculty and work with the District to evaluate and determine what existing equipment is to be moved to the Swing Space. While written for the main project, Attachment A, Exhibit A, Section C.2.b.i.E applies to the swing space scope of work as well.

## ADDENDUM # 1

11. Question:

It was mentioned in the pre-proposal, the District is performing a structural review of the buildings. Will this include recommendations as to the retrofit of the building or are the recommendations part of the scope for the Criteria Architect's Team.

Response:

The structural review will include a feasibility study and recommendations for bringing the existing building's structural systems into compliance with current building codes and DSA standards. The expectation is for the Criteria Documents team to analyze the recommendations, incorporate as needed into their own engineering documents and development of criteria documents.

12. Question:

Is Thornton Tomasetti barred from being on criteria architect teams?

Response:

No, Thornton Tomasetti will not be precluded from being on criteria architect teams, but will be precluded from participating on the DBE team.

13. Question:

Equipment List.

Response:

To be developed by the Criteria Document team. Please reference Attachment A, Exhibit A, Section C.2.b.i.E.

14. Question:

Exhibit A Page 3 District Standards: Are there District standards for Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing and Lighting Systems? Some of this will be covered by Classroom Standards, however there will be some significant gap. If not, should we presume a number of meetings to produce Baseline Specs for these systems?

Response:

District Standards beyond those included in the RFQ/P package do not exist. There are some informal standardized equipment and performance expectations inherent in the LEED Silver + and ZNE as set targets. The development of baseline performance and/or prescriptive specifications for these systems will be required by the Criteria Documents team.

## ADDENDUM # 1

15. Question:

Exhibit A: Page 6 xiii. Won't the LEED or Well Certification effort be the responsibility of the DB team? Shouldn't the deliverable just state the goal and some hints about how to get there?

Response:

Registering and submitting documentation for LEED, WELL, California Energy Design Assistance (CEDA), and PG&E's Market Access Program will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder. However, the Criteria Architect Team shall assess these elements and clearly outline the goals, objectives, and expectations as part of the Criteria Documents for the Design-Build RFP.

16. Question:

Exhibit A: Page 6 xiii. Won't the Total Cost of Ownership analysis be prepared by of the DB proposers? Shouldn't the deliverable just state the goal and some hints about how to get there?

Response:

Total cost of ownership/life cycle cost analysis will be required as necessary in order to inform the basis of design.

17. Question:

Exhibit A: Page 8 g. Can the District provide a base assumption for whether the swing space is rented modulars or repurposed space? It's hard to gauge fees without this.

Response:

The intention is for the Criteria Documents team to determine this. Please reference RFQ/P Attachment A, Exhibit A, Section C.2.a(xiv).

18. Question:

Exhibit A: Equipment Lists. There will be a great deal of equipment to plan for both new and relocated. Will the District be providing the lists or should we include the coordination of this effort with the user groups.

Response:

Coordinate with User Groups and the District. Please reference Attachment A, Exhibit A, Section C.2.b.i.E.

19. Question:

Classroom standards: are members of this design team or the subconsultants precluded from participation in the Criteria Team?

## ADDENDUM # 1

Response:

No, they are not precluded.

20. Question:

What is the difference between the Org Chart requested in Tab 3 vs. Tab 5?

Response:

Tab 3 Org Chart is for the architecture firm. Tab 5 Org Chart is for the entire Criteria Documents team (architect and subconsultants).

21. Question:

Will the District consider allowing proposers to submit electronic copies via email on January 6<sup>th</sup> with digital PDF files that are word searchable and follow up with the hardcopies on or before January 13<sup>th</sup>? Many district's that are still asking for hard copies are allowing this as the hard copy is just for District records.

Response:

The District is not able to receive proposals electronically at this time. SOQ/P submittal requirements as outlined in the RFQ/P remain unchanged.

22. Question:

Criteria Documents Scope Peer Review services: Can a more detailed description of CA services be provided?

Response:

Not at this time. As part of the Criteria Documents Team Staffing Plan and Work Plan submitted with the Fee Proposal, the Criteria Document Team shall outline a plan which conforms with the requirements of Attachment A – Exhibit A, Section D (Proposal Phase), Section E (Design Submittals Review Phase), and Section F (Monitoring Phase).

23. Question:

Criteria Documents Scope Peer Review services: Can a more detailed description of peer review services be provided for the pre-construction phase? Can we assume a peer review report for compliance with criteria documents at the completion of the major milestones (SD/DD/CDs)?

Response:

Peer review reports will be required at the SD/DD/CD milestones, See Attachment A – Exhibit A, Section E.2 for requirements.

## ADDENDUM # 1

24. Question:

Criteria Documents Scope Community and Campus Engagement: We are assuming that upon DBE being on-boarded with the project, the DBE would take over responsibilities for community and campus engagement. Please confirm.

Response:

The intention is to have the Criteria Document team perform the majority of the community and campus engagement activities during development of the Criteria Documents. The DBE will take over community and campus engagement activities once on-board, but the intent is that the DBE will only report-out and obtain feedback/impressions during the design and construction phases, as the majority of the community and campus engagement work will be completed during the Criteria Documents phase by the Criteria Architect.

25. Question:

Swing Space. Please confirm that the expected period of use for the swing space is through the end of construction for the ET Building?

Response:

Confirmed, through the end of construction and occupancy of the new ET building.

26. Question:

Swing Space. Please advise on the estimated size of the temporary Swing Space. We're assuming it is reduced from the current space available, but by how much?

Response:

The intention is for the Criteria Documents team to determine this. Please reference RFQ/P Attachment A, Exhibit A, Section C.2.a(xiv).

27. Question:

Swing Space. What are the expectations for providing toilet facilities for the Swing Space?

Response:

They are to be provided as required. If the swing space ends up in an existing building, then the expectation is that those facilities can be modified as necessary for use.

28. Question:

## ADDENDUM # 1

Swing Space. What does Contra Costa envision as a swing space structure? Conditioned pneumatic tent structure? Portable/modular units? Etc.

Response:

Please see RFQ/P Attachment A, Exhibit A, Section C.2.a(xiv).

29. Question:

We understand that the firms engaged to contract on the Project Criteria Documents will be precluded from being contracted for the design and construction of the project. Does this prohibition apply to sub-consultants as well?

Response:

Please see response to Question 1, above.

30. Question:

On Tab 3 responders are asked to provide “Specialized capabilities in planning and design of **academic art**, multi-use educational Facilities.” Should this be revised to better align with the scope this RFQ/P?

Response:

The term “academic art” is a typo. The phrase should read “higher education technological and multi-faceted academic building projects.”

### **B. If you have any questions regarding this Addendum, please contact:**

Ben M. Cayabyab, Contracts Manager  
Contra Costa Community College District  
500 Court St., Martinez, CA 94553  
Email: bcayabyab@4cd.edu

All other terms and conditions of RFQ/P are to remain the same.

**END OF ADDENDUM # 1**