

ADDENDUM # 2



CONTRA COSTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Project: ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY BUILDING RENOVATION PROJECT DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES RFP
Campus/Location: Diablo Valley College, Pleasant Hill, CA

Date: **12/19/2023**

You are hereby notified of the following changes, clarifications and/or modifications to the original Request for Proposals (RFP), and/or previous Addenda. This Addendum forms a part of the Request for Proposals package and modifies the original RFP documents dated 10/18/2023. This Addendum shall supersede the original RFP 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 RFP cover letter. Failure to acknowledge may subject proposers to disqualification.

A. Deletions, Additions, Changes, Revisions, Clarifications

1. Clarification - Document 00 41 13 - Proposal Form:
 - a. The Established Project Construction Budget for the ET Renovation + MESC Project is \$43,000,000. The budget includes the Estimated Direct Construction Cost (Cost of Work), and all of the DBE's indirect costs, which includes General Conditions (inclusive of Construction Administration Costs (Fees) for the A/E Team During Construction), DBE Overhead & Profit (During Construction), Performance & Payment Bonds (During Construction), Insurance (During Construction), along with 15% Design/Estimating Contingency, 2% Construction Contingency, and 15% Escalation to Mid-Point.
 - b. The Lump Sum Cost (Fee) for the DBE's Criteria Document Review, Design Phase Services, GMP Development and Approval, and Pre-Construction Services is budgeted under a separate line item, within the District's Total Project Budget for the Project, which is outside of the \$43,000,000 Established Project Construction Budget.
 - i. As required in the Proposal Form, the DBE shall provide a Lump Sum Cost (Fee) for the Project Criteria Document Review, Design Phase Services, Pre-Construction Services, GMP Development and Approval, Agency Approvals (excluding DSA permit fees), and all other related costs, fees, insurance, etc. that will be incurred by the Proposer in providing such services during this phase of the project. This cost (fee) shall be for the entire DBE team to complete these services through GMP

ADDENDUM # 2

Approval, Agency Approval, and Notice to Proceed to begin construction phase services.

- c. General Conditions - As required in the Proposal Form, the DBE shall provide a Lump Sum Cost (Fee) for General Conditions, which is for the DBE to administer and coordinate all Construction Services during the Construction Phase of the Project, as set forth in the Contract Documents (once Notice to Proceed to begin construction services is received). As indicated above, the General Conditions is included within the Established Project Construction Budget of \$43,000,000.
 - d. For the purposes of calculating the DBE's Construction Overhead & Profit (During Construction), Payment & Performance Bonds (During Construction), Insurance (During Construction), and to be able to equally score the Proposal Form for each DBE, the District has set an Estimated Direct Construction Cost (Cost of Work) of \$36,000,000 in the Proposal Form. The percentages provided for each of these categories in the Proposal Form will be used two-fold, first to calculate a dollar amount for scoring the RFP Proposal Form, and second to calculate a dollar amount for each of these fees, at the time of GMP approval.
 - e. For the purposes of the Proposal Form, the District calculated the \$36,000,000 Estimated Direct Construction Cost (Cost of Work) using the following line items from the Engineer's Estimate for the Project: 1) Estimated Direct Construction Cost (Cost of work) including any General Requirement costs outside of the General Conditions, 2) 15% Design/Estimating Contingency, 3) 2% Construction Contingency, and 4) 15% Escalation. The \$36,000,000 does not include Design/Pre-construction fees, General Conditions, OH&P, Bonds, or Insurance. The \$36,000,000 is being used for the sole purpose of calculating the OH&P, Bonds, and Insurance values in order to score the Proposal Form. At a future date, when the GMP is established, the percentages identified in the Proposal Form will be applied to the same categories herein (as applicable) in order to establish the final values for OH&P, Bonds, and Insurance, at the time of GMP approval.
2. In the spirit of a Progressive Design Build model, the district will consider alternatives that are at variance to the Criteria Documents for the betterment of the project during the design phase. The requirements identified in the Criteria Document are understood to represent an understanding of the project at a point in time, and the decisions / requirements may be revisited during the design phase as the design progresses.

During the design phase, district will require the DBE's to track items that are at variance to the Criteria Documents and identify the rationale for the variance. All such deviations from the Criteria Documents should be identified and approved by the district prior to acceptance of a GMP.

The DBE shall maintain adherence to the district standards, all code requirements, budget, program, schedule, and prescribed quality standards while developing the DBE's proposal and Design.

ADDENDUM # 2

All sections of the RFP shall be followed as specified in order to have an apples-to-apples comparison between proposers.

3. The District has published updated Building Automation Standards. Please see the following link to access the files.

[Updated BA Standards](#)

B. Questions and Answers

1. Question:

Could a revision to Criteria documents 7.4 Equipment List be provided to include where equipment pads (concrete housekeeping pads) are required, with approximate size?

Response:

Equipment identified in the Criteria Documents table 7.4 is equipment that has been identified to date and is existing equipment which was documented for preliminary planning purposes. As part of the design phase services, described in Appendix A, Section 3.c, the DBE will build upon what has been provided by the Project Criteria Architect and determine if any of the identified equipment will require concrete housekeeping pads. Any required housekeeping pads will be included in the GMP once established.

2. Question:

Can sections Skilled Labor Force, Safety Record, Price Proposal. Etc. have its own Tab? For Instance, can we make:

Tab 7 – Skilled Labor Force
Tab 8 – Safety Record
Tab 9 – Price Proposal
Tab 10 – Insurance
Tab 11 – Comments to Form of Agreement
Tab 12 - Stipend Agreement
Tab 13 - Appendix

Currently they all fall under the Skilled and Labor Force Tab. These sections are evaluated separately, either by points or P/F.

ADDENDUM # 2

Response:

- Tab 7 – A separate tab is not required for the Skilled Labor Force section. By signing Exhibit A, and returning it with the Proposal Form, the DBE and its members at every tier will provide an enforceable commitment to using a skilled and trained workforce.
- Tab 8 – A separate tab is not required for the Safety Record section. By reference of the DBE’s safety record as identified during the RFQ phase, the DBE’s Experience modification rate and average total recordable injury/illness rate meet the requirements of Education Code section 81703, subdivision (c)(2)(G).
- Tab 9 - Submit Exhibit C “Proposal Form” in a separate sealed envelope, as both a hard copy and electronic file format. Include all documents, both hard copy and electronic copy, as identified in Exhibit C in this separate sealed envelope.
- Tab 10 – Please add insurance information as a new Tab 7 and include the required insurance information as requested in the RFP.
- Tab 11 - Comments to the Form of Agreement were due by December 12th, 2023. Comments to the Form of Agreement shall not be included in the RFP submission.
- Tab 12 - The Stipend Agreement is to be returned separately with the Proposal Form, in a separate sealed envelope, and not included in the RFP submission.
- Tab 13 – Yes, please include any Appendix documents as part of Tab 7.

3. Question:

Please provide any available tree assessments completed for the campus or within the project area.

Response:

See the following link for available files. Please note that it is still the DBE’s responsibility to verify all reports, as-builts, other survey conditions, and not completely rely on existing documentation.

[Tree Assessment](#)

4. Question:

Please provide any available original inspection reports and/or material testing reports by original IOR or Laboratory of Record for ET Buildings.

Response:

These documents, if they exist, cannot be located at this time. A renewed effort to locate them can be done post-RFP if they are still required.

ADDENDUM # 2

5. Question:

Please provide any/all available modernization documents for South and North ET Buildings since original construction.

Response:

See the following link for available files. What has been located is not all-inclusive of all alterations the building has undergone over the years. Please note that it is still the DBE's responsibility to verify all reports, as-builts, other survey conditions, and not completely rely on existing documentation.

[Modernization Docs](#)

6. Question:

Tab 5: Design Proposal – Is it acceptable to lay out the two pages within Tab 5 as 11x17 spreads?

Response:

The concept board can be condensed into two (2) 11x17 pages for inclusion in the RFP proposal due on January 4th, 2024. For the final interview, the concept board can either be presented on a 36"x48" display board or can be presented in PowerPoint format (or other similar electronic means).

7. Question:

Please confirm 36"x48" Concept Board referenced in RFP Section IV Item O. Proposal Requirements (on page 12) is to be provided as part of our RFP Proposal on 1/4/23 and that Owner will keep this board and bring it to final interview on 1/16/23.

Response:

See response to Question # 6.

8. Question:

Please reference Appendix Q – ET As-Built Drawings 1971, specifically see Foundation Note 2 on sheet S6. Please provide the referenced Soil Report by Harding, Miller, Lawson & Associates entitled "Soil Investigation – Technical Vocational Facility, Diablo Valley College, Concord, California," Dated January 14, 1969.

Response:

See the following link for available geotechnical information. Please note that it is still the DBE's responsibility to verify all reports, as-builts, other survey conditions, and not completely rely on existing documentation.

[Geotechnical](#)

ADDENDUM # 2

9. Question:

Are there page count or page size limits to documents included in appendix?

Response:

There is not a page count requirement for the documents included in the appendix. Please do not include any documents larger than 11x17 in the appendix. The only documents anticipated to be in the appendix are the insurance information and any updating/correction of information from the SOQ (if needed). All other RFP information should be contained, and book-marked, in their appropriate tab/section of the RFP or included with the Proposal Form in a separate sealed envelope, as outlined in Question # 2. If there is other information outside of the insurance or updates to the SOQ, which does not fit into one of the RFP tabs/sections, then it can be added to the appendix (as needed).

10. Question:

Concept Board. In Section O, Proposal Requirements, Item 1, of the RFP specifies the requirement of a 36"x48" Concept Board to be provided after the interview. Concurrently, for the response to Tab 5, Design Proposal, it is mentioned that our response to that section is to be submitted in one 36x48 Concept Board along with a two-page narrative. In light of these requirements, we would like to clarify the following:

1. Is it permissible to condense the 36x48 Concept Board into 11x17 pages for inclusion in our proposal due on January 4th, 2024? This would facilitate a more streamlined presentation within the proposal document.
2. Alternatively, does the District prefer receiving a rolled-up 36x48 Concept Board at the time of proposal submission, with a mounted version of the same board to be presented during the interview?

Response:

See response to Question # 6.

11. Question:

Directional Airflow Across Tools. The mechanical basis of design for the Machine Shop Dust Exhaust states that a dust collection system is not needed, but that directional airflow across dust producing equipment is needed; this would be accomplished with wall exhaust air plenums. On page 53 of the Project Criteria Documents it is stated that 123C Grinding is no longer critical for the program, so it is unclear what dust producing equipment remains in the new space.

Please confirm which tools would benefit from directional airflow across the tools and the level of dust mitigation that is expected with this design approach.

The BOD does not mention that the exhaust discharge from the machine room should be filtered. This implies that the dust created in this space is minimal. Please confirm this is true.

ADDENDUM # 2

The efficacy of directional airflow across the tools is better suited for mitigating fumes rather than dust. This is dependent on the tools being closest to the exhaust wall plenums (with no other tools in between), the speed and size of the particles created, and the amount of exhaust CFM. Ideally, dust capture would be designed specifically for each dust producing tool. However, if the goal is for cleaner room air without specific dust capture at each tool, then recirculating air cleaners would be more effective at mitigating dust than directional airflow.

Response:

Correct, a dust collection system is not needed in the Machine Shop, but the intent is for directional air flow in that supply air would be provided in the CNC machine areas and the exhaust air would be wall plenums behind dust producing equipment.

Equipment that should be considered dust producing includes, but is not limited to drill presses, grinders, polishers, and other similar equipment. Localized / filtered dust collection systems specific to equipment may also be considered if equipment use is limited. This will need to be confirmed when the equipment list is finalized.

The Machine Shop exhaust air does not need to be filtered.

Note that the Wood Shop does require a dust collection system.

C. Revision to RFP Schedule:

Last day for District to issue an addendum has been extended to 12/20/23.

D. 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 RFP are to remain the same.

END OF ADDENDUM # 2