



South Orange County Community College District

RFQ&P No. 3282-2021:

Architectural Services for 2 Projects at Saddleback College

Addendum No. Two (2)

May 11, 2021

Nick Newkirk

Purchasing and Contracts Manager

Note:

All documents remain unchanged except section or parts added to, revised, deleted and/or clarified by this Addendum.

1. The attendee list for the mandatory pre-proposal meeting held on May 7, 2021 is attached to this Addendum.
2. The responses to the Request for Information submitted by the deadline of 5:00 PM on May 10, 2021 as well as the responses to the questions asked during the mandatory pre-proposal meeting on May 7, 2021 are shown below:

Q1: In several locations, "Architect", "architectural firm", etc. terms are used. Can a non-architectural firm (i.e. an engineering firm) submit as the lead design consultant to the District, provided they show the necessary relevant experience and can assemble the team necessary to successfully complete a DSA project?

A1: An Architectural firm must be the prime/lead design consultant/Architect of Record.

Q2: Under Section 4, Scope of Services, it states that "the projects will be designed within the parameters of LEED Gold Standards..." Does the design team need to achieve and submit the project for LEED certification? Also, can this project even achieve this level? Without a building included in the project scope, it is unclear if this point threshold can be attained.

A2: The District requirement is to design to a LEED Gold equivalent, so certification is not required. To address Title IX and ADA issues, a small structure may be needed. This specific need will be confirmed during programming at which time it will be determined if the LEED Gold equivalent can be attained.

Q3: Has any communication with a PV provider already occurred for this project by the District? Is there a District standard in terms of PV array products or design guidelines?

A3: There is no district standard and no PV provider has been communicated with.

Q4: For the softball field and Lot 12, is there an initial concept plan that was developed to develop the project construction budget? Is there any program scope developed for this work, such as minimum number of added parking spaces, amenities and minimum required elements (as they can vary greatly) for the two softball facilities? Will each field have the same elements? Will the fields be artificial or natural surfaces?

- A4: a. The initial concept is in our 2020 Facilities Master Plan, and was the basis of the project construction budget.
b. No, there is not a detailed program scope.
c. It is anticipated that the fields be artificial turf, but the decision has not been finalized.

Q5: Form B, Item 3: do you want us to include the resumes of personnel for both projects together in this section?

A5: Yes, that is acceptable. If there is personnel designated for only one of the two projects, notate that on the resume.

Q6: Form C, Item 4: we are a national firm serving public entity clients across the country, please confirm if you would like us to list each public entity client served in the past 5 years across the country, or only list those in California?

A6: Preference is for California, and Community Colleges specifically.

Q7: Form C, Item 8: Can you clarify what you mean by listing projects in chronological order? Is there a certain order you are looking for?

A7: Listed by date of project completion, most recent first.

Q8: Form G: we are a national firm serving four-year higher education and community college districts across the country, please confirm if you would like us to list each of these districts in the past 5 years across the country, or only list those in California?

A8: Preference is for projects in California

Q9: Can you please confirm if any of the documents need to be notarized?

A9: No documents require notarization

Q10: Will the district provide a detailed ground topographic survey to the selected firm?

A10: Yes, a detailed survey will be provided to the awarded firm.

Q11: Will the district provide a geotechnical report to the selected firm?

A11: Once the program and layout is identified, the District will secure a geotechnical report and provide to the awarded firm.

Q12: Is consultant required to produce WQMP (Water Quality Management Plan) and also satisfy South Orange County Hydromodification requirements by submitting to City of Mission Viejo for permitting? Or does district has a master plan that for WQMP and hydromodification that is designed and permitted by others which the selected form for this project can simply implement into their design drawings and scope of the project?

A12: Yes, a WQMP is required. If the storm flow off campus is greater in volume or flow rate based on the existing conditions, then the South Orange County Hydromodification requirements must be met. Permitting

by the City of Mission Viejo is not required, but meeting with them to review the storm drainage patterns and flow will be. The District does not have a master WQMP at this time.

Q13: Is the architect required to prepare environmental assessment for this project? Or will district attain environmental consultant and provide architect with the findings and study?

A13: An environmental assessment will not be required for this project, however, there are CEQA Mitigation Monitoring requirements that will need to be addressed as part of the project:

- **Mitigation Measure BIO-1:** Prior to land-clearing activities from February 1 through August 31, a qualified biologist first shall evaluate the type and extent of vegetation removal. As determined necessary, the biological shall conduct a nesting survey to identify any direct or indirect impacts to actively nesting birds. If direct or indirect impacts are identified, the biologist shall specify the appropriate mitigation measure(s) for these impacts. Such measures may include avoidance of occupied nests, working outside an established buffer area, modified scheduling of grading and clearing, and monitoring of active nests during construction.
- **Mitigation Measure PR-1:** Prior to any excavation or grading, the district shall compare the limits of proposed excavations with the depth and lateral extent of existing sub-surface disturbances, including foundations, utility, and fill materials. The district shall determine the extent of sub-surface disturbances by using information including, but not limited to, as-built construction plans, underground utility surveys, and/or historic or recent geotechnical information, including boring and trenching logs.
- **Mitigation Measure PR-2:** Should resources be uncovered as a result of campus grading and/or excavation shallower than five feet, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained and notified, and work in the area of the find shall cease until a paleontological monitor, under the supervision of the qualified paleontologist, arrives. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt or divert any activities adversely impacting potentially significant paleontological resources, and those resources must be recovered, analyzed, and curated with the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.
- **Mitigation Measure PR-3:** Based on information obtained from compliance with Mitigation Measure PR-1, and should excavations exceed five feet in depth, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to conduct additional paleontological assessment using pre-construction geotechnical surveys to define the subsurface geological features of the campuses better. Data from the geotechnical surveys will help define the vertical and horizontal distribution of paleontologically sensitive subsurface units to assist in the accurate development of any monitoring requirements. Should that data indicate paleontological sensitivity, the following shall occur:
 - A qualified paleontologist shall be retained to attend a pre-construction meeting with construction personnel. The paleontologist shall inform construction personnel that fossils may be encountered, and provide information on the appearance of fossils, the role of paleontological monitors, and on proper notification procedures; and
 - A paleontological monitor, under the supervision of a qualified paleontologist, shall monitor all earth-moving activities with potential to disturb previously undisturbed paleontologically-sensitive sediment. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt or divert any activities adversely impacting potentially significant paleontological resources, and those resources must be recovered, analyzed, and curated with the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

Q14: Should the consultant include SWPPP and filing with State water Quality board in their scope? Or will District require selected contractor to prepare and submit for engineer's review prior construction?

A14: The consultant should include the Erosion Control plans. The contractor will be required to produce the SWPPP and file all fees for the NOI and annual fees.

Q15: Can you please confirm if the \$7.2M value for Project 1, and the \$2.8M value for Project 2, are hard construction costs, or project costs?

A15: The values provided are hard construction costs.

Q16: The budget in the master plan seems to estimate this project at \$17M, but the proposal budget seems to be \$7.2M. Why is this different?

A16: The value in the master plan reflects total project costs for each project, whereas, the RFQ&P has the budget for hard construction costs only for each project.

Q17: If we have a solar contractor design-build partner on our team, would that exclude them from bidding on the project?

A17: Yes, that would exclude the solar contractor design-build partner from bidding.

Q18: Appendix "D" (Architectural Services Agreement) outlines tasks and deliverables related to developing design plans for a new building; however, the scope defined in Chapter 4 pertains to site related improvements to the parking lot. Please clarify the list of deliverables for this project.

A18: This will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.

Q19: Appendix "D" Item "O" states that a Topographic Survey will be provided; will this be a CAD and/or Civil 3D file and if so, what version of CAD?

A19: It will be in CAD; version not known at this time.

Q20: Please confirm that a Geotechnical Report will be provide as stated in Appendix "D" Item "O".

A20: See A11 above.

Q21: Has the College mapped out the location of site utilities, and will a working CAD file plotting the utilities be provided?

A21: The College has, to the best of its abilities, mapped out the location of site utilities, and yes, a working CAD file will be provided to the awarded firm.

Q22: Does the campus have a master plan for implementing Storm Water Treatment BMPs that already accounts for the development of this area to tie into or will this project area be required to develop its own stand-alone BMPs covering this project area exclusively?

A22: The District has a draft of a recently developed Storm Water Mitigation Plan that will be provided to the awarded firm.

Q23: Will the Parking Lot Expansion need to provide an ADA path of travel the Fine Arts building as well as to the Softball Fields?

A23: ADA paths of travel to the Fine Arts building and the Softball Fields will be required from Parking Lot 12.

Q24: Does the existing electrical service feeding the existing electrical lighting for Parking Lot 12 have enough capacity to provide additional lighting fixtures to accommodate the parking lot expansion?

A24: The selected firm will need to make this determination.

Q25: Confirm that the Solar PV canopies for both projects will need to be included in the design and not subcontracted to a solar design build company.

A25: Confirmed

Q26: Project 1. Is the \$7.2M total project cost including soft costs or the hard construction cost budget?

A26: See A15 above.

Q27: Project 2. Is the \$2.8M total project cost including soft costs or the hard construction cost budget?

A27: See A15 above.

Q28: Project 2 Scope Item 5. Is there a target number for the total number of electric vehicle charging stations?

A28: Not at this time, but it will exceed what is currently required by Cal Green

Q29: PROPOSAL FORM C. Is the 7 pp. limit for each project (and thus 14 pp. limit) or for both projects?

A29: 7-page limit for each project.

Q30: PROPOSAL FORM C Item 8. Can we list projects not performed by the firm but performed by a consultant who is a specialist for the scope item; i.e., sports fields and solar canopies?

A30: Yes, provided you indicate this on the project reference.

Q31: Agreement. Part B.e. example. Please advise can submittals be all electronic and in the interest of sustainability reduce hard paper deliverables?

A31: Yes, unless it requires a physical sample.

Q32: Agreement. Probable Costs and Cost Estimates. It can be interpreted that seven (7) cost estimates are required. Can this number be reduced to reduce the fees for the project?

A32: This will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.

Q33: If we include a solar consultant on our proposed team, will they be precluded from bidding on the construction phase of **ALL** project Phases (1 – 4) of the Solar Canopies? Or will they only be precluded from bidding on the construction of Phase 1 of the Solar Canopies?

A33: They will be precluded from bidding on the construction of phase 1, as that is the only phase that has design included in this phase.

Q34: Can you please confirm that the Solar Canopy Phase 1 needs to achieve 25% of the 6.5 MW Net Zero Campus Goal, as stated in the verbal introduction to the scope in the preproposal meeting?

A34: The 25% is an approximate figure. The feasibility study should layout the approximate generation for each phase based on the parking lots across the campus.

Q35: If the Solar Canopy Phase 1 is to achieve a specific % of the 6.5 MW Net Zero Campus Goal, and it's not feasible to achieve that goal on Lot 12 and Lot 12 Expansion, can another lot be proposed alongside Lot 12?

A35: Softball/Lot 12 expansion and Solar Canopy Phase 1 are separate projects. Adding solar canopies to Lot 12 separate and in addition to what will be designed and constructed in phase 1 of the solar canopy project.

Q36: Does the district have a preference for the solar canopies to be DSA Pre-Checked design or not?

A36: Preference would be for the solar canopies to be DSA pre-checked design.

Q37: Can the district confirm that the \$2.8M budget for Project 2, Phase 1 includes designing the canopies and systems across the entire campus? Are the canopies in Project 1 included in that budget?

A37: The \$2.8M budget in project 2 is only for phase 1 of the solar canopy project. The solar canopies in Lot 12 (project 1) are separate from the phase 1 project.

Q38: Please confirm along with the topo survey(s) the District will provide a below-grade utilities survey(s) as well.

A38: See A10 above

Q39: Will geotechnical information be provided?

A39: See A11 above.

Q40: Does the baseball field require lighting?

A40: Softball field will require lighting.

Q41: According to the Master Plan on page 15, the Softball Field project includes the multi-purpose lawn. Is this still included in the scope? Will the softball field be synthetic turf or natural grass?

A41: See A4 above.

Q42: Are you automatically deemed non-responsive if you provide exceptions to the sample agreement?

A42: No, however extensive exceptions will be taken into consideration during the evaluation of proposals.

Q43: Will the District send an email to us regarding posted sign-in sheets or should we check on a particular date on our own?

A43: The attendee list for the mandatory pre-proposal meeting is attached to this Addendum.

Q44: Is wayfinding signage part of scope?

A44: Yes

RFQP 3282-2021

Attendee List for Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting on Friday, May 7, 2021 at 9:00am

Firm Name	Firm Representative Name
Aguilar Architects	Guillermo Aguilar
Asphalt, Engineering & Asphalt	Jesse Urirate
Berliner Architects	Richard Berliner
Berliner Architects	Rahel Zewdu
Calvada Surveying	Glenn Fong
Cannon Corp	Samuel Jacoby
Corgan	Tonya Giebel
Corgan	Anthony Wang
CY Architects	Tim Young
FBA Engineering	Rob Rogers
FPL and Associates, Inc.	Rob Canedy
Guida Surveying, Inc.	Tracey Hope
HMC Architects	Kristina Singiser
HMC Architects	Alyssa Potter
HMC Architects	Nicholas Casolari
HPI Architecture	Mylene Tabing
IBI Group	Tom Moore
IDS Group	Christy Stevenson
IDS Group	Peter Gambino
IDS Group Inc	Rob ONeil
Leland Saylor Associates	Lauren Sullivan
Linwood Engineering, Inc.	Jason Rezell
Little	Rita S. Carter
Little Diversified Architectural Consulting	Barsin Bet Govargez
LPA Design Studios	Steven Flanagan
LPA Design Studios	Arash Izadi
M-E Engineers Inc.	Sean Hira
P2S Inc	Wes McKean
PBK-WLC	Marco Eacrett
PBK-WLC Architects	Jason Cochran
Petra Structural Engineers	Peter Sarkis
Q1stCM	Tobias Kelly
Q1stCM	Scott Feeney
Rider Levett Bucknall	Aled Jenkins
Rider Levett Bucknall (RLB)	Helen Gulish
RLA	Travis Ebbert
Stern Architects	James Fortunes
SVA Architects, Inc.	Judy Cheng
tBP Architecture	Carolyn Loughrey
Verde Design	Devin Conway
Ware Malcomb	Luke Corsbie
Ware Malcomb	Tom Myers
Ware Malcomb	Greg Spon
Ware Malcomb	Cory Adams
Ware Malcomb	Brad Sundheimer
Ware Malcomb	Richard G. Hernandez
Westberg White Architecture	Alexandria Bauer