



**ADDENDUM No. 1**  
**PROJECT: ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES**  
**BID NO.: RFQ No. AVC2015/2016-25**

**Notice to Bidders on the Above Project:**

This addendum consists of: **bid clarifications**

Q-1. The 2016 Master Plan said it would be available in Sept. 2016. We were wondering if the District had a Future Capital Outlay Plan or a list of upcoming facilities projects that we might be available to review.

**A-1. Since the District's Facilities Master Plan and Five Year Capital Outlay Plan are in process, and have not been approved by the Board of Trustees, we cannot provide any project lists at this time.**

Q-2. Is there a need for respondents to designate a sustainability/LEED design consultant?

**A.2. Past practice of the District has been to design and implement sustainability practices without seeking LEED certification. As of this time this practice has not changed, however, if the district requires LEED certification for a project in the future, the architect would be expected to provide the necessary consultant(s) for the project to be designed to LEED standards and verification that the project as constructed meets LEED standards.**

Q-3. Will commissioning authority be included in this RFQ or will commissioning authority and commissioning of the project be requested through another RFQ?

**A-3. No. Commissioning will be handled as a separate service.**

Q-4. In addition to the Community College projects, will it be acceptable to provide relevant experience with past and current projects with California State University and University of California campuses? (Ref.: pg. 5, 4.4.3, Tab 3; Relevant Project Experience)

**A-4. Yes.**

Q-5. We have several consultants for each discipline that we have worked with in the past. We select from this group of consultants in accordance to the project assignment size and scope of work. Will it be acceptable for the respondent to identify several consultants under each discipline as part of our team for the District's consideration? (Ref.: pg. 6, 4.4.3, Tab 4; Proposed Project Team)

**A-5. Yes.**

Q-6. We understand that the minimum Respondent Coverage Amount for Comprehensive General Liability and Professional Liability to be as follows:

- Comp. General Liability \$2 M per occurrence / \$4M aggregate
- Professional Liability \$2M per claim/\$4M aggregate

Will it be acceptable to the District for the respondent to provide the Certificate of Insurance after the architect selection process and prior to the project assignments? The \$2M/\$4M requirement may be fitting for the sizeable major cap projects but the \$1M/\$2M coverage may be appropriate for the smaller or medium size projects. In addition and to satisfy this requirement, will a letter from the

respondent's carrier indicating the firm's capacity to provide the \$2M/\$4M coverage as part of this proposal be acceptable? (Ref.: pg. 6, 4.4.3, Tab 8; Insurance Certificates)

**A-6. Paragraph 4.4.3, Tab 8 of the RFQ is modified as follows for the Respondent's Comprehensive General Liability insurance:**

*The minimum coverage limits for the Respondent's Comprehensive General Liability insurance policy shall be One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) per occurrence and Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) in the aggregate. The foregoing notwithstanding, the District expressly reserves the right to require higher minimum coverage limits for an Assigned Project under the Architect Contract. If a Respondent is awarded an Architect Contract and the District determines that an Assigned Project under the Architect Contract will require minimum coverage limits exceeding those noted above, the inability of the Respondent to obtain the minimum coverage limits required by the District for such an Assigned Project, the Respondent will not be considered for such Assigned Project.*

**Paragraph 4.4.3, Tab 8 of the RFQ is modified as follows for the Respondent's Professional Liability insurance:**

*For Assigned Projects with a Construction Budget of Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000) or less, the District will accept Professional Liability insurance of the Respondent with minimum coverage limits of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) per claim and Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) in the aggregate. For any Assigned Project with a Construction Budget of more than Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000), minimum coverage limits for the Respondent's Professional Liability insurance will be Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) per claim and Four Million Dollars (\$4,000,000) in the aggregate. A RFQ Response submitted by a Respondent who does not presently maintain a Professional Liability insurance policy with minimum coverage limits of Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) per claim and Four Million Dollars (\$4,000,000) in the aggregate be rejected for non-responsiveness unless the Respondent: (i) submits with its RFQ Response a Certificate of Insurance evidencing Professional Liability insurance coverage of at least One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) per claim and Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) in the aggregate; (ii) submits a written communication dated within two (2) weeks of the date of the RFQ Response and issued by the Respondent's insurance broker or professional liability insurer which unequivocally and affirmatively confirms that the Respondent is qualified for issuance of a Professional Liability insurance policy with coverage limits of at least Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) per claim and Four Million Dollars (\$4,000,000) in the aggregate; and (iii) the Respondent unequivocally and affirmatively confirms that the Respondent's proposed pricing will not be increased if coverage limits of Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) per claim and Four Million Dollars (\$4,000,000) in the aggregate for any Assigned Project is required by the District.*

Q-7. Does the District have a list of projects for this particular RFQ?

**A-7. Not at this time. See A-1.**

Q-8. Page 6, Tab 8; Insurance Certificates indicates a minimum Professional Liability insurance coverage for the respondent of \$2/4M which is in conflict with RFQ Attachment B, page 31, section 10.8, which requires \$1/2M. Please clarify.

**A-8. Clarification of Professional Liability Insurance Minimum Coverage Limits.** There is a discrepancy between the required minimum coverage limits for Respondents' and Design Consultant's professional liability insurance policies. The correct minimum coverage limits for professional liability insurance are noted in A-6. The professional liability insurance minimum coverage limits set forth in Paragraph 10.7 of the Architect Contract (Attachment B to RFQ) are incorrect and will be modified by the District before award of the Architect Contracts to conform to the minimum coverage limits noted in the A-6.

Q-9. Page 6, Tab 8; Insurance Certificates indicates a minimum Professional Liability insurance coverage for the Design Consultant of \$1/2M which is in conflict with RFQ Attachment B, page 31, section 10.9, which requires \$1/1M. Please clarify.

**A-9. Clarification of Professional Liability Insurance Minimum Coverage Limits.** There is a discrepancy between the required minimum coverage limits for Respondents' and Design Consultant's professional liability insurance policies. The correct minimum coverage limits for professional liability insurance are noted in A-6. The professional liability insurance minimum coverage limits set forth in Paragraph 10.7 of the Architect Contract (Attachment B to RFQ) are incorrect and will be modified by the District before award of the Architect Contracts to conform to the minimum coverage limits noted in A-6.

Q-10. Would Geotechnical Investigation services be a part of this contract?

**A-10. No. This service would be contracted directly with the District.**

Q-11. If the above listed services are a part of the contract, is it a conflict of interest in any way if we are looking to team with both architect and CM firms?

**A-11. The assigned project architect and assigned project CM will not be from the same firm. The District considers this arrangement to be a conflict of interest.**

Q-12. Page 8 of the RFQ documentation attributes 15 (out of 100) points to the Pricing Proposal which is defined as "Respondent's proposed methodology to establish the Contract Price due the Respondent for Assigned Projects for reasonableness of approach and reasonableness of costs by application of the proposed pricing methodology..." However, there is no place in Section 4.3 – Response Contents/Format that requests our pricing methodology. Is there a designated place in the response where our pricing methodology should be included?

**A-12. See RFQ, Attachment C, Paragraphs 3 and 4. Paragraph 3 of the Proposal Form requests discussion of the pricing methodology and Paragraph 4 requests pricing information for any reimbursable items/services.**

Q-13. Could you please post the pre-proposal meeting attendance list?

**A-13. Sign-in sheet posted on May 17, 2016.**

All other terms and conditions remain the same.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mina Hernandez, Purchasing Manager

5/25/16  
Date