



ADDENDUM No. 1
PROJECT: CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES
BID NO.: RFQ No. AVC2015/2016-26

Notice to Bidders on the Above Project:

This addendum consists of: **bid clarifications**

Q-1. Will there be a moving portion down the road that will require moving services of any kind?
A-1. Moving services will be contracted directly with the District and coordinated by District personnel.

Q-2. What is the District's construction delivery method for projects with Construction Management Services? I.e. Lump Sum Bid from General Contractors, Design/Build, CM Cost Plus Fee or CM Multiply Prime Trade contracting.

A-2. Most, if not all, projects are expected to be executed utilizing the construction delivery method of CM Multiple Prime Contractors/Trades. If it is deemed in the best interest of the District to utilize Design/Build and/or General Contractor Lump Sum, the District may utilize one of those delivery methods.

Q-3. Are testing and Inspection actually a part of this contract?

A-3. Professional services not included as part of this CM contract are as follows: Inspection Services; Test & Inspection Services; Geotechnical Services; Environmental Studies Services; Environmental Hazardous Materials Services; Surveying Services; and professional services that are the responsibility of the project architect of record. These services are contracted directly with the District. It is expected that the assigned project CM will fully assist the District in selecting and coordinating all professional services, as necessary, to meet project deadlines and objectives.

Q-4. 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-4. 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-5. On page 5, Item 4.4, articles 4.4.1 and 4.4.2: Can the Cover Sheet and Letter of Interest be the same document? If yes, how many pages total? If not, how many pages each.

A-5. Yes. No page limit.

Q-6. On page 6, Tab 2; Relevant Project Experience, it states that "This section of the RFQ shall not exceed fifteen (15) pages." Are the other sections limited to a certain amount of pages? Is there a page limit for the entire document?

A-6. No.

Q-7. Is there a small business interest or a required goal percentage amount?

A-7. No.

Q-8. On page 6, Tab 6; Financial Statement, it states that "Financial Statements must be reviewed by a California licensed Certified Public Accountant." The cost of such reporting is considerable. Why is this required and can it be removed from this proposal?

A-8. This level of financial reporting is deemed by the District to be necessary to ensure stability of a firm doing business with the District for a period of five to ten years, or longer.

Q-9. On page 6, Tab 7; Insurance Certificates, it shows a requirement of \$4M aggregate for Comprehensive General Liability, and \$4M aggregate for Professional Liability. Can this be reduced to the standard \$2M aggregate for each Comprehensive GL and PL?

A-9. Page 6, Tab 7 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 CM Contract. If a Respondent is awarded a CM Contract and the District determines that an Assigned Project under the CM 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.

Page 6, Tab 7 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-10. On page 5, Item 4.4, articles 4.4.1 and 4.4.2: Can the Cover Sheet and Letter of Interest be the same document?

A-10. See A-5.

Q-11. Are there going to be District supplied staff offices for the construction management team members selected by the District or are these to be supplied by the construction teams responding to this RFQ?

A-11. The District will provide a modular, portable building for each project site, as necessary, with required utilities to support normal business activity for the CM team. Space in the building will also be provided for the project Inspector of Record. All furniture, equipment and supplies are the responsibility of the construction management firm.

Q-12. Would all office equipment, supplies be supplied by the District?

A-12. See A-11.

Q-13. Has the District selected a program manager, and if yes, who is the Program Manager?

A-13. No. The District is in the process of developing a plan for program management. This plan will be dependent on whether local and/or state bond funds become available to the District in 2016 for capital outlay projects.

Q-14. Has the architect been selected by the District, and if yes, who is the Architect?

A-14. No. A pool of architectural firms will be selected. For each project an architectural firm will be selected from the pool.

Q-15. Which District campuses are proposed for this RFQ?

A-15. This RFQ applies to all District locations and facilities.

Q-16. Has the scope of work been developed for each of the proposed District campuses?

A-16. The 2016 Facilities Master Plan is in process and expected to be approved in September 2016 by the Board of Trustees. The Facilities Master Plan will define the capital outlay projects for all District facilities that are further developed and prioritized annually for the Five Year Construction Plan. Preliminary planning for the Facilities Master Plan has identified a significant amount of work to meet long term facility needs. In addition, small and medium sized capital outlay projects are defined each fiscal year to meet maintenance and operational requirements. Project scope of work and funding has not been developed for the 16-17 fiscal year as of this time.

Q-17. Has the District completed its design and construction guidelines and/or requirements for the architect and proposed construction management teams?

A-17. Design and construction guidelines will be available upon approval of the 2016 Facilities Master Plan.

Q-18. Has the District ever filed a claim against any consultant or contractor in the past 5 years?

A-18. Yes. In an action by a subcontractor for additional compensation, the District filed a counter-claim against the contractor for the project for added costs sustained by the District as a result of the subcontractor's work. The matter was resolved by a negotiated settlement.

Q-19. Proposed price should be only for one(1) year or should be for all contract duration?

A-19. For the contract duration.

Q-20. Where will be the work location for the project team? Since the District will not provide a work station can CM firm use its own office? If so, does this office have to be close to District?

A-20. The District will provide a modular, portable building for each project site, as necessary, with required utilities to support normal business activity for the CM team. Space in the building will also be provided for the project Inspector of Record. All furniture, equipment and supplies are the responsibility of the construction management firm.

Q-21. Project Team members (Project Executive, Project Manager (Job Captain) and Construction Phase Manager) have to be a CA Licensed Registered Engineer? If so for which positions this is required? Is that a plus or is that a requirement? (Ref.: Attachment C)

A-21. CM services must be provided by or under the direction and control of a California licensed architect, licensed contractor or registered engineer as required by Government Code 4525(e).

Q-22. During the pre-proposal meeting it was mentioned that there was an Architect already on board and please confirm that if Design Phase Manager is needed for this proposal. (Ref.: Page 41)

A-22. A new pool for Architectural Services will be selected. The CM is to provide design phase management.

Q-23. If our company team up with a subcontractor do we need to submit subcontractor's information and the resumes from subcontractor should be in their letterhead?

A-23. Yes.

Q-24. Page limit is indicated only in 4.4.3 Tab 2 (page 6). Please confirm that there is no page limit indicated in other sections such as Project Approach and etc.

A-24. There are no other page limits.

Q-25. Qualification Statement (Attachment A) can be up to how many pages? Section 2-Respondent Experience.

Q-25. See 4.4.3 – Tab 2; Relevant Project Experience which states: "This section of the RFQ Response shall not exceed fifteen (15) pages."

Q-26. Will AVCCD be willing to provide insight into the size of the current/remaining building program? (We note that the Antelope Valley College website identifies current capital outlay projects, listing several completed large projects and approx. 30 projects, valued in total at approx. \$5 million, mostly in planning and programming.)

A-26. 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-27. Financial Statement: Page 6, Tab 6 indicates that "Financial Statements must be reviewed by a California licensed Certified Public Accountant". Any other Accountant from other states (ex: Colorado) is acceptable? Please advise.

A-27. Paragraph 4.4.3, Tab 7 of the RFQ is modified by deleting the requirement for the Financial Statement of a Respondent to be reviewed or audited by a California licensed CPA. A Financial Statement reviewed or audited by a CPA licensed in any US state is acceptable.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.


Mina Hernandez, Purchasing Manager

5/25/16
Date