

CAL POLY HUMBOLDT

December 13, 2022

To All Prospective Bidders

SUBJECT: RFP #PW22-1, Engineering & Technology Building, and Student Housing, Project PLY101

Addendum #1

The following changes, omissions and/or additions to the Bidding Documents shall apply to proposals made for and to the execution of the various parts of the work affected thereby and all other conditions shall remain the same. In case of conflict between Bidding Documents and this Addendum, this Addendum shall govern.

1. RFP Cost Proposal Opening.

RFP Cost Proposal Opening date has not changed and remains Tuesday, January 17, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

Questions and Answers

- Q1. On page 19 of the RFP, under Tab 4, it states "Limit to four pages for each section herein (this limitation does not apply to the quality control plans)." Can Cal Poly Humboldt please clarify what counts as a section for this tab as well as what the total page count for Tab 4 is?
Answer: Tab 4-Section A, Phase 1; and Tab 4-Section B, Phase 2. Two sections so total page count is 8 pages for Tab 4, excluding the QC documents which may be included as appendices.
- Q2. Will FFE be paid by the owner?
Answer: Yes, see RFP Section 13.02 Table B.
What group will this budget be applied to?
Answer: Group II furnishings and equipment.
- Q3. On page 3 of 30 in the draft RFP, the direct construction cost budget is stated as \$90,922,000. In Appendix A, Fee Proposal Form, the direct construction cost budget is stated at \$103,179,000. In Appendix A, Fee Proposal Form page 2 of 3, the direct construction cost budget is stated at \$90,922,000. In Addendum 1 that was released with the RFQ, the estimated design and construction cost was changed to \$114,745,000.
Answer: The Direct Construction Cost Budget is \$101,508,000. The Project Budget GMP is \$122,924,000.

On page 4 of 30 in the draft RFP, Submit Fee Proposal Form is due on 3:00 p.m. on January 6, 2023. In Appendix A, Fee Proposal Form, this is shown as 3:00 pm. on Friday, March 11, 2022.
Answer: Cost Proposal due at 3:00 p.m. on 06 January 2023.

Please confirm cost information in the draft RFP is correct. Please advise if University will re-issue the Appendix A, Fee Proposal Form.

Answer: Appendix A, Fee Proposal Form, will be reissued.

- Q4. On page 4 of 30 in the draft RFP, the schedule states that the Fee Proposal Form is due on January 6th, 2023 at 3pm and the Cost Proposal Opening is on January 17th, 2023. On page 1 of the Table of Contents, it states proposals are due on January 17th, 2023. Please confirm the due dates that will take precedence are the dates listed in the final RFP.

Answer: See Q3 above.

- Q5. RFP 3.01 (page 3 of 30) ends with two sentences which reads:
- Attached to the RFQ are concept drawing to be used as reference only.
 - The Project is more fully illustrated in the documents listed in the Exhibits.

These documents were not attached to the RFP and are not available on the web site. Please provide both documents at your earliest convenience.

Answer: These documents have been provided. See Attachment 1 to RFQ – Programming & Feasibility Study.

Exhibits A through L have been posted online. RFP Section 2.01 references the Table of Contents for a complete listing.

- Q6. RFP 10.03 includes two (2) "Site Management Fee section which is "C Site Management Fee / Construction Phase Services" and "G Site Management Fee" (page 22 of 30). It is assumed that section "C Site Management Fee / Construction Phase Services" is the correct section. Please confirm this is the case.

Answer: RFP Section 10.03.G is deleted.

- Q7. Exhibit D - Supplementary General Condition reads as "This Project shall be enrolled in the Trustees' Owner Controlled Insurance program. Design-Builder shall disregard the provisions of Article 36.06-b.". Article 36.06.b is in fact the Owner Controlled Insurance Program. What document(s) should D-B entities reference for OCIP information/requirement?

Answer: The project will be enrolled in the OCIP program. Exhibit D is revised.

- Q8. Exhibit A, the site survey, was provided as a pdf file. Is the CAD version of the survey available? If so, please provide CAD file.

Answer: It is available on the CPH Procurement web site.

<https://procurement.humboldt.edu/bids/construction>

- Q9. In the Draft RFP, Section 620 states at minimum of three qualified trade contractor bids is required for each bid package. In the Design-Assist and Design-Build Subcontractor Contract Documents, it states that a minimum of four qualified trade contractor bids is required. Please confirm that the number of qualified trade contractor bids required for each bid package is three including Design-Assist contractors.

Answer: Minimum of three qualified bidders.

- Q10. In the Draft RFP, Section 6.14 Construction Cost Estimates / GMP Submittals states that the Design-Builder shall provide continuing estimate support, and full and complete proposals at:

- 100% Schematic Design - GMP proposal
- Design Development , timing based on schedule, as agreed between Design-Builder and Trustees

- Final GMP proposal

Whereas, Exhibit F, Section 1.2 Cost Estimate Submittals states that Project construction cost estimates shall be developed/updated and submitted as a part of each of the following submittals and list:

- .a Schematic Presentation (to CPDC)
- .b 100% Schematic Design (updated)
- .c 100% Preliminary Design
- .d 50% Construction Documents
- .e 95% Construction Documents (updated)
- .f 100% Final Construction Document submittal (updated)

Please clarify which to follow.

Answer: The University is looking for a collaborative and continuous approach to cost management as stated in RFP Section 6.14. RFP Section 6.14 speaks primarily to the GMP deliverable requirements, and in some instances, these will be the same as required in the Exhibit F CSU Procedure Manual for Capital Projects and are not additional deliverables.

Q11. In the Draft RFP, Section 5.05, Owner Provided Documentation, the list includes "Site Survey of existing conditions". Please advise if this includes survey such as 1) GPR and/or pothole survey of (E) underground utility lines and 2) butterfly survey of (E) electrical/telecom manhole(s) and raceway(s). Can we expect these to be part of Section 6.16 Design Phase Investigation Work that University will be taking on? Or are these Design-Builder's responsibility? If so, does the University entertain the idea of setting a set allowance for all Design-Builders to carry?

Answer: The site survey will not document the two scopes mentioned. With respect to RFP Section 6.16, additional site investigations will be addressed as stated in this section. There is not a need to establish an allowance at this time.

Q12. Confirm the project is LEED Gold equivalent.

Answer: Yes.

Q13. How does the university account for escalation?

Answer: Escalation is included within the Budgeted Direct Construction Cost.

Q14. Who are the other shortlisted teams?

Answer: The University will not disclose the shortlisted firms at this time.

Q15. Are we able to visit the campus between now and the end of the year?

Answer: Yes, the campus is open to the public. A hosted visit cannot be accommodated however.

Q16. Can we obtain the collateral used by the feasibility team? There is quite a bit of a head start represented in that document that includes modeled site, diagramming, and layouts. We have a short duration to recreate an in-depth process represented in the feasibility study.

Answer: The feasibility study is one possible outcome of our programming work. The university would expect the project that is delivered may be substantially different from the concept. The University feels that sufficient documentation has been provided to inform the Proposers so that key decisions and strategies can be based for this procurement, and that further materials would distract from the primary purpose of this effort, which is to identify the best team to lead this project. This is not a design competition, and efforts to "recreate" the feasibility study are

unnecessary and probably better directed towards other aspects of the response.

- Q17. Relating to design requests as part of the technical proposal – what mechanism do we have to obtain feedback on design approach without Collaborative Design Meeting?
Answer: No feedback will be provided prior to submission of the Technical and Cost Proposals. As stated, this is not a design competition. The goals and expectations for the “sketch” are specified in the RFP.
- Q18. What is Cal Poly Humboldt’s feeling on phased submissions?
Answer: Within this context, we are assuming that you are referring to the design and permitting process. The University is open to any scheme or approach that maximize value for the project.
- Q19. How does the university account for escalation?
Answer: See Q13 above.
- Q20. What is Cal Poly Humboldt’s approach to renewable energy?
Answer: Please see link below:
<https://facilitymgmt.humboldt.edu/energy-management>
<https://facilitymgmt.humboldt.edu/sustainability-office-welcome>
- Q21. Please confirm that the project will not be tied to central utility infrastructure except telecom/data.
Answer: Confirmed.
- Q22. Please clarify the target area for the single rooms for the housing? Page 43 – graphic program states 100 sf and page 86 room data sheet states 120 sf.
Answer: This discrepancy can be resolved early in the Schematic Design phase.
- Q23. Is CAD available for the site survey?
Answer: It is available on the CPH Procurement web site.
<https://procurement.humboldt.edu/bids/construction>
- Q24. Who will be present (in the room/online) for the January 11 interview?
Answer: The Evaluation Committee will consist of the following: University, academic, and student housing leadership; professional staff within Facilities Management; and PM/CM consultants.
- Q25. Can you clarify the process of engagement with the Office of Fire Safety? Is it similar to the Office of State Fire Marshal Process or more like the CSU process with multiple reviews at SD, Preliminary Plans and CDs with comments resolved prior to permitting?
Answer: It is anticipated that OFS will be engaged at each design phase deliverable.
- Q26. How should we address programming opportunities? For example, the laundry facility in the housing should be measured based on calculations for best practices for number of washers and dryers per bed and stackable equipment could save area.
Answer: These can be addressed early in the Schematic Design phase.
- Q27. The housing program does not include a package room. The mail room should handle basic, daily mail with some packages, but currently that is insufficient to handle all of the package needs of

students with Amazon delivering daily. Should we add a separate package room to the program?
Answer: That is a consideration that should be addressed early in the Schematic Design phase.

Q28. The student housing program does not address trash, compost, or recycling. Is the intent that students use a trash chute on each floor down to a common trash room or will students bring their trash down to a common trash room? Should a trash room be added to the program? How is trash handled for the engineering + technology building?

Answer: Those are considerations that should be addressed early in the Schematic Design phase.

Q29. Can the housing team share move-in day procedures?

Answer: It would be premature to presuppose a move-in procedure for a facility not yet designed.

Q30. The diagrams for the housing structure do not show space for mechanical or electrical rooms. Is the intent to leverage those spaces in the Engineering + Technology building for the entire three building complex? It is likely the housing building will need its own electrical / data room and mechanical room. The electric hot water heat pumps alone would take up significant space. Are these spaces intended to come out of the gross area?

Answer: It is not a given that the final design will result in a three building facility; therefore, it would be presumptuous to assume the location of MEP support spaces to a prescribed area. Also reference Section 3.3.2 of the *Programming & Feasibility Study Report*.

Q31. The planning diagrams do not show an MPOE as noted in the narrative nor a battery storage space. Are these spaces additions to the program or accounted for in the electrical room? An IDF or MDF is not indicated in the housing diagrams that should be identified separately. Are these spaces intended to come out of the gross area?

Answer: See Section 3.3.2 of the *Programming & Feasibility Study Report*.

Q32. Is reception or security considered in the living/gathering room of the housing? A single point of entry needs to be monitored for students coming to the housing building.

Answer: That is a consideration that should be addressed early in the Schematic Design phase.

Q33. Contract General Conditions Questions:

a. Article 38.01 e - "Use of Design Builders Contingency" – This section does not address the use of contingency for escalation costs. On our call with the Cal Poly team last week there was discussion around the use of line item escalation values allowed to be carried where future escalation may happen in the time between setting the GMP and future bidding to the subcontractor community. Article 38.01 f describes the "Use of Allowances" and there is no mention of escalation being an approved Allowance item. Please confirm escalation values may be assigned as "Allowances" to be reconciled at the time of award of a subcontract at a later date.

Answer: Reference RFP Section 6.30 and Section 6.34.H. Escalation shall not be carried as a discrete allowance.

b. Article 36.04 a – "Substitution of Trade Contractors" describes that all bonding requirements for subcontractors must be spelled out in the bidding documents to meet the public contract code. Our organization uses a combination of Subcontractor Default Insurance (SDI) managed by our company and 3rd party payment and performance bonds provided by the subcontractors. Please confirm SDI may be used for this project.

Answer: Confirmed.

Article 36.06 a (1) a (i) requests the Contractor to provide General Liability Insurance and article 36.06 b describes an OCIP administered by the Owner/Trustees. Please confirm this project will be an OCIP GL policy.

Answer: The project will be enrolled in the OCIP program, and Article 36.06-b is applicable. See also the link below:

<https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/doing-business-with-the-csu/capital-planning-design-construction/operations-center/Pages/construction-insurance-programs.aspx>

- Q34. If available, please provide metered data (preferably 2019) showing maximum demands on medium voltage feeders '4' and '6' to validate their capacity.
Answer: This information is not currently available.
- Q35. The topographic and utility survey dated 2017 shows the site condition prior to the installation of module buildings which we understand have been removed by the University. Does the University intend to provide an updated topographic and utility survey (including invert elevations of the sanitary sewers) that documents the existing condition?
Answer: Yes, an updated survey will be provided.
- Q36. Which teams have been shortlisted for the RFP phase of the project?
Answer: The University will not disclose the shortlisted firms at this time.
- Q37. Section 3.01 of the Draft RFP states the project scope includes streetscape improvements along B Street, 17th Street, and Wildlife Lane. Please confirm the sidewalks and streets are within the jurisdiction of the City of Arcata, subject to the City's Complete Streets Policy, and permitted by the City's Engineering Department.
Answer: The sidewalk and streets are not within the jurisdiction of the City of Arcata.
- Q38. Per the Programing & Feasibility Report, Landscape Basis of Design, the Drainage Paragraph states "drainage shall also conform to the forthcoming master plan report." Will the University provide a draft copy of the report?
Answer: Yes, when it becomes available.
- Q39. Per the Programing & Feasibility Report, Civil Basis of Design, Section 5.2.3 a 24-in storm drain located in the Events Field will need to be relocated. Please confirm ownership and if the relocation is the responsibility of the University or the D/B team.
Answer: The 24" storm drain is a University facility. Relocation would be part of the project scope (CDB team).
- Q40. Exhibit D – Supplementary General Condition
Please note that Exhibit D which was re-issued as part of Addendum #01 has no change and continue to state "Design-Builder shall disregard the provisions of Article 36.06-b." Please re-issue correct Exhibit D.
Answer: See Q7 above.
- Q41. General Condition & Final RFP General Condition Section 36.11 Responsibility to Secure and Pay for Permits, Licenses, Utility Connections, Etc. states: "Design-Builder shall secure all permits and licenses required for any operations required under this Contract and shall pay all costs relating thereto as well as all other fees and charges that are required by the United States, the

State, the county, the city, a public utility, telephone company, special district, or quasi-governmental entity."

Final RFP Section 13.01 – Classification of Project Costs (Table A), Indirect and Miscellaneous Costs Item 16 through Item 26 lists various Fees to be "Paid by Owner". Please confirm Section 13.01 – Classification of Project Costs (Table A) is correct that University will pay all costs and fees.

Answer: With respect to fee payments, RFP Section 13.01 is confirmed as "Paid by Owner" for the items listed (Indirect and Miscellaneous Costs, Items 16 to 26).

Q42.

Final RFP Section 10.03, A. Design Fees and Table 13.02B - Design Fee Allocation Matrix do not address Reimbursable expenses for the Architect and Design Consultants. Is there a preference from CSU Humboldt as to where these design reimbursable fees (such as postage, reproduction, travel, physical models, photography, etc.) are categorized?

Answer: These costs are to be included in the Design Fees (reference RFP Section 10.03.A). There is no separate allocation for "design reimbursable expenses."

-END OF ADDENDUM-

Contracts & Procurement

Addie Dunaway
Procurement Specialist