

California State University, Chico



ADDENDUM #1
Addendum Date: July 29, 2019
Project: BUTE39
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
FOR
COLLABORATIVE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES
FOR THE
Butte Hall Renovation
RFQ2019-02MM

This Addendum forms a part of the Contract Documents and modifies the original Bidding Documents and any previous Addenda. The Bidder shall acknowledge his/her acceptance of this addendum by writing its number designation on the SOQ Cover Letter. Failure to do so may subject Bidder to disqualification. In case of conflict between Bidding Documents and this Addendum, this Addendum shall govern.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS DUE:

AUGUST 1, 2019 BY 3:00PM

Revisions

MODIFICATIONS TO REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

The University is providing the following clarifications based on questions from proposers.

1. Are the consultants listed in the Butte Hall Feasibility Study precluded from participating on Design Build teams for the RFQ phase?

Answer: There are no restrictions on who can bid on this project.

2. SOQ required information and scoring section 8.6 requests a matrix indicating all proposed team member and their joint project experience. Will the University be requiring an organization chart and resumes for the proposed GC and Architectural team members in this SOQ response? And if so, where should we include these?

Answer: While this section of the RFQ does not specifically ask for an organizational chart or resumes, if you would like to include them, do so in this section.

3. As it relates to section 8.6 and general design-build experience would the University like responding teams to include relevant sub-consultants, and subsequently including them as part of our proposed team? And if so, where should we include the consultant information

Answer: While this section of the RFQ does not specifically ask for relevant sub-consultant information, if you would like to include them, do so in this section.

4. Under **Section 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION** (page 1), it states, “*The renovation will require coordination and moving of large amount of faculty and staff to other buildings on campus in order to maintain College of BSS operations during construction.*” Please clarify the expectations of the Design Build team’s scope regarding faculty & staff relocation. Will surge planning, phasing plans, and relocation execution be required by Design Build team?

Answer: Yes, the Design-Build team will be responsible for all of the above scope, surge planning, phasing plans, and relocation execution.

5. Under **Section 8 – SOQ REQUIRED INFORMATION AND SCORING**, Item 5 - Project Specific Requirements (page 5), it asks for the Design Build team’s “Experience and expertise in understanding

and implementing California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).” Please describe the expected Design Build team’s CEQA scope required for an existing educational building structure.

Answer: At this time, the full extent of any required CEQA mitigation measures is not known. Once the project is fully developed, that information will be known and shared. The RFP will contain the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs (MMRP) from the Campus’ Master Plan & EIR.

6. Will CSU Chico require or encourage Small Business Enterprise / Small Local Business Enterprise (SBE / SLBE) as part of the design architect/engineer consultant team? If required or encouraged, please provide the specific SBE / SLBE requirements for the Design-Build team.

Answer: CSU Chico encourages participation from California certified small business, but it is not required. Small business participation is not evaluated during the Request for Qualifications process. As part of the Request for Proposals, the Trustees shall give a certified small business a bid advantage of five percent (5%) of the highest technical proposal score. For more information and a sample of how the small business preference is calculated, see Section 32.11, “Small Business Five Percent Proposal Advantage” of the Contract General Conditions located at: <http://www.calstate.edu/cpdc/cm/rfp-collaborative-design-build.shtml>.

7. As stated as part of question 6 of the RFQ, we are asked to provide a matrix indicating all proposed team members and their joint project experience, if any. Does the definition of “team members” pertain to firms (i.e. engineers, consultants & AEC team) or does it pertain to individual team members (i.e. project manager, superintendent, AOR, etc.)?

Answer: While this section of the RFQ does not specifically ask for relevant sub-consultant information, if you would like to include them, do so in this section.

8. Are we required to list our engineers and consultants at this phase or is this strictly an SOQ for the Architect and Contractor teams only?

Answer: While this section of the RFQ does not specifically ask for relevant sub-consultant information, if you would like to include them, do so in this section.

9. As part of question 6 of the RFQ, are we also required to provide resumes for the key team members or is this not required at this phase?

Answer: While this section of the RFQ does not specifically ask for resumes, if you would like to include them, do so in this section.

All other terms, conditions, and provisions of the original #RFQ2019-02MM shall remain the same.

DATE: July 29, 2019

University File Copy Signed

Michael McNairn
Contracts Coordinator
Procurement and Contract Services