

ADDENDUM NO. 1

PROJECT NAME:

**Request for Proposals/Qualifications For Renovation of Bohemian Park Project
Environmental, Architectural, and Landscape Architectural Services**

July 9, 2024

This Addendum form is a part of the Contract Documents for the above-identified project and modifies the original Specifications and Contract Documents, as noted on the following pages. Portions of the Contract, not specifically mentioned in this Addendum, remain in force. All consultants, subconsultants, and trades affected shall be fully advised of these changes, deletions, and additions.

The Proposal submittal date will remain July 29, 2024 at 5:00 p.m.


Emily Ballus, General Manager

PROPOSERS CERTIFICATE

I acknowledge receipt of all seven (7) pages of this Addendum No. 1 and accept the aforementioned.

Proposers Signature

Date

**THIS DOCUMENT TO BE SIGNED
AND SUBMITTED WITH PROPOSAL**

ADDENDUM NO. 1

PROJECT NAME:

**Request for Proposals/Qualifications For Renovation of Bohemian Park Project
Environmental, Architectural, and Landscape Architectural Services**

July 9, 2024

The following questions and answers, additions and/or corrections shall become a part of the Contract Documents and Specifications for the above named project. When submitting a proposal for the project, this Addendum shall be acknowledged and ***a signed copy of the Addendum shall be included in the proposal package.***

QUESTION 1

Much of the language in the RFP is pertinent to construction projects and not design projects. For example, Liquidated damages clause. This is an example of a provision that is pertinent to construction where there is one phase to the work but not to design services. The design work will be done in phases with time lapse in between to accommodate District review, county review etc. Therefore, even the overall time lapse of the design phase is outside of the control of the consultant. Thus, liquidated damages is not workable in the opinion of the consultant. Would the District consider removing this requirement? Additionally, if this provision must remain, who will make the determination on invoking liquidated damages, and can the FECRPD provide guarantees of turnaround time on decision making, plan review, and budget confirmation.

ANSWER 1

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents. Before a contract is executed, the District reserves the right to negotiate final contract terms, the proposed workscope, and/or method of compensation with the selected Proposer. If modifications are necessary after award, the District will negotiate contract terms, workscope, and/or method of compensation with the contracted Consultant.

QUESTION 2

How was it determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration will be required? Is it certain that this level of CEQA document is necessary? It may be excessive for CEQA compliance for this small and type of a project. Such a determination of the need for a MND would normally occur after the permitting agency (Sacramento County) has done a preliminary assessment. Additionally, this work would be better sourced to a CEQA consultant directly whether it be a MND or some other form of CEQA compliance documentation. Is the District open to contracting with a CEQA consultant directly?

ANSWER 2

All proposers are to provide complete environmental analysis, review, and approval under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and assume a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) will be the appropriate CEQA document.

QUESTION 3

It is the opinion of the consultant that it is preliminary to request a rendering. Additionally, the ability to generate a nice looking rendering is not an indication of a firm's ability to manage and resolve the various complexities associated with this project. That should be assessed by reviewing and understanding a firm's qualifications. In our experience, it is best for development of renderings to take place after design work on building and site improvements, with substantial consultation with District, County, Fire District and other stakeholders, has occurred. The other concern about a rendering is it will establish prejudice and expectations that may or may not be reasonable. Would the District consider removing this requirement from the submittal?

ANSWER 3

Proposers shall provide preliminary sketches and renderings of ideas for the proposed improvements.

QUESTION 4

How does the district anticipate the \$4M in additional funds from Assemblymember Cooley will be allocated and how they will affect the program for the building? Understanding how these funds will be utilized is critical in providing a fee proposal, even an estimated fee proposal, as well as a schedule. Due to the unknown scope of work on the building, would it be possible for this RFP to become an RFQ with the fee to be negotiated after discussion and clarification of the building project? Or Perhaps a workable alternative is for the consultant to provide a rough estimate of design fees based upon the known funding to date only? Additionally, per page 2 of the RFP, the District is seeking additional grants and other funding. Presumably, these funds, if secured, would further modify the scope and program of the project. Can the District clarify the final size and budget of the building and what are the final funds available for the building? If not, how should the consultant approach their fee estimate, which is required to be valid for 90 days from submittal, given this ambiguity?

ANSWER 4

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents. Before a contract is executed, the District reserves the right to negotiate final contract terms, the proposed workscope, and/or method of compensation with the selected Proposer. If modifications are necessary after award, the District will negotiate contract terms, workscope, and/or method of compensation with the contracted Consultant.

QUESTION 5

In regard to a schedule, what can the consultant reasonably assume in regards to district turnaround time for review and decisions? Please provide for staff level decisions and those which must be approved by the Board.

ANSWER 5

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents. Review and decisions by the District will be provided as promptly as is practical during the process.

QUESTION 6

Per page 2 of the RFP, the District is seeking additional grants and other funding sources. Presumably, these funds, if secured, would further modify the scope and program of the project. Can the district provide more info about each of these potential funds and sources, current status of the request, anticipated likelihood of award and expected notification of award?

ANSWER 6

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents. Before a contract is executed, the District reserves the right to negotiate final contract terms, the proposed workscope, and/or method of compensation with the selected Proposer. If modifications are necessary after award, the District will negotiate contract terms, workscope, and/or method of compensation with the contracted Consultant.

QUESTION 7

Given the ambiguity of funding for the community center specifically. Will the district consider a phased project to allow for the park to be created and designed while the building funding is being solidified?

ANSWER 7

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents. Before a contract is executed, the District reserves the right to negotiate final contract terms, the proposed workscope, and/or method of compensation with the selected Proposer. If modifications are necessary after award, the District will negotiate contract terms, workscope, and/or method of compensation with the contracted Consultant.

QUESTION 8

What services will FECRPD provide as part of the project? Will the district hire a construction management firm to manage install of the project?

ANSWER 8

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents. Additional services to be provided by the District are unknown at this time.

QUESTION 9

Does the District have a translator available to provide translations for the non-English speaking community (on schematic plans for example)?

ANSWER 9

FEC has interpreters that can assist with working with the Afghan population around Bohemian Park.

QUESTION 10

During the Schematic Design Update process, does the District want Consultant team to perform the Outreach to gain input from park users/the community? We recommend at least one onsite meeting with the community with a follow-up meeting with District Staff/stakeholders.

ANSWER 10

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents. Before a contract is executed, the District reserves the right to negotiate final contract terms, the proposed workscope, and/or method of compensation with the selected Proposer. If modifications are necessary after award, the District will negotiate contract terms, workscope, and/or method of compensation with the contracted Consultant.

QUESTION 11

Page 7 of the RFP, section J – Certificate of Insurance simply states “see note under insurance requirements.” However, in the “Instructions to Proposer” section on page 13, it is stated that a proposer shall provide a COI in the “form, coverages and amounts specified in the sample Professional Services agreement... within 10 calendar days after notice of contract award.” What, if anything, should be submitted in response to Section J above in the RFP response? Additionally, the language in the sample contract has blanks in regards to Errors and Omissions coverage limits and requirements for reporting tail. Please confirm the information required there.

ANSWER 11

Proposers are to provide proof of insurance. Before a contract is executed, the District will negotiate final contract terms, including insurance terms and limits, with the selected Proposer.

QUESTION 12

On page 5 of the RFP, it is requested that “proposals must include all terms and conditions, including... Written warranties, maintenance/service agreements, license agreements and lease purchase agreements” – these are items typically provided by a General Contractor and/or a separate commissioning vendor as part of Construction Close out. Are there specific warranties or other info desired from Design team that the district is seeking with this request?

ANSWER 12

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents.

QUESTION 13

Are sub consultants to be identified in the proposal response? If so, do sub-consultants need to provide the following information requested in RFP:

- a) Company background and info
- b) Qualifications/ work examples
- c) Billing rates

ANSWER 13

Proposers shall submit subconsultant information as per the SUBCONSULTANT LIST in the RFP/Q documents, as well as the estimated hours for each phase of the work provided by sub-consultants. Company background, information, qualifications, work examples, and billing rates are not required but may be provided by the Proposer.

QUESTION 14

By 'consultant', did you mean the Melton Design Group (MDG)? Are they precluded from submitting on this RFP?

ANSWER 14

In 2020, FEC contracted with the Melton Design Group (MDG) to assist FEC in conducting community input meetings. As a result of the meetings, MDG developed a Bohemian Neighborhood Park 2021 Park Expansion & Renovation Master Plan (Exhibit B). MDG's original contract work with the District has concluded. MDG is allowed to submit on this RFP/Q.

QUESTION 15

Does addn. public outreach need to be included as part of the scope?

ANSWER 15

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents. Before a contract is executed, the District reserves the right to negotiate final contract terms, the proposed workscope, and/or method of compensation with the selected Proposer. If modifications are necessary after award, the District will negotiate contract terms, workscope, and/or method of compensation with the contracted Consultant.

QUESTION 16

Was curious how developed the ideas were for the Community Center building component that Mogavero Architects developed? Is the intent to continue with them as the architects during the detailed design process? Also, how large (sf) is the anticipated Community Center footprint? Have Mogavero Architects done any cost estimating to see if the \$3.65M building cost mentioned in the grant is adequate?

ANSWER 16

Proposers should submit proposals to the best of their abilities in accordance with the RFP/Q documents. In February 2022, FEC contracted with Mogavero Architects to develop ideas regarding a new community center. Mogavero Architects' original contract work with the District has concluded. Mogavero Architects is allowed to submit on this RFP/Q.

QUESTION 17

Has any environmental / CEQA work been done so far, and if so, which firm was involved for this?

ANSWER 17

All proposers are to provide complete environmental analysis, review, and approval

under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and assume a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) will be the appropriate CEQA document.

When submitting a proposal for the project, this Addendum shall be acknowledged and a signed copy of the Addendum shall be included in the proposal package