RFP No.: 19-20/01 Architectural Design Services for the College of Alameda (COA) Aviation Economic Development Administration (AEDA) Project

August 30, 2019

ADDENDUM No. 3

This addendum supersedes items of the original contract documents wherein it is inconsistent with it. All other conditions remain unchanged. The following changes, modifications, corrections, additions or clarifications shall apply to the contract documents and shall be made a part of and subject to all of the requirements thereof as if originally specified or shown. It is the responsibility of the bidder to review the list of attachments to ensure that the addendum is full and complete. This Addendum modifies the original RFP Documents for the above proposal. Acknowledge receipt of this addendum in the space provided on the BID FORM. Failure to do so may subject Bidder to disqualification.

QUESTIONS:

1. The Utility/Cylinder Feed at the entrance is shown to be removed. What is the function of this device?

   **Response:** The exterior chemical/gas assembly is no longer used and is described as such in the in the RFP. The usage is not pertinent to the current project at this time.

2. The Phase 2 project discussed for the campus includes a new hangar. What will be the size (square footage) of the new hangar?

   **Response:** Replace existing Hangar A is not part of this project. All of the work for the grant funded project, per EDA-approved revised scope (which is the only scope described in the RFP), is interior to existing Hangar B, with the exception of the following, which are all identified in the RFP narrative and the cost estimate detail included in the RFP:

   a. sewer lift/pump work at the exterior yard between the two existing hangars
   b. repairs to hangar doors at Hangar B
c. relocating the main entry to Hangar B (does not impact the footprint of Hangar B)

3. The "General Context", paragraph 3 (Page 18) refers to the campus as 2.5 acres. The "Existing Conditions, Project Scope", paragraph 2 (Page 19) refers to the campus as 1 acre. Which is correct?

**Response:** The size of the existing property is unlikely to be pertinent to the design of the grant-funded project since it does not change the size or shape of any existing buildings.

4. Are Landscape Design and Irrigation Plans included in the project scope?

**Response:** There are no significant landscaping or irrigation scope included in the grant-funded project.

5. The original construction drawings indicate that the electrical service to Building B is fed from the main switchboard in Building A with a 400A, 3 pole 480V circuit breaker. Will this feed remain for the Phase 1 project, or will the building receive a new electrical service from the utility company?

**Response:** This feed will remain, unless the design requires additional power, in which case the design team will address the issue.

6. Is the existing computer lab used only for taking FAA exams, or also for online research for parts, system diagrams, manuals, etc.? If not, where will this online research take place?

**Response:** Yes

7. The RFP indicates that a Topographical Survey will be provided by the district. Is civil engineering for site improvements and modifications for storm water drainage included in the scope of work for architectural and engineering services?

**Response:** No

8. A lift station is mentioned as needing repairs or replacement. Is this lift station for storm water drainage or domestic waste? How is sewer and domestic waste handled? Does it gravity feed to a sewer main in the street or elsewhere, or does it require a lift station?

**Response:** Feeds to street, which is the purpose of the lift station. Include replacement or repair in scope of work.

9. In the meeting there was reference to the poor quality of the potable water. Will a test be done on the system and any recommendations on domestic water design? Or should we assume that effort to be in the design scope?

**Response:** Include in design scope and project budget.
10. Will there be any changes to the hoist/crane? Any changes to its loading requirements?

   **Response:** No changes anticipated to be made to the existing hoist system at Hangar B or its associated loading requirements for either project (grant or state funded).

11. We see the 1968 drawings were signed by the “State Fire Marshall” not DSA. Has there been any discussion with DSA on acceptance of the current structure as is?

   **Response:** Both have DSA signatures on them.

12. Will a complete list of furnishing and equipment be provided indicating “provided by owner installed by contractor”, “provided and installed by contractor”, or “provided and installed by owner”? Or should the design team anticipate working with you to prepare the list? This is particularly important for shop equipment which will have power and attachment requirements specific to each piece of equipment.

   **Response:** The District can provide an updated list of new equipment that will be procured by the grant-funded project (the updated list was included in the scope revision request submitted to the EDA). All other existing FF+E will need to be inventoried as needed by the design team and protected for re-use. There is no separate budget for FF+E beyond the grant-funded list.

END OF ADDENDUM THREE