



Addendum No. 1

RFP 21-16 WCC PA Construction Management Services

Date: 02/08/2022

Clarifications:

- Question:** When does the District anticipate issuing the Notice to Proceed to Lathrop Construction?
Answer: After the local District Board provides Conditional Authorization to award AND the State Chancellors Office provides Authorization to Award. Likely the week of February 25, 2022.
- Question:** When does the District anticipate awarding the contract to the successful Construction Management Consultant? March 10, 2022, Board Meeting?
Answer: After the local District Board provides Conditional Authorization to award AND the State Chancellors Office provides Authorization to Award. Likely the week of March 24, 2022.
- Question:** It appears the Regular Board Meetings rotate from various campus locations. Under Article 2.2/2.b of the RFP, it indicates the CM is expected to attend the Board meetings and other meetings as required. For CM estimating services, how many meetings should the CM Consultant assume they will need to attend as meetings can consume a significant amount of the CM budget or could result in lower cost proposals if the CM is only really expected to attend a small number of Board meetings at the District Office. Also, please confirm if attendance would be in-person or by Zoom since some of the meetings could be in Lake County, for example, per the current Board meeting schedule.
Answer: Please include time to ZOOM into the Board meetings as needed. For the purposes of bidding the project, include 8 zoom meetings that run from 5pm to 8pm. Also include 2 in-person Board meetings at the District Offices at 425 Plumas Blvd, Yuba City, California from 5pm to 8pm. Also include 1 in-person Board meeting at the Woodland Community College campus at 2300 East Gibson Road, Woodland, California, 95776.
- Question:** Under Article 2.2/2.f of the RFP, it requires the CM to track all preliminary claim notices. Typically, the notices are sent directly to the District Purchasing Department for tracking purposes. If the CM is expected to track submittal of these claim notices, will Purchasing or someone else send them to the CM for tracking purposes?
Answer: Yes, the District will share this information.



5. **Question:** Under Article 2.2/2. Construction Phase of the RFP, we did not see a specific requirement to review Lathrop's Initial CPM Schedule (60 days), Baseline CPM Schedule or CPM monthly updates? It will be extremely important for the CM to review and provide comments regarding Lathrop's initial CPM Schedule and Baseline Schedule prior to them submitting monthly CPM updates. The same is true for the monthly CPM schedule updates submitted by Lathrop, especially if they include impacts from Proposed Change Orders. Please confirm the intent of Article 2.2/1.1 is to review and respond to Lathrop's Initial CPM Schedule, Baseline CPM Schedule, along with each of their month updates, as this can be a very time-consuming CM activity during construction, especially if Lathrop happens to fall behind schedule at some point.
Answer: Good point. Yes, please include an initial review of the CPM Schedule (60 days), the Baseline CPM Schedule, and the Monthly updated CMP Schedules. Please plan to provide written comments and suggestions regarding these schedules.
6. **Question:** Regarding Article 2.2/2.h of the RFP, please confirm the District only wants PDF copies of the Certified Payroll Reports Lathrop and their subcontractors submit to the Department of Industrial Relations since providing hard copies would be a significant expense.
Answer: Yes, the District only requires PDF format copies of the CPR for Lathrop and it's subcontractors.
7. **Question:** Regarding Article 2.2/2.j of the RFP, please confirm the intent of the District is only to review and approve Lathrop's monthly progress applications, or is the intent of the District for the CM to review and approve the invoices of the Architect of Record, IOR, and other District consultants? If the intent is to review payment requests other than the Lathrop Pay Applications, please provide a list of these other District Consultants the CM is expected to manage payments for. Also, would the CM be expected to review any change order requests by District consultants other than Lathrop's Pay Application, or is this something that the District PM is managing? Managing and approving invoices and potential change orders of other District consultants would be very time consuming, especially if they are requesting change orders.
Answer: The CM needs to review and sign ONLY the Lathrop Construction monthly progress payments. The District PM will review and approve the consultants progress payments.
8. **Question:** Regarding Article 2.2/2.k of the RFP, we are not sure how the CM could identify possible payment defaults since the CM does not have access to Lathrop's subcontractor agreements or the amount, they pay each subcontractor or material suppliers each month. The District Purchasing Department would receive Stop Notices from subcontractors and material suppliers, which then Lathrop would have to bond around or rectify, which can be tracked and monitored once the CM receives the Stop Notice documentation from Purchasing. Please clarify the intent of this CM scope of work task.
Answer: Please remove this scope request. The District PM will coordinate this activity.



9. **Question:** Regarding Article 2.2/2.L of the RFP to “Make recommendations that maintain project lowest costs of ownership and lowest long-term maintenance, operations and energy costs.”, since the contract was already bid on and will be shortly awarded to Lathrop Construction, the CM could make such recommendations, but said recommendations at this point in construction would likely result in extra cost change orders and a possible delay to the completion of the project. Typically, this effort by a CM would occur during the design development phase or at some point early in the construction document phase. We would recommend deleting this task and have the CM focus on Article 2.2/2.1 to monitor that Lathrop and their subcontractors are furnishing and installing what was specified in the contract documents/approved shop drawings. Lathrop could submit “substitution requests” when products are no longer available, and the CM could assist with these reviews conducted by tBP Architecture, but we did not see this specific task listed in Article 2.2.

Answer: I agree with your suggestion. Remove the scope of work: “Make recommendations that maintain project lowest costs of ownership and lowest long-term maintenance, operations and energy costs.” Please plan to focus on the following: Article 2.2/2.1 to monitor that Lathrop and their subcontractors are furnishing and installing what was specified in the contract documents/approved shop drawings. Lathrop could submit “substitution requests”. Please plan to provide a review of substitution requests as a collaborative process with the Architect of Record and the District PM.

10. **Question:** Regarding Article 2.2/5 of the RFP, Other scope to be included in Consultant’s Contract, “a” can be very little scope or a significant scope of work if proposed change orders develop into “claims” as defined in the contract documents. Same for “c”. As a suggestion, can the District set a specific monetary allowance amount that would be included in the CM Contract and only authorized for expenditure at the District’s written request in the event Lathrop submits a claim as compared to the typical PCO? This will help ensure all CM are assuming the same scope of work as part of their cost proposals.

Answer: An allowance of \$25,000 will be added to the Bid Form for District approved “Unforeseen” additional services. These unforeseen additional services include 2.2/5a and 5c and other specific District approved services not specifically addressed in this RFP.



11. **Question:** As for “b” in Article 2.2/5 in the RFP, the Contract Documents require Lathrop to use a mutually agreeable construction management software (Section 01 31 80). Has Lathrop confirmed they are using EADOC or some other software like Procore? We have experience with both, but it would be good to know which document management system they plan to use for this project. Since Section 01 31 80 requires most of the project documents to be on this software program, which will be provided to the District, please clarify you are not expecting the CM to provide a separate software program for document management. We would use the Lathrop document management software to develop reports used weekly for open RFIs, open submittals, etc., and would share monthly status reports via email or some other suitable format (e.g., Drop Box).

Answer: Lathrop Construction uses Procore and will provide access to the CM, Architect of Record, and the District PM to load, process, and approve all project documents.

12. **Question:** Regarding Appendix A in the RFP, would be acceptable to include an attachment, such as an Excel Spreadsheet with hourly rates and estimated hours/month, to illustrate how costs were developed for Items # 1 and #2 in Appendix A, or would that be submitted later if we should be short-listed for an interview?

Answer: The District would like to see a breakdown of the costs attached to Appendix A and costs totalized. The District would also like to see the hourly rate costs and unit costs for possible other services considerations.

13. **Question:** The RFQ/P Statement of Qualifications. Phase 3. Question 13 requires at least (5) projects valued at least \$15 million in the past 5 years and (3) projects with a value of \$35 million in the past 8 years.

Question: Are the exact values mandatory to meet & what are the penalties for not meeting the requirements.

F.E if you have projects that are between 12-14 million or 27-32 million?

Answer: *No, these values are desirable but not mandatory. Please present what you can regarding these values and for point consideration. The point system is not an all or nothing criteria.*

14. **Question:** The RFQ/P Section 12 pg. 14 states; Only Firms that can provide the full comprehensive inspection and testing services as outlined in this RFP will be considered.

Question: Will the CM firm be required to provide these services in-house or are we able to sub-contract testing & inspections under the accepted CM. Also, is the district discussing potentially removing this requirement into a stand-alone contract specifically for Testing & inspections.

Answer: I’m sorry. This was a carry over from another RFP. There are no Testing and Inspection services required in this RFP for CM Services.



15. Updated Appendix A Bid Form:

No.	Description	Cost
1	Construction Management / Quality Assurance Services:	\$
2	"Unforeseen or Unexpected" CM Services	\$ 25,000.00
3	Other costs:	\$
4	Total Costs:	\$

Do not include any hotel or meal costs.

This is a prevailing wage project.

Provide a detailed breakdown of the costs of this proposal as an attachment to this Bid Form.

Provide hourly rate costs for future additional scope of work items and attach to this Bid Form.

The End.