<u>Civil Engineer Design Services for Student Residence Halls</u> Responses to questions for RFP – June 30th, 2022

1. **Question:** Is the goal for this development to capture 150 occupants due to the two residence halls being "unsafe", or is there a goal for more than 150 occupants?

Response: The anticipated occupancy is currently 266 beds.

2. **Question:** The Project Description states the College is expecting to maintain a high level of control through the project. What should we expect for this? Is the College wanting to be at every design meeting? Or should we expect a series of milestones and reviews by the College?

Response: This is a blanket statement. The College will attend any and all meetings deemed necessary to maintain owner's control of the Project.

3. **Question:** Only 2 companies attended the mandatory site walk-down. The RFP did not mention requiring 3 bids minimum. Does that mean only the 2 companies that attended are allowed to provide RFP's?

Response: Yes, 2 (two) proposals are adequate for the Project.

4. **Question:** Are there site utility and topographic plans that the College has for record drawings of the area planned for the development?

Response: A topographic survey is being conducted currently and will be available once completed by external consultant. Utility plans are not currently available for this area, however general utility plans for the site can be obtained as the project progresses and the needs arise.

5. Question: Does the College have their own Architect that will be reviewing this project?

Response: Yes, the Architect will be under contract soon and will be reviewing the Project. The architect will be KTGY Group, Inc.

6. Question: Does the College want student input on the design of the project?

Response: Yes, some public outreach will be incorporated into the overall concept. This will likely be by a survey over the internet. Also, a student survey and formal feasibility study were complete early on in the planning phase and feedback was incorporated into the design concept and bed capacity.

7. **Question:** I understand that an EIR/Initial Study is being conducted. What reports (geotechnical, environmental, etc.) are being conducted with that work?

Response: A consultant is working on the CEQA portion of the Project, and another consultant is working on the Geotechnical portion of the Project. An inquiry has been made to the CEQA consultant as to their suggestion on further environmental testing is suggested or required.

8. Question: Is there a set footprint/area that is determining the spatial size of the development?

Response: This question has two answers.

The footprint of the building is currently not finalized as there are many factors that need to be determined, i.e. dining services, outdoor dining, common space within the building, as well as potentially other services. The most current concept is a three story with 22,106 sf per floor foot print.

The other is the buildable area as determined by a seismic fault survey. This information can be provided during the design coordination with the architect.

9. **Question:** Will the inspectors for construction required to be DSA or will ICBO/ICC certification be acceptable?

Response: DSA inspector/Inspector of Record will be required for this Project.

10. **Question:** Is there a tentative design for the future Gym, or a set footprint that the new development cannot encroach upon?

Response: Yes, the footprint of the Physical Education Facility has been tentatively submitted to the DSA, however some work is still needed to be completed prior to final DSA approval/review. The "footprint" of the proposed PE facility can be made available under request.

Kevin Carter
Director of Facilities and Planning
College of the Redwoods

03/30/2022