ADDENDUM NO. 1

BID-CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

FOR

BID No. 2016

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Compliance Services

COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
1370 Adams Avenue
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
The following changes, additions, deletions, clarifications, or corrections shall become part of the Bid-Contract Documents for Coast Community College District Bid No. 2016, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Compliance Services. All other terms, specifications, and conditions remain the same.

Modifications are identified by “clouds” and the following: Deletions strikethrough. Insertions/Substitutions italic-underlined.

Item 1: Add the attached VENDORS QUESTIONS & ANSWERS (March 12, 2013)

END OF ADDENDUM

Prepared By:

John Eriksen
Director of Purchasing
1. Our firm is reviewing the District’s RFP for CEQA services for the three campuses and noticed that the interview date is set for April 5th. Is there any chance that would be adjusted forward into the next week? The first week of April is spring break for many local school districts and several key staff will be out of the office.
   
   **Response:** In order to meet our approval deadlines, the date needs to remain as scheduled.

2. Can the District provide more information regarding Item B, Project Description and Project Budget? What is the amount allocated for the CEQA compliance task?
   
   **Response:** We have not allocated a specific budget to this project as the required CEQA process is not defined at this time.

3. While we understand the CEQA document will analyze the impacts of the Vision 2020 Master Plan for the three Coast College Campuses, how is this related to the Coast Community College District Measure M Budget Summary, which highlights projects and timelines? We assume the Vision 2020 Master Plan is a long range development plan (for the three campuses) for which a program EIR would be prepared to cover the Master Plan as well as projects under the capital improvement program. Please Confirm.
   
   **Response:** The budget summary was derived from the Vision 2020 master Plan. The master plan has evolved slightly since it was finalized in spring of 2011 and the Budget Summary reflects the most current planning.

4. Beyond what’s highlighted under Item A which says the CEQA document will analyze the impacts of the Vision 2020 Master Plan, the proposed project is not further described under Item B, Project Description and Project Budget. Given this, does the District anticipate receipt of a fee for all three probable scenarios: Negative Declaration, Mitigation Negative Declaration and Environmental Impact Report (described under the Scope of Work)? Or should we assume providing a fee schedule would suffice?
   
   **Response:** For purposes of this RFQ, the fee schedule is sufficient.

5. Given the focus is Measure M, per the description under Item B, should we assume all projects will be funded by Measure M? The Measure M Budget Summary spreadsheet indicates that some projects will receive state funding. Will the state funding be above and beyond the $698M?
   
   **Response:** In the event of the passage of a state-wide facilities bond in 2014, the District is anticipating state funding of approximately $200M. These funds will be in excess of the $698M in local funding.

6. Are you anticipating a Program EIR covering all three campuses or separate documents for each? Also it would be helpful to have more information on the physical improvements planned for each campus, projected enrollments, etc.
   
   **Response:** The planned improvements are outlined in the District’s Vision 2020 Master Plan ([http://www.cccd.edu/about/docs/Vision2020%20Facilities%20Master%20Plan.pdf](http://www.cccd.edu/about/docs/Vision2020%20Facilities%20Master%20Plan.pdf)). The District will seek the consultant’s guidance as to the most appropriate CEQA process for implementing this plan.

7. Item F.9 of the RFP discusses Local Business Participation. What is the District’s definition of Local Business Participation? Is it within Orange County?
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Response: This District does not have a formally adopted definition of “local business participation”, however this criteria suggests that the firm with the closest proximity to the District and/or our campus sites would receive the highest score in this criteria.

8. Item 5 of the Scope of Work discusses the potential environmental issues associated with future projects. The descriptions of Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Hydrology and Water quality refers to providing summaries of the reports in the environmental document. Are we expected to assume that the environmental consultant would not include team members to prepare these technical reports and assume that they will be prepared by other consultants for the District?

Response: See #17

9. Section F, Item 7, Can you define “incidents” and “involving” for purposes of answering this requirement fully?

Response: This item seeks provides consultants with the opportunity to disclose any and all litigation, arbitration, claims, or disputes with a public agency.

10. Section F, Item 8 proposed cost: In order to present a fee schedule with any direct and indirect proposed personnel that might assist with meeting contract needs, we are planning to provide our complete company fee schedule, categorized by staff type, with reimbursable expenses annotated. Will that meet this requirement?

Response: Yes. For this RFQ, a fee schedule will be sufficient.

11. Section F, Item 8a Proposed Cost: Are you expecting a full budget estimate for all aspects of the work outlined in this proposal or just a fee schedule?

Response: For this RFQ, a fee schedule will be sufficient.

12. Section F, Item 11: we understand we are to provide one original version of the proposal in our complete submittal package. In order to provide original signatures of all company officers authorized to bind our firm, we would need to gather signatures from multiple cities. Is it acceptable to offer the original signatures of those officers located in our corporate office and use electronic signatures for additional officer signatures?

Response: Yes.

13. What amount do you have budgeted for the CEQA work?

Response: We have not allocated a specific budget to this project as the required CEQA process is not defined at this time.

14. Does CCCD have any background material (historic CEQA documents, historic traffic studies, etc) that proposers can review? Could these materials be loaded onto an ftp site or similar?

Response: The District has completed previous CEQA documents which will be made available to the selected firm. For purposes of this RFQ, the documents will not be available to proposers.

15. What other EIRs/MNDs has CCCD completed recently?

Response: The District previously completed two Program EIRs (one at Golden West College and one at Orange Coast College). Furthermore, the District has completed two MNDs for the Coastline College Newport Beach Learning Center and Orange Coast College Maritime Academy.
16. Will technical studies for geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, and hydrology/water quality be provided by the District for summary in the EIR? Have historical resources evaluations for the three campuses been completed? Any other studies?

**Response:** See #17

17. Our understanding is that the following technical reports will be required:
   - Air quality technical report (including Greenhouse gases)
   - Noise technical study
   - Traffic Impact report
   - Biological Resources Report
   - Cultural Resources Survey (including archaeological/paleontological records searches)

We have assumed that the EIR and technical studies will cover all three campuses.

**Response:** No determination as to the required technical reports has been made. The District will seek the consultant’s guidance as to which reports are necessary to satisfy the CEQA requirements. Respondents to this solicitation may be asked to prepare these reports, as appropriate.