

ADDENDUM #03 - BID NO. GCC-003

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FROM DESIGN-BUILD ENTITIES FOR THE

DESIGN-BUILD DELIVERY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE CENTER (IBCC)

The following changes, additions, deletions, clarifications, or corrections shall become part of the Request for Proposals for the above listed project. This Addendum #03 forms a part of the RFP document and modifies the original documents. **Addendum #03 MUST Be acknowledged in the cover letter.** Failure to do so may subject response to disqualification.

Glendale Community College District	Program Management: Gafcon
Bid No. G00-003	Program Manager: Joe Jackson

Informational Updates
1. Update 2.1.1 Procurement Schedule (changes in red below)
2. PG 34. APPENDIX B - Insurance Affidavit-RevAdd3
3. Request for Clarification – District Responses
4. H. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS – For Information Only
16. IBCC-Langan-700091001 Rev Geotechnical Investigation Report-042021
17. IBCC-Langan-CGS-03-CGS5167

2.1.1 Procurement Schedule. The details below are the proposed procurement schedule. The proposed schedule may change at District’s discretion.

RFQ Schedule. The following is the anticipated schedule of events related to the Request for Qualification process and Award of the Design-Build Contractor:

.1 Issuance of Request for Qualifications:	Friday, March 13, 2026
.2 Pre-Submittal Conference:	Friday, March 20, 2026 at 2:00PM
.3 Requests for Clarification Deadline:	Tuesday, March 31, 2026 at 4:00PM
.4 District Response to Request for Clarifications	Friday, April 3, 2026
.5 Design-Build Qualification Due:	Friday, April 10, 2026 at 2:00PM
.6 Evaluation of Design-Build Qualifications:	4/20-4/23/2026
.7 Issuance of RFP documents to (2-3) shortlisted firms	Monday, April 27, 2026

RFP Schedule. The following is the anticipated schedule of events relative to the Request for Proposal process and Award of the Design-Build Contractor:

.1 Issuance of RFP documents to shortlisted firms	Monday, April 27, 2026
.2 Mandatory Pre-submittal Conference & Job Walk	April 30, 2026, at 10:00 AM
.3 RFP Requests for clarification deadline	May 5, 2026 by 4:00 PM
.4 District Response to Request for Clarifications	Friday, May 8, 2026
.5 RFP Proposals due	May 15, 2026 by 2:00 PM
.6 Evaluation of RFP Proposals (approximate)	May 18-22, 2026
.7 Notify firms of interviews, if held (approximate)	Wednesday, May 20, 2026
.8 Interviews, if held (approximate)	May 26-28, 2026
.9 Notice of Intent to Award (approximate)	Friday, May 29, 2026
.10 Board of Trustees Approval (approximate)	Tuesday, June 9, 2026
.11 Notice to Proceed (approximate)	Monday, June 15, 2026
.12 Debriefings:	By Appointment after award of contract

ADDENDUM #03 - BID NO. GCC-003

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FROM DESIGN-BUILD ENTITIES FOR THE
DESIGN-BUILD DELIVERY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE CENTER (IBCC)**

3. Request for Clarification – District Responses

#	RFC Question due by Tuesday, March 31, 2026 at 4:00PM	District Response to RFCs issued Monday, April 6, 2026
1	<p>DSA Approved Civil Plans dated 02.03.2023 differ from RFP Attachment "04. Site Demolition Sketch". Sheet C1.01 shows three (3) buildings to be demolished within the scope, whereas the Demo Sketch shows two (2) of those three buildings being demolished along with three (3) additional buildings. Please advise on which buildings will be demolished by others and which are to be removed within the scope of this project.</p>	<p>Demolish the three (3) buildings according to Sheet C1.01. Also, demolish three (3) additional modular buildings listed in the RFP Attachment "04. Site Demolition Sketch".</p>
2	<p>Reference: RFQ indicates that G. Exhibits - 3. General Conditions-Draft will be released in an addendum. We request to have the General Conditions and Special Conditions issued in the next Addendum prior to submission of the RFQ Proposal.</p>	<p>Revised Addendum 2, issued 3/20/2026, includes 2. Revised Design-Build Contract; 3. General Conditions. Page 55 – fingerprinting references Special Conditions - VOID Page 68 – DBE Owned Equipment Allowable Rental Rates references special conditions. DB must provide detailed backup for actual costs incurred.</p>
3	<p>"RFQ>Owner Docs>Initial RFP Attachments>Reference Documents" includes a pdf titled "11. UG Utility Survey". Electrical Demo sheet E1.00 shows some of the items in the Utility Survey to be Demolished but is missing items. Please advise if GC is to perform any demolition or construction related to the UG Utility Survey document.</p>	<p>The selected Design-Build contractor should use the DSA-approved plans for demolition scope of work. The reference documents are for background information only.</p>

ADDENDUM #03 - BID NO. GCC-003

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FROM DESIGN-BUILD ENTITIES FOR THE
DESIGN-BUILD DELIVERY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE CENTER (IBCC)**

4	<p>The current draft of the Design-Build (DB) contract identifies the contracting party as the “Design-Build Entity,” defined as a combined entity consisting of both the Architect/Engineer (A&E) and the General Contractor (GC). Additionally, the contract appears to require that insurance and Performance & Payment bonds be issued in the name of the “Design-Build Entity.”</p> <p>Please confirm the intent is for the contract to instead be structured between the Design Builder (General Contractor) and the College, with the Architect serving as a subconsultant to the Design Builder under a separate teaming or subcontract agreement.</p>	<p>The College's intent is to contract with a single Design Build Entity (DBE) comprising of the selected Design Builder (General Contractor) and Steinberg Hart as the Architect of Record in a subconsulting agreement with the General Contractor.</p>
5	<p>Per the pre-submittal conference the project design has been completed prior to execution of the Design-Build contract. However, the current contract language appears to assign full design responsibility to the Design Builder (GC). Please confirm whether it is the Owner’s intent that the Design Builder assumes full responsibility and liability for the existing design, including any errors, omissions, or deficiencies, despite the design having been prepared prior to the Design Builder’s engagement.</p>	<p>The Design-Builder will be responsible for delivering the complete final design and constructing the project. In the RFP phase, proposers will be asked to thoroughly review the existing design documents. Proposers will be asked to prepare a price for all work required to verify design accuracy, address any gaps or incomplete elements, and bring the design to a fully coordinated and constructible state. Your proposal should account for assuming full responsibility for the design and ensuring it complies with all contract requirements.</p>
6	<p>Will any preconstruction work product, subcontractor pricing, or procurement data from the original PCL/Steinberg Hart team be made available to shortlisted proposers during the RFP phase?</p>	<p>This information is not available to share.</p>
7	<p>Are there any known pending DSA amendments, deferred submittals, or unresolved DSA conditions of approval that the incoming Design-Builder should be aware of?</p>	<p>There are no known pending DSA amendments, deferred submittals, or unresolved DSA conditions of approval</p>
8	<p>Could you confirm whether the previous DBE team developed a complete baseline schedule? If so, please share it for reference.</p>	<p>This information is not available to share.</p>

ADDENDUM #03 - BID NO. GCC-003

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FROM DESIGN-BUILD ENTITIES FOR THE
DESIGN-BUILD DELIVERY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE CENTER (IBCC)**

9	Can Glendale Community College confirm that the current DSA-approved construction documents have been reviewed and are in full compliance with the College's Design Guidelines and Owner's Project Requirements?	The Design Build entity may need to align the current DSA-approved construction documents with minor changes to the College's Design Guidelines and Owner's Project Requirements. This will be discussed in the preconstruction phase (Phase I).
10	Please clarify whether finish selections and specifications are fully defined and approved by all District stakeholders.	Yes. Final design selections were approved by all stakeholders. The District may wish to revisit some of these components in the Constructability Review and Value Engineering phase.
11	Please confirm whether the Design-Builder will be compensated for costs associated with design validation.	Yes. The Phase 1 fee and approach will be an element of the RFP competition.
12	Please confirm whether all subsurface investigations and utility verifications have been completed and incorporated into the design documents.	Confirmed.
13	Please clarify whether the Design-Builder is required to utilize any pre-identified or preferred trade partners.	No. Please refer to the specifications for additional requirements.
14	Please identify any known design assumptions, allowances, or placeholder systems embedded in the documents that may require further development post award.	These items will be addressed in the Constructability phase of the project, if any.
15	Please confirm whether the District considers the current DSA-approved documents to represent a fully constructible, fully approved by the District and coordinated design suitable for GMP establishment, without further design development, program changes, or guideline changes.	The District is not seeking GMP establishment at this time. The District will require proposing firms to identify if the current DSA-approved documents represent a fully constructible, fully coordinated design suitable for GMP establishment, without further design development during Phase I of the contract which will include a Constructability component.
16	Please provide the previously agreed-upon DBE contract between the Architect and the previous Contractor.	This information is not available to the College.
17	Please identify any areas where the District anticipates post-award design evolution, and how associated cost and schedule impacts will be addressed.	Any potential post-award design evolution must be approved by the Owner.
18	Given the Design-Builder was not involved in the design phase, please clarify how the District intends to allocate risk for any design deficiencies discovered during construction.	The awarded Design Build firm will assume responsibility for the Design after it concludes the buyout effort included in Phase I.

ADDENDUM #03 - BID NO. GCC-003

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FROM DESIGN-BUILD ENTITIES FOR THE

DESIGN-BUILD DELIVERY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE CENTER (IBCC)

19	Please confirm whether any Subcontractors or Trade partners were involved in design assist scope. If applicable, kindly provide a list of the relevant scopes and firms.	Please refer to the DSA Approved plans and specifications for those requirements.
20	Please confirm if BIM coordination was completed during preconstruction with the Design Team and Previous Contractor before the DSA submission. If it was, could you provide the coordinated model?	The BIM coordination study is not available for release at this time.
21	Please confirm whether a formal constructability review has been performed by previous contractor. If so, please provide.	This information is not available to the College.
22	Are covers and tabs included in the page count?	All proposals should be submitted electronically. No proposal shall exceed 60 pages in length including all exhibit(s), attachment(s), but excluding covers, tabs and resumes.
23	While reviewing the Reference Documents folder on PlanWell (ARC Southern California), it looks like Documents 5 and 13 may be missing. Can you please confirm and provide if available?	Omit Item 5 & 13 from "H. Reference Documents"
24	Proposal Form A.3.4 - Audited Financial Statement Can respondents be permitted to submit the requested audited financial statement separately via email to the District's RFQ contact in lieu of including it as an exhibit in the RFQ response?	It is acceptable for respondents to submit the requested audited financial statement separately via email to the District's RFQ contact in lieu of including it as an exhibit in the RFQ response. Mark "Confidential" in the subject line.
25	Can financial statements be submitted as a separate confidential document?	It is acceptable for respondents to submit the requested audited financial statement separately via email to the District's RFQ contact in lieu of including it as an exhibit in the RFQ response. Mark "Confidential" in the subject line.
26	Is section G. Exhibits provided as reference only, or is acknowledgment required?	Acknowledgement is required for G. Exhibits documents.
27	Is section H. Reference Documents provided as reference only, or is acknowledgment required?	H. Reference Documents was provided for Information Only and acknowledgment is not required.

ADDENDUM #03 - BID NO. GCC-003

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FROM DESIGN-BUILD ENTITIES FOR THE
DESIGN-BUILD DELIVERY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE CENTER (IBCC)**

28	<p>Per RFQ Section 2.1.2, Steinberg Hart (and their consultants) is a District-assigned consultant team to the Design-Build Entity, not a design partner independently selected by the proposing teams. We recommend that the District consider normalizing Steinberg Hart's constructability review and construction administration fees as a District-negotiated fixed cost or allowance, excluded from each team's individual RFP proposals. This would ensure competitive equity by eliminating any real or perceived advantage from prior relationships, protect the confidentiality of each team's proprietary schedule and construction approach during concurrent fee negotiations, and produce a true apples-to-apples RFP comparison based solely on each team's construction expertise and pricing. This approach also aligns with the District's interest in a transparent procurement while preserving the District's ability to negotiate the best value directly with its assigned design partner.</p>	<p>The District will confirm this approach in the RFP phase.</p>
29	<p>Is the IBCC project a OCIP general liability and OCIP worker's comp programs?</p>	<p>This will be a Contractor Controlled Insurance Program - CCIP for general liability and worker's comp programs.</p>
30	<p>Section 2.12. of the RFQ states the project was awarded to PCL/Steinberg Hart and then shelved due to insufficient funding. What was the full GMP estimate value at the time the project was shelved?</p>	<p>A full GMP was not developed on this project.</p>
31	<p>What BIM modeling has been performed on the project to date? 1. Will these models be made available and released to the firms selected to the RFP shortlist of bidders?2. What, if any, clashes or other items have been identified. Have any of the clashes or item already been incorporated into the DSA stamped and approved drawing package?</p>	<p>The BIM coordination study is not available for release at this time. Clashes or other items have been identified and incorporated into the DSA stamped and approved drawing package.</p>

ADDENDUM #03 - BID NO. GCC-003

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FROM DESIGN-BUILD ENTITIES FOR THE
DESIGN-BUILD DELIVERY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE CENTER (IBCC)**

32	GCC shared the original program design and DSA package was intentionally designed beyond the stated budget when awarded to the PCL/Steinberg Hart design build team. Are there any known or planned programming changes to the current DSA approved drawings and/or specifications identified by the GCC at this time. If so, what are they and why are they being pursued?	The Owner's design intent is captured in the DSA Approved plans and specifications.
33	What are the prescribed mandatory project requirements in terms of disadvantage, minority, local hiring	There are none at this time.
34	Section 6.10 D.1 titled, Geotechnical and Survey, states that the Design Build shall be responsible for obtaining a geotechnical report and that the Design Work shall be consistent with both findings and recommendations. 1. With the plans and specs already DSA approved, please confirm the geotech report is completed and design is already conforming to the finding and recommendations in the report. 2. Who will hold the Geotech Engineer responsibility during Constructability and Construction phases.	1. Confirming the Geotechnical report was completed and design is already conforming to the findings and recommendations in the report. 2. The College will assume responsibility of the Geotechnical Engineer findings. Report provided via Addendum Reference Document - For Information Only: "16. IBCC-Langan-700091001 Rev Geotechnical Investigation Report-042021"; "17. IBCC-Langan-CGS-03-CGS5167".
35	Are there any specific logistic requirements for the shortlisted RFP bidders to consider during Constructability & Demo phase and subsequently during the Construction phase. Noise mitigation, environmental, material delivery, material laydown, construction path of travel, etc. What logistics plans were developed by PCL/Steinberg initially and can these be shared?	The selected Design Build Entity will be responsible for developing the logistics plan after selection.
36	Does the MEOB and EEOB need to be maintained over the course of construction. Can EoB be transferred to D/B mechanical, electrical and plumbing subcontracting firms?	The Engineers of Record (EOR) are intended to be maintained over the course of construction.
37	Have any temporary shoring plans been developed for the project?	There is no knowledge of a temporary shoring plan.
38	Has all environmental soil testing been completed for the existing soil within the IBCC project footprint? If so, are there any mitigation findings that need to be addressed?	If requested document is available to the College, it will be issued via Addendum prior to RFQ due date.

ADDENDUM #03 - BID NO. GCC-003

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FROM DESIGN-BUILD ENTITIES FOR THE

DESIGN-BUILD DELIVERY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE CENTER (IBCC)

39	<p>The RFP notes that plans/specs are DSA approved. However, the project was originally approved 4/25/23 and over 12 months have passed without a construction start. Furthermore, DSA's Tracker site does not note an approval extension date. Please confirm: 1) Project documents will not need to be updated to the new building code and, 2) The project as a whole will not need to be resubmitted to DSA (CCD's for minor items aside).</p>	<p>Reference DSA "PROJECT CERTIFICATION GUIDE" REVISED EDITION 01/17/13 Section Voided projects (Void letter). The DSA voids projects under certain circumstances: More than four (4) years have passed from the date of DSA plan approval without the start of construction (No extension are allowed). Voided projects can be reinstated by filing a new application and fee. Plans, specifications and design shall comply with the requirements of the current California Building Code.</p>
40	<p>Are our company financial documents included in the total allowable page count of 60 for the RFP response? Or are they considered supporting documents not included in the 60 page limit?</p>	<p>Financial documents are excluded from the total allowable page count.</p>
41	<p>RFQ states that "No proposal shall exceed 60 pages in length including all exhibit(s), attachment(s), but excluding covers and resumes." Please confirm that the proposal content may be delivered in an 11x17 page format.</p>	<p>Proposals shall be submitted electronically. The proposal shall not exceed sixty (60) pages, inclusive of all exhibits and attachments, but excluding covers, tabs, and resumes. No restriction is placed on page size.</p>
42	<p>The RFQ states proposals shall not exceed 60 pages "including all exhibit(s), attachment(s), but excluding covers and resumes." Please clarify the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the 60-page limit include the required Proposal Forms (A through H and Appendices A–D), or are those forms excluded similar to covers and resumes? 2. Are divider tabs excluded from the page count? 3. Can financial statements be excluded from the page count (example – may be in excess of 20-25 pages)? 	<p>Proposals shall be submitted electronically inclusive of Proposal Forms, but excluding covers, tabs, and resumes. No restriction is placed on page size.</p> <p>Financial documents are excluded from the total allowable page count.</p>
43	<p>Confirm that during the RFP phase, proposers will be permitted to contact employees of Steinberg Hart directly.</p>	<p>Confirmed.</p>
44	<p>During the Pre-Submittal conference meeting it was discussed that the Construction Administration costs for Steinberg Hart would not be a fixed lump sum value provided by Glendale and carried by all proposing DBE's. Please confirm.</p>	<p>The College will contract directly with Steinberg Hart for the Phase 1 activities. Design Builder will contract directly with Steinberg Hart for the Phase 2 activities through Construction Administration (CA) and closeout.</p>

ADDENDUM #03 - BID NO. GCC-003

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FROM DESIGN-BUILD ENTITIES FOR THE
DESIGN-BUILD DELIVERY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING CONFERENCE CENTER (IBCC)**

45	Please clarify what OSHA certification is required for the safety representative referenced in section 6.24 of the General Conditions	OSHA 30
46	General conditions section 10.4.D references Article 9.4(D)(1) and Article 9.4D(1)(b) however these sections do not exist in Article 9. Section 10.3.D also appears to incorrectly reference article 9.4. Please clarify if there will be a revised Article 9 or if the Article 9 referenced sections are incorrect.	Any reference to Section 9.4 and its subsections are incorrect and are revised to Section 9.
47	General Conditions section 5.5 states the pollution liability limits will be set forth in the Special Conditions however there is no amount referenced in the Special Conditions, please provide.	Pollution liability coverage must be \$2M, or at least \$1M with a \$10M umbrella.
48	Please clarify if the Owner will revise the indemnity language in GC 6.30 to include the Civil Code Exceptions in 2782, including 2782.8 with respect to design liability.	District confirms existing clause complies with the statute.
49	<p>Appendix B - Insurance Affidavit Form</p> <p>The current Appendix B identifies the following "a proposal to provide On-Call Architect Services".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please clarify if the form will be revised to match the current project name? 2. Limits identified on form conflict with General Conditions please advise if form will be revised to match? 	Appendix B - Insurance Affidavit Form is revised in this Addendum.

END OF ADDENDUM #03