

ADDENDUM TO RFP #21-008



ADDENDUM #1

Request for Proposal (RFP) #21-008

On Campus Housing Project Consultant Services

May 6, 2021

Addendum #1 – The following clarifications are provided and must be considered when completing your proposal. Acknowledgement of receipt of this **ADDENDUM #1** is required in your proposal as noted on Page 5 of the issued RFP. Please clearly note the addendum date and number in your proposal acknowledgement.

Please note that there are no changes or modifications to the Schedule as shown in the RFP on Page 9, Section H.

Consultant Proposals remain due no later than Wednesday, May 12, 2021, at 2:00 PM.

1. Written responses to key questions asked during the Non-Mandatory Pre-Submittal Conference held on April 28, 2021:

a. What is the Solano Community College District's ("District's"/"Solano's") definition of co-generational, cohousing, and multi-generational housing?

RESPONSE: Following are some common definitions of these housing models, which present alternatives to more traditional housing found on college campuses. It is the desire of the District to explore the possibility of developing an on campus housing project more in line with these types of housing approaches/models.

- i. **Cohousing** - Cohousing is community designed to foster connection. Physical spaces allow neighbors to easily interact with others just outside of private homes. Common areas may include areas such as kitchen, dining space and gardens to bring people together. Collaborative decision-making builds

relationships. In a way, it all comes down to making the world a better place. Connection, environmentalism, security and community support all draw neighbors to cohousing communities. People stay because they love their neighbors, the lifestyle they share and the growth they experience. Since each cohousing community is planned within its context, a key feature of this model is the encouragement of social interaction and its flexibility to meet the needs and values of its residents.

- ii. **Multi-generational housing** – Multi-generational housing consists of, relates to, or involves more than one generation as a family. The basic idea of multi-generational living is that at least two adult generations live together. This could be a home with grandparents living with their children and grandchildren, a home with parents and their adult children, or even a three- or four-generation home. In a multi-generational home, each generation benefits from having their own separate space and privacy. Many “multi-gen” homes also have a separate living area and even a kitchen and separate entrance. Multi-generational homes are designed to provide space for multiple generations to live together under one roof. This style of home is on the rise in the United States because it is practical, affordable, and allows for more quality time with family. Today 1 in 5 Americans is living in a multi-generational home — a 30 percent increase since 2007.
- iii. **Co-generational housing** – The term “co-generational housing” is interchangeable with the term “multi-generational housing”.

b. What is the anticipated size and make-up of the project?

RESPONSE:

The District does not have an anticipated size or make-up (i.e., number of beds, types of housing units, square footage, number of stories, multi-use spaces, commercial/retail spaces, community spaces, academic program spaces, student/faculty support spaces, etc.) for this project. The initial phases of these consultant services are intended to assist with the determination of the feasibility of on campus housing, how large the project may be and what facilities components and housing types might be a part of the overall project. Completion of Phase 1 (Assessment) and Phase 2 (Feasibility) services will allow the District to answer this question.

This project may ultimately involve multiple phases of implementation, as the facility may begin small and grow over time. The RFP “anticipated project schedule” found in Section H on Page 9 represents the initial implementation of an on campus housing project. Future phases, if implemented, are not included in this “anticipated project schedule”. However, this selection process will give the District the option to continue working with the on campus housing consultant and partners selected, if there are future phases and the District finds the relationships to be in the District’s and the project’s best interest.

c. How does the District define/determine best value?

RESPONSE: Best value is not necessarily lowest price. As a “best value procurement” the District is looking at factors other than price only, such as quality and expertise, when selecting this consultant. The value of services can be simply described as a comparison of costs and benefits. Section G on Page 7 of the RFP provides additional information on the benefits and costs that will be used by the District in making this “best value procurement”.

d. Clarification of Page 2, Phase 1 (Assessment), Subsections C, E and F of the RFP.

RESPONSE:

Subsection C addresses the requirement for the consultant to perform preliminary market research (during Phase 1) to determine the range of housing and partnership options available to the District for this project. This is expected to result in identifying many options, which would be further evaluated and analyzed during the Assessment and Feasibility Phases of these services. Some of these options may be considered very traditional for on campus college housing projects. Some are expected to be non-traditional as described in the response to Question 1 on Page 1 of this Addendum #1. Some of these options may include non-traditional partnerships beyond the more commonly seen P3 (Public-Private Partnerships) models. This requirement of the Assessment Phase is intended to result in a broad look at on campus housing and partnership options, which may be available and advantageous to the District and the communities it serves. These options would be refined as the Assessment and Feasibility Phases progress. The end result would be the identification of the best fit for Solano’s on campus housing needs and partnership arrangements.

Subsection E addresses the requirement for the consultant to review and present its findings on other housing projects at colleges of similar size with similar objectives. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the District has a good understanding of what their peers and other institutions are doing. Solano does not intend to “duplicate” what others are doing. It is, however, important to understand what choices are available at peer institutions and how these housing projects are working.

Subsection F addresses the requirement for the consultant to review non-traditional on campus college housing models such as cohousing, co-generational and/or multi-generational housing. Review of these non-traditional housing models is not restricted to college campuses and may include consideration of national and international projects that have implemented these non-traditional housing approaches. Through the exploration, review, testing and presentation of these non-traditional housing approaches, the District hopes to differentiate itself from other institutions and peers, and to better meet the needs of the District’s students, faculty, staff and service communities.

e. Clarification of total page limit (30 pages) as noted in Section F on Page 4 of the RFP.

RESPONSE: The total number of pages for your proposal submission must not exceed thirty (30) pages. These pages are defined as 8-1/2” x 11” sheets in the portrait orientation. If you use an 11” x 17” sheet format, each page face will count at two (2) pages. As this is an electronic only submission, “double-siding” does not explicitly apply. However, if you imagine that your proposal is hard copy and would have been double-sided, each side of the sheet would count as one (1) page. As a result, a double-sided page would count as two (2) pages. Excluded from this total page count are any tab/divider sheets with no text, table of contents and covers. The proposal, which includes items listed in Sections F.1 through F.5 on Pages 4 and 5 of the RFP, should not exceed twenty (20) pages. Section F.6 (Appendix) items should not exceed ten (10) pages.

f. Would an architect on the consultant team during Phases 1 through 3 (in whole or in part) be prohibited from being involved with future phases of the project (Phase 4 - Implementation)?

RESPONSE: Yes. If an architect/architectural firm participates on this project during any part of Phase 1, Phase 2 and/or Phase 3, that architect/architectural firm is prohibited from participating in Phase 4 (Implementation) as the architect-of-record on this project.

2. Responses to questions received following the Non-Mandatory Pre-Submittal Conference and prior to the written questions deadline on May 3, 2021:

- a. We would like to further understand the District’s interest in the co-generational/multi-generational housing model. Has there been any previous study that indicates the demand of different cohort groups (students and non-student seniors) in the Fairfield market? Besides the facility master plan, has there been any discussion or report on the campus regarding this model?

RESPONSE:

There has not been a study completed regarding the demand for cohousing, co-generational/multi-generational housing models. The District believes these housing models provide greater opportunities in support of it’s Mission:

“Solano Community College’s mission is to educate a culturally and academically diverse student population drawn from our local communities and beyond. We are committed to student learning and achievement and to helping our students achieve their educational, professional, and personal goals. Solano transforms students’ lives with undergraduate education, transfer courses, career-and-technical education, certificate programs, workforce development and training, basic-skills education, and lifelong-learning opportunities.”

Additionally, the District believes that these more diverse and inclusive approaches to housing are aligned with its **Core Values** and **Strategic Goals and Objectives**. These can be found on the District’s website.

The concept of cohousing, co-generational/multi-generational housing has been discussed in various settings and meetings over the past several years. These discussions have been more informal and informational in nature rather than specifically addressing the models and how they may be implemented in on campus housing. Delivery of the consultant services outlined in Phase 1 of the RFP will provide the opportunity to assess the desire for the specific housing models best suited to the District and the communities it serves.

- b. Do you expect conceptual renderings/architectural concepts to be part of the deliverables?

RESPONSE:

The District is not anticipating that conceptual renderings/architectural concepts be developed during Phases 1 and 2 – Assessment and Feasibility.

Illustrations and images of cohousing, multi-generational/co-generational housing and peer institution housing referenced as part of the Assessment Phase may be helpful. However, these could be photos or existing plans/drawings of housing projects identified during benchmarking, market research and analysis and/or housing review as delineated on Page 2, Phase 1 services.

The Phase 1 services of performing various surveys for students, faculty, staff and community constituents may also benefit from illustrations and/or images of housing types and/or facility components. These images/illustrations would not be developed specifically for the future Solano housing project, but would rather be of existing or planned housing projects, which help convey concepts of and approaches to any housing types and/or facility components being addressed as part of the survey(s).

Phase 2 services may also benefit from the inclusion of images or illustrations of existing or planned housing at other locations. Again, these would not be renderings or architectural plans/drawings of the future Solano housing project, but would rather be representative of concepts of and approaches to housing types and facility components that are part of the deliverables noted in Phase 2 services on Pages 2 and 3 of the RFP.

Phase 3 services should not require any renderings or architectural plans/drawings from the consultant. These may be required as part of the partnership selection process; however, in this case, the renderings or architectural plans/drawings would be requested from the potential partners rather than developed by the consultant team selected through this RFP process.

Phase 4 consultant services do not require any renderings or architectural plans/drawings from the consultant. The services provided by the consultant team selected through this RFP process for Phase 4 are owner's representation services only.

- 3. See the following page for the list of attendees from the Non-Mandatory Pre-Submittal Conference. This information was also posted on the District's website on April 29, 2021.**



SOLANO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE



**Solano Community College District
Capital Improvement Program**

4000 Suisun Valley Road, Fairfield, CA 94534

**NON-MANDATORY PRE-SUBMITTAL CONFERENCE
SIGN-IN SHEET**

Phone: (707) 864-7189

MICROSOFT TEAMS MEETING (VIRTUAL MEETING)

DATE: April 28, 2021
PLACE: Microsoft Teams Meeting

PROJECT: SCCD Capital Improvement Program
**On Campus Housing Project Consultant Services
RFP #21-008**

TIME: 2:30 PM

Print Name	Company / Firm	Phone No.	Email Address
Ray Tennison	Scion Advisory Services	(312) 896-7965	rtennison@thesciongroup.com
Phillip Aguilar	Plant Construction Company, L.P.	(415) 609-1948	phillipa@plantco.com
Ralph le Roux	Nineteen Six 19-6 Architects & Interiors	(408) 891-0498	ralph@19six.com
Thang Do	Aedis Architects	(408) 300-5155	tdo@aedisarchitects.com
Michele Moffatt	Glumac	(916) 439-9986	MMoffatt@glumac.com
Kelly Wilga	Cunningham Engineering Corporation	(951) 795-8588	kelly@cecwest.com
Debbie Kern	Keyser Marston Associates		dkern@keysermarston.com



SOLANO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE



**Solano Community College District
Capital Improvement Program**

4000 Suisun Valley Road, Fairfield, CA 94534

**NON-MANDATORY PRE-SUBMITTAL CONFERENCE
SIGN-IN SHEET**

Phone: (707) 864-7189

MICROSOFT TEAMS MEETING (VIRTUAL MEETING)

Print Name	Company / Firm	Phone No.	Email Address
Kevin Feeney	Keyser Marston Associates		kfeeney@keysermarston.com
Greg Kochanowski			gkochanowski@gmail.com
Bill LaPatra	Mithun	(206) 971-5618	BillL@Mithun.com
AJ Yoon	The Scion Group	(650) 300-9375	ayoon@thesciongroup.com
Cindy Bustamante	LPAS Architecture	(916) 443-0335	cbustamante@lpas.com
Lucky Lofton	SCCD		lucky.lofton@solano.edu
Priscilla Meckley	Kitchell		priscilla.meckley@solano.edu
Noe Ramos	Kitchell		noe.ramos@solano.edu
Lisa Dixon	Kitchell		lisa.dixon@solano.edu