



City of Los Banos

At the Crossroads of California

ADDENDUM NO. 1

March 25, 2026

CITY OF LOS BANOS

**Request for Statement of Qualifications (RSOQ)
for
Design-Build Entities for the
City of Los Banos Fire Station #4**

Proposal Due Date/Time: April 7, 2026 / Before 2:00 pm

NOTICE TO RESPONDENTS SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

RESPONDENTS ARE ADVISED THAT CHANGES TO THE RFQ HAVE BEEN MADE AS FOLLOWS:

Item No. 1: Question:
Would the Owner consider revising the EMR requirements from a three-year average to a five-year average? A five-year average may provide a broader measure of a contractor's long-term safety performance by accounting for fluctuations that may occur within a shorter period. Using a five-year average could allow otherwise highly qualified contractors with strong overall safety records to remain competitive while still maintaining the intent of evaluating safety history and risk management practices.

Answer:
Yes, a 5-year average is acceptable.

Item No. 2: Question:
In some locations the RSOQ requires an "audited or reviewed" financial statement, and others it only says "audited". May we please confirm that wherever the financial statement is referenced, that an "audited or reviewed" financial statement is acceptable?

Answer:
In this case, an audited financial is acceptable.

Question:
Additionally, may we please confirm that the confidential, financial information regarding financial balances and ratios on page 50 may be included in the

"separate sealed original Financial document marked Confidential Financial Information" as directed on page 20?

Answer:
Confirmed.

Item No. 3 Question:
May the D-BE meet insurance liability requirement 6., with a primary policy limit of \$2,000,000 per occurrence, \$2,000,000 aggregate, and \$13,000,000 in excess liability?

Answer:
No, D-BE must have a liability insurance policy with a policy limit of at least \$5,000,000 per occurrence, \$5,000,000 aggregate and \$10,000,000 in excess liability from a California admitted company with a Best Rating of A:VII or better.

Item No. 4: Question:
In order to showcase the most relevant and recent project experience possible, and allow for more local D-BE teams to submit, will the City please consider making the specific requirements for project status (e.ii, f.ii), project cost (e.iii, f.iii), and delivery method (e.iv, f.iv) optional but not required?

Answer:
The city will consider the project experience submitted that best meets the requirements of this RSOQ as it pertains to this project specific criteria such as project status, project cost, and delivery method.

Item No. 5: Question:
The EMR scoring thresholds appear to be very restrictive. EMR ratings below 0.80, and particularly below 0.60, are uncommon in the construction industry, even among contractors with strong safety records. Additionally, the current pass/fail threshold of 1.01 or greater resulting in a failure may also be overly restrictive, as many otherwise qualified contractors maintain EMR ratings slightly above 1.00 due to normal fluctuations in workforce size and claim history. Furthermore, a time threshold of the last three years of EMR is extremely restrictive, one recordable accident within this time period, would automatically promote a failure to qualify on this project, a 5-year average would be more realistic based on the industry average.

As written, this may limit the ability of many qualified firms to receive meaningful points or qualify under this category. Would the City consider revising the scoring scale to better reflect typical industry EMR ranges (e.g., rewarding EMRs below 1.00) and raising the failure threshold so that otherwise qualified contractors are not excluded from consideration?

Answer:
A 5yr average is acceptable. All other requirements to remain.

Item No. 6: Question:
Is the \$13M the total project cost or the construction cost?

Answer:

The \$13M is construction cost.

Item No. 7: Question:
the RFQ states that "Phase 2 will utilize a Best value selection method." Will the shortlisted DBEs be required to provide an all-in GMP for design and construction as part of their RFP response?

Answer:

Yes, the DBE must meet the \$13M construction GMP cost.

Item No. 8: Question:
For the Organizational Chart requested on page 22, may we confirm that respondents are only required to list the individuals identified in the personnel resumes section DII (a,b, and c on page 23), and that no other design team members or subcontractors are required to be listed in the Org Chart for this RSOQ phase?

Answer:

Confirmed.

Item No. 9: Question:
It is our understanding that a properly licensed General Contractor can act as the DBE if they contract with a properly licensed Design Architect and Architect of Record, (which can be both), please confirm?

Answer:

Correct.

Item No. 10: Question:
On page 10 of the attached RFQ, it states, further details will be provided in the RFP process regarding DBE responsibilities and maintenance requirements. Please confirm this should not be included in any fee structures during the RSOQ phase?

Answer:

Correct.

Item No. 11 Question:
Please confirm if unsuccessful responsive DBE's are not shortlisted, they will be subject to a \$10,000.00 stipend?

Answer:

Not confirmed. Only two successful pre-qualified (RSOQ) Proposers who are accepted to move on to the Request for Proposal (RFP) phase and provides a responsive Proposal during the RFP phase, shall be provided with the stipend. Proposers who (including without limitation withdrawing from the competition), and any finalist Proposer that fails to submit a responsive best and final Proposal, shall not receive a stipend.

- Item No. 12: Question:
Attachments I and J: Can you please provide scalable pdfs for attachment I "Conceptual Floor Plan" and attachment J "Conceptual Site Plan"? The current attachments are too blurry to perform conceptual budgeting/takeoffs.
- Answer:
For the purposes of this RFQ, conceptual budgeting/takeoffs will not be required.
- Item No. 13: Question:
Project Schedule: The RFQ states the design duration as four months in Exhibit A. Is the City resolute on the design duration or are they open to a slightly longer timeframe?
- Answer:
The Exhibit A is "estimated summary schedule". The city will consider a slightly longer timeframe, depending on other funding factors and milestones the city may need to meet.
- Item No. 14: Question:
Bridging Documents: Can the City confirm when the bridging documents will be released?
- Answer:
The bridging documents will only be issued to DBE's that are selected to proceed to the RFP stage.
- Item No. 15: Question:
Project Profile Template: The instructions for Section DIII, Project Profile Template (page 24), state that projects should be "similar in size, scope, character, or complexity" to the Project. However, the scoring note for Section DIV, Working Relationship Matrix (page 79), indicates that "larger construction projects will be weighted heavier than lower value construction projects." To ensure optimal scoring and alignment with the City's evaluation priorities, could you clarify which criterion should take precedence when selecting projects for the Project Profile Template—overall similarity to the Project, or the advantage given to larger-value construction projects?"
- Answer:
Overall similarity to the Project is preferred over larger-value construction projects. For instance, essential services type projects are preferred over larger projects that do not have an essential services component.
- Item No. 16: Question:
Project Experience: We would like to request clarification regarding how to list shared project experience in the Project Profile Template (Section DIII). When the General Contractor and the Architect of Record have collaborated on the same projects, should those shared projects appear in both entities' project profiles to highlight team synergy and established working relationships (which are relevant to Section DIV)? Alternatively, does the City prefer that we present a broader range of experience by listing shared projects in only one entity's profile

and featuring different, non-shared projects in the other's profile? Please advise on the City's preferred approach.

Answer:

The city prefers the DBE to present shared projects under one entity's profile and feature different, non-shared projects in the other's profile to illustrate broader scope of work.

Jelene de Melo, Engineering Operations Manager

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1