

BID/ RFP ADDENDUM
DATE: 11/19/2025
BID/RFP No: 2025-15
BID/ RFP TITLE: Wayfinding Consulting Services

MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Andre Urquidez, Dir. Of Business and Fiscal Services
3600 M Street, Merced, California 95348-2898
Email: purchasingbids@mccd.edu

ADDENDUM 1

This addendum contains clarification and additional information, which modifies the conditions of the above referenced BID/RFQ as follows:

1. The RFP indicates a 10-page limit, but it is unclear what pages are considered part of that 10-page limit.

Answer: Title Page and Table of Contents do not count toward the limit.

2. It is noted that "resumes and attachments" are excluded; can you list what items would be considered an "attachment" and excluded from the page limit?
 - a. Are all sections, including the cover page and table of contents, included in the page count? Is the signature form and cost proposal part of the 10-page maximum limit?
 - b. Are relevant project experience/qualification materials considered "attachments"?
 - c. Is the "district-provided services/information" under Section V. Contents of the proposal to be a written, detailed scope?

Answer: An attachment can be Brochure or Resume something that is not part of the required proposal information.

3. The cost proposal is listed as "submitted separately." Can you please clarify the process for submission? Will this be submitted digitally and as a separate file? Is there a file naming convention?

Answer: Disregard requirements to submit separately.

4. "Experience with Progressive Design-Build and higher education clients" is listed as 20% of the evaluation points for the proposal. However, the RFP describes a design-bid-build approach. "Progressive design build" is rare for signage projects; "design bid build" is a common procurement process. Please clarify the evaluation criteria and procurement approach.

Answer: Strike the 'Progressive Design-Build' experience as it is not relevant to this rfp.

5. In order to develop a responsive schedule, more information is required about the College's design approval process.
 - a. Is there or will there be an established "signage and wayfinding committee" that will collaborate with the selected firm? If so, approximately how many stakeholders will be on the committee?
 - b. How is Leadership (cabinet level and president) obtained?
 - c. How will the Board of Trustees approval be obtained? Is their approval for design and budget, or just budget?

Answer: a. Approximately 6-7 members of a shared governance committee. b. Shared governance chair will present to Cabinet for approval.

c. Board Approval is required for construction contract award only.

6. Page-Limit Clarification: The RFP indicates a 10-page maximum (excluding resumes, attachments, and the separately submitted cost proposal). The instructions also ask us to follow the sequence A–I, where

All other bidding contract and construction drawing documents, stipulations, dated and times remain unchanged, in full effect and by reference become a part of this addendum.

items A (Title Page) and B (Table of Contents) are required. Would it be possible to exclude the Title Page and Table of Contents from the 10-page limit so that the 10 pages apply to the substantive proposal content?

Answer: Title Page and Table of Contents do not count toward the limit.

7. Budget and Cost Scope: Is there a defined design budget and/or fabrication budget for this project?
- Should the consultant provide an overall project cost estimate or only an implementation cost per sign as outlined in the RFP?

Answer: Provide both an overall project cost estimate and a cost per sign average. The average cost per sign should include all project costs including design, estimating, and construction administration services as well as estimated construction costs.

8. Project Schedule

- Does the District have a target start date or anticipated completion timeframe for design and installation?
- Is there flexibility in phasing the Merced and Los Baños campus scopes?

Answer: The District would like to have the wayfinding in place for the start of the Fall 2026 term.

9. Branding and Design Standards

- Is the District currently undergoing or planning any brand refresh or logo update that could affect color standards, logo usage, or typography?

Answer: The current branding, color standards, logo, and typography were recently changed and are accessible from our website.

10. Architectural / Regulatory Coordination

- Will this project require review or approval by the Division of the State Architect (DSA)?
- Is there an Architect of Record or other consultant currently under contract who will coordinate with the wayfinding consultant?

Answer: a. This will not be a DSA project. b. There is no AOR or other consultant under contract for coordination. All coordination to be conducted with the District Capital Projects team.

11. Existing Signage and Removal

- Should the consultant include a sign removal plan or inventory of existing signage to identify which elements will remain or be replaced?

Answer: The 'street sign' wayfinding for pedestrian pathways strategy is new, no current signage exists.

12. Governance and Stakeholder Engagement

- Will this project be guided through a Wayfinding Committee or other stakeholder group?
- Will decisions be made through a shared-governance process, and if so, who will represent the primary approving body?

Answer: Yes, there will be a shared governance committee with the District Cabinet acting as the primary approving body.

13. Site Conditions: Are there any specific site constraints or environmental factors (e.g., proximity to the river or railway) that should be considered in the design scope?

All other bidding contract and construction drawing documents, stipulations, dated and times remain unchanged, in full effect and by reference become a part of this addendum.

Answer: There are no site constraints outside of existing infrastructure and pathway lighting that may conflict with placement.

14. Based on this RFP, can you provide the top (3) wayfinding issues that students, visitors and staff are currently having on the main Merced College campus?

Answer: Locating buildings, user experience, sense of place.

15. Based on this RFP, can you provide the top (3) wayfinding issues that students, visitors and staff are currently having on the Merced Los Banos campus?

Answer: Locating services, user experience, sense of place.

16. Does Merced CCD currently have signage / graphic standards to utilize? During our recent site visit we noticed some existing signs had been "wrapped" with what looks like a new graphic vocabulary to cover up the older looking graphics (ie: the Business & Economics (B&E) sign).

Answer: The 'Street sign' strategy is new to the District. The intent is to remove any old wayfinding signs with 'wrapped' graphics once street signs are in place. The District will be responsible for removal of old signage.

17. The RFP classifies this as a "Pedestrian" walkway system, does scope boundary only exist in pedestrian areas, along pedestrian walkways? Please confirm.

Answer: Yes, this rfp is for pedestrian walkways only.

18. The RFP highlights scope to include a "Naming Framework". Is MCCC coming to the table with naming ideas or is MCCC exclusively leaning on a selected wayfinding consultant to come up with the naming methodology?

Answer: The naming framework will utilize current building name conventions found here: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.mccd.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Merced-Campus-Map-Print-202501-v1.pdf>

19. Who will be the main stakeholders / decision makers in approving the proposed wayfinding solutions? Will there be Leadership, Academic, Staff and Student representation on decision making and design approvals?

Answer: See answer #5

20. Would MCCC like to conduct workshops to gain feedback from Leadership, Academic, Staff and Student representatives on issues and solutions?

Answer: See answer #5

21. Is there any thought as to when MCCC would like to target having this program implemented by?

Answer: See answer #8

22. Does MCCC have a targeted budget for both SOFT and HARD costs associated with this design and implementation exercise?

Answer: The District does not have a targeted budget for this project.

23. Are there any other large infrastructure projects (ie: AG Tec Innovation Center) currently being implemented or planned for the future that may influence how wayfinding is approached on the Main campus?

Answer: The District is working on design for a new Music Art Theatre complex and is also in the running for State matching funds for a new Gym/Pool complex

24. How have the digital kiosks on the main Merced College campus been received? Do you have any data on how often they are used to access wayfinding routes by students / visitors?

Answer: The District has installed 3 digital kiosks at main campus and one at the Los Banos campus. We have data on frequency of use.

25. Do you have any data to share on what destinations are most sought after with engagement on the digital kiosks on the main Merced College campus?

Answer: This data is available.

26. While visiting the Merced Los Banos campus we noticed some infrastructure (power / data) going in near the Science Building. Is this infrastructure for a future digital kiosk? If not, are there any plans for digital kiosks at the Los Banos campus?

Answer: Yes, there is a new digital kiosk at the Los Banos campus.

27. While visiting the Merced Los Banos campus we noticed preparations for large scale walls flanking the entry to the campus. We assume these are campus "branding walls" to draw better attention to the entry. Is this correct?

Answer: Yes, there are two new entrance signs for the Los Banos campus.

28. We noticed you did not list development of DSA documentation within SCOPE OF SERVICES. We assume this may be required. Do you concur?

Answer: This will not be a DSA project.

29. We assume having an architectural partner on your team to handle any DSA submittals and reviews (access & structural) would be favorable. Do you concur?

Answer: This will not be a DSA project as all blade style on pole should be under 8' max.

30. Does MCCD have a "pool of approved architects" that handle any DSA submittals? And if so, will consultants need to engage one of the "approved architects"?

Answer: There will be no DSA submittals for this project.

SPECIAL NOTE:

It is the responsibility of each Bidder to acknowledge all addenda by signing below and submitting a copy of each addendum with their respective bid.

I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTAND THESE MODIFICATIONS TO THE ABOVE BID:
