

ANSWERS TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS - ROUND 2
(QUESTIONS 22- 57)

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 22 | As-Built drawing sheet P-1 in Attachment 8 shows a 6” Sanitary Sewer line that services the existing Courthouse building connecting to an existing Sanitary Sewer manhole on All American Way. Attachment 9 Site Demolition Plan Sheet C-2.0 does not depict the demolition of the existing 6” SS line. New Site Utility Plan Sheet C-4.0 shows a new 6” SS line servicing the new Courthouse building to be installed and connect to the same manhole at a higher invert elevation directly above the old line. Please confirm the intent is to abandon in place the existing 6” Sanitary Sewer line section outside of the Property Line. | Attach 9 - Performance Criteria Documents (page 7) | Confirmed, the intent is to abandon the existing 6” SS line in place outside of the property line. Where it is abandoned outside of the property line, it needs to be filled with lightweight cellular concrete per City of Sunnyvale requirements. |
| 23 | Attachment 9 – Performance Criteria Page 168 Section 5.1 states that “All existing utilities (Water, Fire, Storm, Storm [S/C], etc) serving the building are to be removed and replaced.” Attachment 9 – Performance Criteria Specification Section 31 10 00 – 6 states “Where Utility removal is shown on the plans, excavate to expose existing utility, demolish and remove section of pipe or conduit indicated. Cap section of pipe or conduit to remain.” Demolition Plan Sheet C-2.0 shows certain sections of utilities lines and utility structures to be removed but does not account for all utility lines and structures shown on As-built sheets P-1 and P-2. Please clarify the extent of each site utility demolition and/or abandonment. | Attach 9 - Performance Criteria Documents (page 168) | Refer to Demolition notes 11 and 12 on sheet C-2.0. Where existing utility lines and structures are shown on As-built sheets P1 and P2 but not shown on C-2.0 or C-3.0, lines not to be otherwise utilized shall be removed to allow for the new work of the project. Where existing irrigation lines are shown within the project boundary, as shown on the as-builts, that do not serve landscape to remain, these shall be removed. |
| 24 | Attachment 9 – Performance Criteria, Specification section 31 10 00 – 4 Part 2.1 makes reference to slurry cement backfill for pipe abandonment materials. Site Demolition Plan Sheet C-2.0 and Utility Plan sheets C-4.0 do not show requirements to slurry backfill abandoned piping. Confirm slurry backfill is not required for any abandoned piping. | Attachment 9 – Performance Criteria, Specification section 31 10 00 – 4 | “Slurry backfill” is intended to indicate the lightweight cellular concrete per City of Sunnyvale requirements. Refer additionally to Sheet C-2.0, as issued in Addendum No. 2. |
| 25 | Please provide AutoCAD files of the site boundary, topo survey, and preliminary site plan layout. | General | AutoCAD files for the boundary, topo survey, or preliminary site plan layout will not be provided as part of the RFP. The DBE teams shall utilize the RFP .pdf files. |

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|-----|---|--|---|
| 26 | The geotechnical report recommends using 2" of lean concrete at the bottom of the foundation. However, the 03 30 00 specification indicates that lean concrete is not to be used. Could you please confirm whether we should proceed with the 2" lean concrete as suggested in the geotechnical report or follow the specification? | Performance Criteria Att 9. Spec section 03 33 00, and Att 8. Geotech Report 4.2.4 | As indicate in Section 03 30 00, please use controlled low strength material (CLSM) per Section 31 23 00 wherever lean concrete is specified. |
| 27 | There are multiple discrepancies between the Room Data Sheets and the Door Schedule in the drawings. Please confirm that the Room Data Sheets are to take precedence in the design. As an example of the discrepancies, the Room Data Sheets call out doors 2.06A and 2.06B as aluminum frame doors. The door schedule on A6.12 shows the doors as steel frames. | Performance Criteria Att 9 Room Data Sheets and A6.11, A6.12 | The Room Data Sheets and Door Schedules are complimentary. The two documents have been reviewed and coordinated to remove noted discrepancies and have been re-issued in Addendum No. 3. |
| 28 | Per Attachment 9: Performance Criteria Document page 215, Section 7.8 Building Elements under interior partitions it indicates gypsum wall assemblies to be a minimum 20 gage, Specification 05 40 00 notes 18 gage or heavier. Specification 09 21 00 2.2.D indicates 20 gage or lighter for framing. Interior partitions types sheet A6.01 and A6.02 in the drawings indicate 25 gage minimum. Please confirm which is correct? | Performance Criteria Att 9 Section 7.8, Spec Section 05 40 00 and 09 21 00 | Typically, 20-gage or lighter framing shall be used following specification 09 21 00, unless otherwise noted or required to meet blast hardening requirements for which specification 05 40 00 may be used for the heavier gage studs. DBE shall note that some partition types utilize 25-gage studs to achieve their listed STC ratings, as called out on sheet A6.01. If the DBE is going to use these wall types, a 25-gage stud must be used. If the DBE intends to utilize an alternative partition assembly to achieve the required STC ratings, then the requirement to utilize 25-gauge studs may not apply. For all partition assemblies that do not have 25-gage studs listed on sheet A6.01, utilize 20-gage studs and follow spec section 09 21 00. |
| 29 | Section 5.5.4 of the OCIP manual states that the "Sponsor" will carry the Builder's Risk policy but will exclude flood and earthquake. Please clarify the following: 1. Will the JCC be buying this product from a different source? 2. Should the Design Build Entity (DBE) carry the cost of purchasing the flood and earthquake insurance as part of the stipulated sum? 3. If the JCC chooses not to buy the coverage and does not want the DBE to buy the coverage, please confirm that the JCC will indemnify the DBE from any losses arising from these events. | Performance Criteria Att 9 OCIP 5.5.4 Builders Risk | Q1. Yes, the Judicial Council will be including earthquake and flood coverage as a part of the Builder's Risk policy for this Project. Each peril (earthquake and flood) will carry a maximum of \$25M limit in coverage. The limit for these perils is non-negotiable as the Judicial Council will not be obtaining additional coverage limits for either earthquake or flood. Q2. No, the DBE should not include the cost of purchasing the flood and earthquake insurance as part of the stipulated sum. Q3. Not Applicable based on the above response to Question 1. |

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 30 | <p>The provided 100% SD Drawings sheet L3.00 show spherical bollards, fixed concrete seating, and curved concrete benches. Attachment 9 - Performance Criteria Documents Section 2.3 further notes, “ ... concrete seating walls and targeted locations of decorative bollards to provide vehicular setback; these elements will need to be engineered by the DBE to provide sufficient strength to prevent vehicular entrance.”</p> <p>Based on the Performance Criteria, we understand that there will be some “targeted locations” of engineered barriers. However, the Performance Criteria and Drawing Set do not appear to specify the location of engineered barriers, the design vehicle impact speed, and the design basis vehicle size, all of which are required to properly engineer a barrier. Please provide the desired protected locations, the design basis vehicle size, and design impact speed.</p> | Attachment 9 - Performance Criteria Documents Section 2.3 | Sheet L1.00 has been updated to identify that the (3) 18” Sphere Bollards and the curved concrete Low Feature Wall at both sides of the entry plaza are to be engineered by the DBE for vehicle anti-ram resistance. Performance Criteria Section 2.3 has been updated to define the level of anti-ram resistance required for these elements. Refer to Addendum No. 3. |
| 31 | Blast threat locations are provided in the Performance Criteria Document Section 9.2.9 and Drawing Sheet S002. Lobby and waiting areas are specified as one of the blast threat locations. We understand the intent of this requirement to mean the public area prior to security screening, not locations marked as “secure” such as the secure lobby. Beyond the screening point, it is typically assumed that threats will have been identified and contained. Please confirm this is the correct design approach. | Performance Criteria Document Section 9.2.9 and Drawing Sheet S002 | <p>As designed in the Performance Criteria Documents as an enclosed unscreened lobby, this is correct. But if the unscreened lobby is not enclosed the requirements may extend to the Lobby or waiting areas.</p> <p>The Blast Threat, originally listed for the Lobby and waiting area, in the Performance Criteria has been revised to: Unscreened Lobby in both Section 9.2.9 and S002, including the description of the interior hardening required. The Secure Public Lobby, as designed in the Performance Criteria, is not required to receive interior hardening for a blast threat.</p> <p>Sheets A2.01, A2.61, A4.02, A4.03, S201.A, S201.B, and S303 have similarly been revised to correct the location and extent of required interior hardening for the defined blast threat. Refer to Addendum No. 3.</p> |

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 32 | <p>Drawing Sheet S002 notes that the blast envelope requires blast hardening. Performance Criteria Document Section 2.3. notes that the Courthouse is a “Low Risk” facility per the Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Traditional blast hardening of structural elements for “Low Risk” facilities includes the design of the structural roof deck, supporting roof beams, perimeter beams, and perimeter columns. Blast hardening of non-structural elements of these facilities include window systems, infill cold formed steel studs, and infill metal panels. Other lightweight and brittle infill material, such as stucco, of low risk facilities are not typically designed for blast loads. Doors are also not usually explicitly designed for blast loads. Rather, glazed portions of the door prescriptively match the debris mitigating layups used around the surrounding envelope. As the intent of the blast envelope is to protect the interior occupants and prevent wide-spread collapse, non-structural portions of the envelope are allowed to “blow out” or eject away from the building.</p> <p>Please confirm this the correct blast envelope design approach for structural and non-structural elements.</p> | Performance Criteria Document Section 2.3 | <p>Sheet S002 and Section 9.2.9 have been revised to more accurately describe that at the Secure Parking, critical space (e.g. electrical room, UPS room) must be located at least 25-feet away from secure parking or the enclosure (building envelope) for such critical spaces must be hardened for a screened vehicle threat of 25 pounds TNT equivalent. No other extents of the building envelope are required to be hardened. In areas defined for a blast rating, interior and exterior glass, frames and anchorage shall be designed to achieve a blast hazard rating of Low. Refer to Section 7.7 and 9.2.9 as revised and reissued in Addendum No. 3.</p> |
| 33 | <p>Drawing A3.00 notes, “Exterior wall areas below Judicial Chamber and Judicial Conference room to have ballistic inner panel.” The Performance Criteria Document notes, “Ballistic shielding at exterior wall panels of Judicial Chambers and Conference Room above or below the ballistic glazing shall include bullet-resistant starch-oil woven roving ballistic-grade fiberglass panels to match the ballistic rating of the glazing.” Furthermore, the design strategy at the first floor is to limit the ballistic extent to up to 8 feet high.</p> <p>Please confirm if it is acceptable to limit the ballistic extent of wall panels and glazing at the Judicial Chamber and Conference rooms to 8 feet high.</p> <p>Please also confirm if the exterior wall panel left and right of the Judicial Chamber and Conference rooms exterior ballistic glazing also requires ballistic protection.</p> | Drawing A3.00 notes The Performance Criteria Document notes | <p>Confirmed, the extent of ballistic wall panels and at the Judicial Chambers and Conference rooms may be up to 8 feet high.</p> <p>Confirmed, the exterior wall panel left and right of the exterior ballistic glazing of the Judicial Chambers and Judicial Conference Room must also be provided with ballistic shielding protection.</p> |
| 34 | <p>Confirm if window frames are required to be ballistic as part of ballistic rated glazing systems.</p> | Window System Ballistic Requirements | <p>Window frames where ballistic rated glazing is required are not required to be ballistic. However, where blast threat rating is defined as required, refer to Section 7.7 Building Assembly – Exterior Envelope, sub-section Exterior Windows and Glazing for additions to the Performance Criteria related to window glazing and frames. Refer to Addendum No. 3.</p> |

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|-----|---|--|---|
| 35 | Clarify whether interior partitions and glazing must be hardened against interior blast threats (e.g., at the mailroom or lobby) or if the design intent is to protect structural elements and prevent widespread collapse, while allowing for localized damages. | Interior Blast Protection | Interior columns, floor above, interior walls, glass and window mullions, frames and anchorage must be hardened for defined blast threat level at the mailroom and unsecure lobby. Refer to Sheet S002 and Section 9.2.9 that have been included in Addendum No. 3. |
| 36 | Room data sheet identifies the room "Reception Circulation" as Room #7.05. There is no room 7.05 on the SD plans. Please advise as to which room this data sheet is meant to describe. | Room Data Sheets | There is no Room 7.05. Room Data sheet 7.05 has been removed from the Performance Criteria Documents. |
| 37 | Conference rooms are scheduled with mid-grade carpet in the performance criteria docs, but are given CPT 4 Premium in the SD docs. Please advise as to the correct specification. | Carpet Types | Premium carpet to be used in Conference Rooms. |
| 38 | 4/A3.03 indicates a storefront entrance but lacks a window type diamond tag. Which window type is this? | Window Type | Use Kawneer 350/500 IR Entrance with blast mitigation, or equal, as Basis of Design per Performance Criteria Section 7.7 Building Assembly – Exterior Envelope, Exterior Windows and Glazing as re-issued in Addendum No. 3. |
| 39 | Door 101 is scheduled on A6.11 as a typ G2 door, which is an aluminum framed entrance per 4/A3.03. However, the door schedule calls this out as a painted steel door and frame. Please advise as to the correct door/frame type. | Door Type | Door 101 has been updated on Sheet A6.11 to be an aluminum framed entrance. Use Kawneer 350/500 IR Entrance with blast mitigation, or equal, as Basis of Design, per Performance Criteria Section 7.7 Building Assembly – Exterior Envelope, Exterior Windows and Glazing as re-issued in Addendum No. 3. |
| 40 | Door STC Requirements: Door STC's not noted in SD door schedule. Please clarify which doors require ratings. | Door STC | Door requirements for select spaces within the court facility are defined by the Table in Section 16.5 for STC rating and requirements for seals, door bottoms, sealed astragal. Refer to Addendum No. 3 for updated Section 16.5 Table. All other doors on the project do not require an STC rating from the manufacturer. |

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 41 | Note 8.05 Sheet A3.03 notes "Translucent Glazing w/Sun/Glare shading @ exterior Typ"? Please provide more information about the intent here. Is this an applied film to all exterior windows? Please specify. | Glazing | Performance Criteria section 7.8 Building Elements – Interior, subsection Shading and Glare Control addresses this question and suggests the use of exterior sun control devices and/or difused glazing and visual distractions. The section 7.8 has been further clarified for acceptable use of glazing in Addendum No. 3. It is the DBE's responsibility to design an appropriate system and combination of exterior sun control devices and/or glazing to ensure glare and light control is managed within the courtroom and does not adversely impact the interior use of the space. Use of window coverings at the courtroom clerestory are not desired. |
| 42 | Interior storefront on 4/A4.15 is not shown on A6.21. Please define this window type/size. | Glazing | Dimensions have been added to 1/A4.08 and 4/A4.15. Refer to Addendum No. 3. Use Kawneer Trifab Versaglaze 450 Framing System 1-3/4" as Basis of Design. |
| 43 | Bullet resistant walls @ judges' chambers are not noted in wall tags/types in the SD plans. Please clarify extent of bullet resistant panels at the judges chambers. | Framing/Drywall | There are no requirements for interior walls, only for exterior walls. Refer to Question #33, response that clarifies the extent of bullet-resistant panels at exterior walls. |
| 44 | Is 11x17 acceptable for the Organization Chart and Schedule? | Proposal Requirements | Yes, 11x17 pages would be allowed for the Organization Chart and the Schedule. |
| 45 | The extension of one elevator to the underground parking will exceed the travel limits of the holeless hydraulic elevators of some of the listed manufacturers in 14 24 00 and may require additional pit depth and overhead travel clearance. Will JCC entertain alternatives such as a traction-type elevator? | Addendum 1 | The Judicial Council's preference is to stay with a hydraulic elevator if Enhancement EH-09 is offered and shall meet the extra height requirements, incorporating any additional pit depth and/or overhead clearance requirements into the design, if so required by the elevator and elevator manufacturer selected by the DBE's elevator consultant. |

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 46 | Contractor would like to request access to the site to validate and conduct additional testing in regards to Lead and Asbestos as well as review water in the monitoring wells. Please indicate availability the week of 4/14/25 for access to perform additional studies. | Attachment 8 Environment Studies -Hazardous Materials Survey Report & Environment Site Assesment | <p>Per 4/08/2025 Email to all DBE firms: The Judicial Council will allow each of the participating DBE firms the option to access the site to validate and conduct additional testing in regards to Lead and Asbestos if the DBE firm executes the attached Temporary Right of Entry Agreement and furnishes the required document(s) meeting the stated insurance limits and provisions. The Right of Entry granted under this Agreement will commence on April 14, 2025, and expires on April 30, 2025. The Right of Entry Agreement, required insurance document(s), and DBE firm's proposed date, time and duration of a site visit must be provided to the Judicial Council as soon as possible and with no less than 72 hours advance notice (calculated on work days only, Monday thru Friday) to allow coordination of Judicial Council escort availability and confirmation of the requested date and time. The Judicial Council's Policy on Asbestos Management in Court Facilities is attached for reference.</p> <p>Please note that there are no existing monitoring wells on the Judicial Council property of 605 W. El Camino Real, Sunnyvale, CA; therefore, the Judicial Council can not authorize Contractor's review of water in the monitoring wells of which the contractor has requested access.</p> |
| 47 | Per RFI Q#4 response in Addendum #2, STC ratings are to follow partition table in section 16.4. There are contradictions in some locations between room data sheets and partitions table. For example Room 3.06 Judicial Conference is noted to receive STC 50 and STC 60 partitions per partition table in section 16.4. In Room data sheets, Room 3.06 Judicial Conference is noted for partitions to be STC 55. Please confirm Partition Table in section 16.4 take precedence over drawings and room data criteria. | Addendum #2 - Performance criteria section 16.4 | Table 16.4 for partition sound-isolation STC requirements has been updated and re-issued in Addendum No. 3. This updated table shall be followed. Refer to Addendum No. 3. |
| 48 | Per Addendum 2, multiple plan sheets added Blast Hardened Wall Assembly. Please confirm only the north and east wall of the Mail Room is receiving this assembly. | Addendum #2 - Performance Criteria Architectural Drawings | Per Addendum No. 2 and further clarified in Addendum No. 3, only the columns, floor above, and interior walls of the Mail Room are required to be blast hardened. These walls are the north and <u>west</u> walls. |

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 49 | Both the ALTA survey and topo survey were provided in the RFP documents. Will the DBE be able to utilize the supplied ALTA and topo survey or will a new topographic survey be required? Will CAD files of the boundary and topo survey be supplied? | General | The Alta Survey and topo survey are informational documents as described by RFP Attachment 8, Section B and RFP Attachment 7, Agreement, Exhibit A General Conditions, Article 13.12. Refer to RFP Attachment 7, Agreement, Exhibit A General Conditions, Article 13.19.6 related to Field Engineering for survey responsibilities of the DBE. AutoCAD files for the boundary and topo survey will not be provided as part of the RFP. The DBE teams shall utilize the RFP .pdf files. |
| 50 | The PG&E XFMR is shown in what appears to be a secured parking area. Please confirm this location has been vetted with PG&E. | Attach 9 - Drawings, E1.01 | PG&E transformer location is shown as reference only per Sheet keynote 1. on Sheet E1.01. DBE to confirm location with PG&E and CalTrans per Sheet keynote 1. on Sheet E1.01. |
| 51 | Section 12.2.7 of the criteria indicates lighting is to be 120V. Please confirm 277V is acceptable. | Attach 9 - Perf Criteria (Page 225) | 277V is acceptable for lighting. |
| 52 | Section 12.3.2 of the criteria indicates egress lighting is to provide 1 FC minimum along egress path. The code required 1 FC average. Please confirm the code level is acceptable. | Attach 9 - Perf Criteria (Page 226) | Code required level is acceptable. |
| 53 | Section 14.2.3, c, iii of the criteria indicates the HVAC in the telecom rooms are to be served by generator. Based on the electrical criteria and drawings this building will not include a generator. Please confirm HVAC in telecom rooms are not to be served by generator. | Attach 9 - Perf Criteria (Page 253) | Performance Criteria Section 14.2.3, c, iii was in error. Confirmed that HVAC in telecom rooms are not to be served by a generator. Performance Criteria Chapter 14. Telecommunications Program Narrative will be revised in its entirety in forthcoming Addendum. |

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|-----|--|--|---|
| 54 | Per Attachment #9, Section 2.1, it states that the DBE shall revisit the north-south building placement to determine if it may be shifted nominally north and increase the secure parking drive aisle width. Local code of ordinances calls for a minimum backing distance / aisle width of 24 feet for 90-degree parking stalls. Moving the building to the north will reduce the building setback on the north side to less than 25 feet. Please confirm the minimum drive aisle width, as currently provided in the RFP documents, is sufficient. Is the DBE allowed to shift the building footprint to achieve the drive aisle width per local code and have less than 25-ft setback to the north? | Attachment #9, Section 2.1 | <p>Local Codes and Ordinances do NOT apply to this project.</p> <p>In consultation with the Judicial Council's Security Unit, at the north side of the building it is acceptable to determine the 25-foot vehicle setback from the face of the building structure to the location of the nearest parked vehicle. Utilizing this definition, the 25-foot setback may include the sidewalk outside of the property limits to the face of the sidewalk curb. The DBE may shift the building footprint to the north utilizing this 25-foot setback definition.</p> <p>The preferred drive aisle for the secure parking is 24 feet for 90-degree parking stalls.</p> |
| 55 | For the east side front parking lot, the drive aisle width in between parking stalls is 21.5 feet. Local code of ordinances calls for a minimum backing distance / aisle width of 24 feet for 90-degree parking stalls. Please confirm the minimum drive aisle width, as currently provided in the RFP documents, is sufficient. Is the DBE allowed to shift main driveway several feet to the east to achieve the drive aisle width per local code? | General | <p>Local Codes and Ordinances do NOT apply to this project.</p> <p>The existing parking lot, east of the main access drive from El Camino Real is connected and congruent with the adjacent City parking lot; therefore, it shall remain in the same general layout of the parking stalls and drive aisle as it exists presently.</p> <p>The new parking lot, west of the main access drive from El Camino Real shall have a drive aisle of 24 feet, per Judicial Council standards for new construction.</p> |
| 56 | <p>Section 13 - Responsibilities of Design Build Entity section 13.17.25.5 states:</p> <p>"Consistent with other requirements of the Contract Documents, Design Build Entity shall, in the performance of Design Work, perform the Work leaving adequate time for Code Compliance Review(s), Performance Criteria Review(s), and Peer Review(s). Design Build Entity is responsible for including, in its Contract Schedule, time for all reviews required by the Contract Documents, including, without limitation, those in the Design Review Table."</p> <p>Can you provide the Design Review Table noted in 13.17.25.5?</p> | Section 13- Responsibilities of Design Build Entity section 13.17.25.5 | Refer to RFP Attachment 8, Section B, Item 8, Design Review Table. |

| Q # | Questions | RFP Reference (Document & Page-Section-Item) | Answers |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 57 | On FF&E procurement matrix it has a couple items as JCC (Owner) furnish and installed but lists the cost responsibility as on the project capital cost. These apply to Furniture (Case Goods, Conference Tables, Chairs - Freestanding), Office Furniture (Desks, Chairs, Tables, File Cabinets, Bookcases, Shelving Units - Freestanding), Modular Workstations/System Furniture (MSF), Breakroom Furniture (Movable Tables/Chairs - Freestanding), Storage (Metal Shelving for Storage Rooms, Lateral Files, Bookcases - Freestanding), initial Phone Connection to Building (for building systems - i.e. elevator, fire system...), LAN/WAN Network: Hardware Routers, Switches, etc. , Service Application for Network Connection to Building, Entrance Screening Magnetometer/Xray Scanners. Is it expected for DBE to carry the costs for these items in stipulated sum? | Attachment 9 - Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment Procurement Matrix | No. The “Responsibility” columns are distinguishing if the cost is coming out of the Capital Project or is the responsibility of the Court to fund. The Capital Project has a soft cost budget for furnishings which will fund the “Owner Furnished (OF)” designations. The DBE is only responsible to include FF&E items that are “Contractor Furnished (CF)” in the stipulated sum. The Installation cost of items that DBE must include in the stipulated sum are designated as “Contractor Installed (CI)”. |
| END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS | | | |