CITY OF HIDDEN HILLS, CALIFORNIA

ADDENDUM #1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
TO PROVIDE
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES
for

CITY HALL LANDSCAPE AND HARDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

Date Issued: October 21, 2026

Addendum for: CITY HALL LANDSCAPE AND HARDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

Addendum No.: 1

Addendum Date: October 21, 2026

Issued by: City of Hidden Hills

Reminder 1: Proposal due date is not changed. Proposals are due at 5:00 PM on October 28, 2026.

Reminder 2: Consultants shall acknowledge receipt of addendum on their proposals to be considered responsive.

Addendum 1 provides responses to the questions received by the City. Please see below responses provided to the questions submitted.

Question 1: Is parking adequate for the facility as shown in the concept design, or will redesign with additional parking be necessary?
Response 1: Parking expansion is not required.

Question 2: Will the City need additional EV parking stalls and infrastructure?
Response 2: Additional EV stalls and infrastructure are not identified in the RFP.

Question 3: Are all improvement areas highlighted in the concept plan (e.g. the design will not need to extend much beyond limits shown in the RFP graphic)?
Response 3: The concept graphic establishes the general scope but does not define the final limits of work. The design shall address all requirements outlined in the RFP, including the recommendations in the Fireline Defense Report. The areas included are to the fence on north, east, and west and the street to the south.

Question 4: Are building/site record drawings available?
Response 4: No record drawings are currently available.

Question 5: Are there any known UG utilities on site aside from building service lines/laterals? Can we assume no utility relocations will be required?
Response 5: Task 2 requires utility research, identification and coordination, and a design compatible with utilities that may be protected, removed, installed, relocated, or adjusted. Utilities that may be in conflict shall be potholed to confirm location.

Question 6: Will hazmat materials testing be needed?
Response 6: Testing is not expressly included in the RFP.

Question 7: What is the project budget for design services and/or construction?
Response 7: Not available.

Question 8: Is the existing irrigation functional? Any known issues need to be corrected with this project?
Response 8: Unknown.

Question 9: Are as-builts available showing irrigation equipment and components? Is there a dedicated irrigation meter, and if not will one be required?
Response 9: No record drawings are currently available.

Question 10: Is it safe to assume that the project excludes CCTV, WiFi, fire sprinklers, and any upgraded electrical service for the additional lighting?
Response 10: Assumptions shall be avoided. Design shall evaluate additional services that may be required.

Question 11: Will the design plans require a separate street improvement plan set for driveway improvements to meet ADA standards?
Response 11: A separate street improvement plan set is not expressly required.

Question 12: Is an Environmental firm required for the categorical exemption, or has this been determined?
Response 12: The selected design consultant shall handle the categorical exemption determination and NOE filing for this project.

Question 13: Is an existing current topographic survey of the site available?
Response 13: The consultant shall perform the necessary field and topographic surveys per the RFP.

Question 14: Is the site currently ADA compliant?
Response 14: Existing sitewide ADA compliance has not been established. The consultant shall evaluate accessibility within the project scope and incorporate the required improvements.

Question 15: Preliminary engineering scope seems to indicate that traffic signal equipment is a part of the scope of services, however this is not listed in the II. Background listing of scope of services nor on the renderings. Please clarify site limits of the project and if offsites are included, including traffic signal improvements.
Response 15: Traffic signal improvements are not required within the project limits.

Question 16: Is there any flooding or ponding of water on the site?
Response 16: The consultant shall perform the necessary field and topographic surveys per the RFP to determine existing flooding and ponding site conditions.

Question 17: During the October 13 site walk, City staff indicated that the scope of work should incorporate the structural recommendations outlined in Attachment C (Fireline Defense Report). These include replacing exterior combustible siding, installing fire-resistant shear backing, upgrading to dual-pane tempered windows, and retrofitting attic ventilation and metal gutters. Under California Business and Professions Code (Sections 5500 and 5615), building envelope modifications to a municipal facility require the stamp and signature of a licensed California Architect. Can the City confirm that it is acceptable and appropriate for a Landscape Architecture Prime Consultant to retain a licensed Architect as a subconsultant to prepare and stamp the architectural construction drawings and specifications for these building envelope improvements?

Response 17: The design shall address the report's recommendations. Yes. The RFP permits a Landscape Architect as prime consultant with appropriately licensed subconsultants, including an Architect to prepare and stamp the architectural documents.

Question 18: Does the City intend for the replacement siding, windows, and trim to match the existing exterior appearance and profiles in-kind, or is there an opportunity during preliminary design to propose modest aesthetic refinements to the building's primary exterior elevation?
Response 18: The City will provide direction to the selected design consultant.

Question 19: Can the City confirm that the City Hall structure is not designated or eligible as a local, state, or federal historic resource that would trigger specialized CEQA documentation or historic preservation standards?
Response 19: The City cannot confirm.

Question 20: Are record drawings (as-builts) of the existing building footprint, site utilities, domestic water connection, irrigation main lines, and electrical panel schedules available for review during design?
Response 20: No record drawings are currently available.

Question 21: Does the City have historical geotechnical reports, percolation and infiltration test data, or pavement structural section records for the parcel, or should proposers include a Geotechnical Engineer to perform field testing to support the LA County MS4/LID Plan and concrete deck foundation design?
Response 21: Proposers should include a Geotechnical Engineer.

Question 22: In light of the LA County Measure W funding allocated to this project, does the City have specific preferences for green infrastructure or nature-based BMPs (such as bio-filtration swales, rain gardens, or permeable pavers) to fulfill the LID requirements?
Response 22: The RFP does not identify preferred BMPs. The consultant shall evaluate LID applicability and recommend suitable measures, subject to City review.

Question 23: Could the City confirm the anticipated plan check and permitting path for the combined site and building envelope improvements? Please clarify.
Response 23: The City will provide direction to the selected design consultant.

Question 24: Has an electrical load calculation been performed on the main City Hall service panel to confirm sufficient spare capacity for the 4 new light posts, step/bench accent lighting, and 3 exterior floor outlets, or should the Electrical Engineer include load metering and potential panel upgrade design in their scope? If the load calculations indicate that the main incoming electrical service drop is inadequate, will coordination and utility application fees for a service upgrade from Southern California Edison be handled directly by the City, or should this be carried as a potential Additional Service line item?
Response 24: This should be included as part of the electrical design for the new lights.

Question 25: If structural engineering calculations or detailing become necessary for foundation design on the stamped concrete deck, seat walls, or building shear wall retrofits, can the City confirm whether structural engineering should be carried in the base proposal or handled as an Additional Service line item?
Response 25: Structural calculations should be included as part of the design for base bid and additional services line items.

Issued by City of Hidden Hills