



April 6, 2026

## ADDENDUM NO. 1

### Request for Proposals – Vineyards at Marsh Creek – Event Center - Amphitheater CIP Project No. 337-37231

#### NOTICE TO PROPOSERS:

The following clarifications, amendments, additions and/or deletions as set forth herein shall apply to the above documents, shall be made a part thereof, and shall be subject to all the requirements thereof as though originally specified and/or shown. Submitters shall assure themselves that all addendum changes have been incorporated into their proposal.

#### A. CLARIFICATIONS

1. For reference, can the City provide the 2008 event center study and 2019 amphitheater feasibility study?

Yes

2. To what extent should the team rely on the existing 30% amphitheater, site, and parking design?

*Rely mostly on the parking lot design, amphitheater site will be a future phase.*

3. Are there known site constraints, easements, or infrastructure limitations not reflected in the previous plan?

*None.*

4. In addition to total costs, what were the key reasons why prior concepts were not implemented?

*There were concerns however about noise, feasibility, weather, traffic.*

5. Is the 10,000 SF target fixed, or is the City open to validation and recommendations based on market demand and budget?

*City is open to validation and recommendations.*

6. Is the intent to balance this development with future potential for a larger planned outdoor amphitheater, or is planning for the expanded venue no longer envisioned?

*It is still planned to include the 750-1000 seat amphitheater with the project as a future phase, however there is no current funding or timeline for its build-out. Initial thoughts is the amphitheater and indoor theater/event center will serve different purposes.*

7. Is the focus strictly on an indoor facility or is the City open to hybrid concepts, such as a small indoor venue with an outdoor lawn amphitheater component?

*Currently indoor facility only.*

8. What is the extent of site improvements anticipated as part of the reduced project scope?

*Currently just the parking lot area and necessary utilities.*

9. Is the +/- \$8.7M budget intended to cover construction only or total project costs (including soft costs, FF&E, contingencies, escalation)?

*Total project costs. It would be ok to get through the process and discover additional funds are needed, at which time the City can decide to work towards acquiring the needed funding.*

10. Should the feasibility study include phased or incremental development scenarios if the full program exceeds budget?

*Yes.*

11. Are there any updated market, economic, or tourism studies available?

*Not that I'm aware of.*

12. Has the City identified priority event types (concerts, community events, private rentals, conferences, etc.)?

*Performing Arts is the intent for the Theater/Event Center. i.e. theatrical or musical performances.*

13. Are there specific regional operators and promoters the consultant should engage with as part of the analysis?

*The Consultant could specify regional promoters that they identify, but should get feedback from City staff regarding their preference and recommendation.*

---

**ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

150 City Park Way, Brentwood, CA 94513

Phone 925.516.5420 FAX 925.516.5421

www.brentwoodca.gov

14. Is the City expecting a high-level validation for market analysis, or a more detailed demand modeling with attendance projections and capture rates?

*High level.*

15. Should the consultant evaluate revenue opportunities such as naming rights, sponsorships, and grants in detail?

*Yes.*

16. Is the City expecting a high-level order-of-magnitude operating pro forma or a more detailed line-item modeling (staffing, utilities, programming mix)?

*High level.*

17. Has the City identified an acceptable annual subsidy threshold?

*We have not, however this is of interest.*

18. Has the City had discussions with potential operators or partners, or should the consultant identify and engage potential operators during the study?

*No.*

19. Does the City have a preferred operating model, or is a full exploratory comparison of all models preferred?

*Full exploratory comparison.*

20. Will the City be leading outreach efforts or is the consultant expected to identify, coordinate, and lead engagement?

*The Consultant is expected to lead the outreach efforts in coordination with City staff.*

21. Does the City have a target duration for pre-design analysis and feasibility reports?

*No.*

22. Are there known critical milestones that have not been identified (e.g., funding deadlines, Council approvals)?

*No.*

---

**ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

150 City Park Way, Brentwood, CA 94513

Phone 925.516.5420 FAX 925.516.5421

[www.brentwoodca.gov](http://www.brentwoodca.gov)

23. Given budget constraints and the concept evolution, is the City seeking validation of a preferred concept, or is the intent for the consultant team to objectively evaluate and recommend the most viable facility type, size, and operating model?

*The City has a concept as described in the RFQ, however, City would like the objective evaluation and recommendation of a viable facility type, size, and operating model.*

24. What are the parameters for the Market Survey Alternative Site Analysis? Are there specific alternative sites identified by the City?

*Yes, alternative sites are all City-owned or former redevelopment agency properties.*

25. Will the Topographic and Boundary Survey be available in .DWG files for design team use?

*Yes, the City will be provide this information.*

**-END OF ADDENDUM NO. -1-**



---

Anju Pillai, P.E.  
Engineering Manager

---

**ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

150 City Park Way, Brentwood, CA 94513

Phone 925.516.5420 FAX 925.516.5421

[www.brentwoodca.gov](http://www.brentwoodca.gov)