

Responses to Questions for RFP 2010-3
Architectural Design

The following questions have been submitted prior to the December 7th date indicated in the RFP. Responses to future questions, if any will be posted on the District website on December 9th

Question: I downloaded the RFQ and noticed that it has a “proximity” requirement. Can you tell me how this will be used? Will firms within a certain radius be considered, or will there be a point system that deals with this?

Answer: The proximity is not a requirement.

Question: We downloaded your RFP package for design services for new construction and modernization of White Hill Middle, Brookside Elementary, Manor Elementary and Wade Thomas Elementary Schools, but it was unclear regarding how the District plans on addressing any geotechnical needs. Can you tell me whether geotechnical services are part of this RFP or are they separate?

Answer: Geotechnical services are not part of this RFP. The District expects to issue a separate RFP for these services

Question: I note that you have outstanding RFP’s for architectural services for you new Measure A projects. Can you please let me know the status of Geotechnical Services for these projects? It does not appear that Geotechnical work is included in the RFP’s, has it already been performed or will you have another RFP coming out?

Answer : See response above

Question: First, is the “evaluation work, schematic design and preliminary estimate of costs” mentioned in the RFP available for review?

Answer: Please refer to Addendum #1 now posted on the District website.

Question: And, what is the role of Kam Lee, Marshall Lee Architects in the implementation phase of the bond projects? We see that he is listed as part of the District’s Project Management Team.

Answer: Marshall/Lee Architects were hired by the District to assess facility needs, and prove the scope of work and the feasibility of completing the work required within the District’s budget.

Question: Will there be a formal guided tour of the school sites? If not, can we make arrangements to visit the sites?

Answer: There are no formal tours being considered for the architectural RFP. Site visits can be arranged. We do ask that you first check with Bret Joyner to minimize disruption to classroom activities. Visiting personnel must also check in at each school office and obtain visitor passes while on campus

Question: On page 7 of the RFP, the selection criteria lists Project Understanding (10 points). I'm not sure where this is to reside in the proposal. Is the district asking for specific approaches and understandings for the projects listed, and if so, where are we to place this information?

Answer: Responses should reflect a responders understanding of what the projects entail.

Question: Would it be possible not to count the team member resumes towards the page limit? We are having a hard time fitting the information requested in the allotted space.

Answer: The District would prefer not to make an exception.

Question: In the RFP there is mention that the District hired an architect to prepare a master plan for the campus facilities including a preliminary estimate of costs. Is this master plan available for us to review. It would be helpful to see the type of projects anticipated by the District.

Answer: The master plan for the District was prepared by a consultant not an architect and is available for review on the District website. Please review Addendum #1 to the RFP, posted on the District's website, to answer your question.

Question: You are not having a pre proposal meeting, is it possible for us to visit the different schools? Who would we check in with?

Answer: Architectural firms are welcome to visit the school sites. Please refer to a previous question for conditions.

Question: There is mention that you are in the process of completing the Educational Specifications. Is there a draft that will be available prior to our submission? Can we see a draft copy? When will the Educational Specifications be completed? Can you tell us who is the firm that was hired for this project?

Answer: There will not be a draft copy of the updated Educational Specifications available prior to the architectural selection process. We

anticipate a draft copy in January 2010. The firm hired to prepare the Educational Specifications is WLC Architects, Oakland, CA.

Question: Is the District going to create a pool of architects for this work? Do you know how many firms you plan on having on the list.

Answer: The District hopes to receive responses from both large and small architectural firms that will also identify the scope of work they are interested in performing. Whether or not this will result in a pool of architects is not known. The number of firms "short listed" for interviews will be dependent on the responses received.

Question: The proposal request states that tabs are to have the exact section language in bold. We have custom tabs that are a part of our graphics and branding program that are pre-printed with letters or numbers that link to a Table of Contents. Is this acceptable to you? If not, we will purchase tabs that can be fed through a printer to meet your request.

Answer: The purpose of the tabs is to allow the selection committee quick and easy access to the same sections from different proposals. If the tabs are cross referenced to the Table of Contents that uses the language requested there is no objection to your request.

Question: Your Project Description and Project Budget portion indicates that Educational Specifications will be complete in December and are not a part of this contract. Your Scope of Services section describes a "Space and Functional Programming Phase." Have you done a District-wide Needs Assessment of existing facilities to support the Bond Measure financial distribution and use? If not, could this be a part of the programming phase? You mention to "Review and validate existing conditions at the proposed sites as well as as-built documentation of the relevant existing facilities." This makes campus-by-campus determinations and may not address parity and distribution of funds. The clarification of this issue would be greatly appreciated, and has a potential impact upon time and cost.

Answer: As mentioned elsewhere in this response, the Education Specifications will now not be available in December. The primary purpose of this Bond is to finance additional classrooms due to the current and projected student population growth and to replace non permanent classrooms with permanent structures. Please refer to Addendum # 1 to the RFP that defines the scope of work being proposed on each campus.

Question: The "Selection Criteria" section refers to a Proposal consisting of a detailed scope of services and proposed design fee and schedule. Please confirm that this information is to be provided only by the short-listed firms following your initial review of the Proposals and establishment of the short

list, and that this requirement is not a part of this initial response. Thank you for respecting the Qualification Based Selection process.

Answer: The intent of this RFP is to select the firm or firm(s) deemed to meet the needs of the District as outlined in the RFP. Design fee is not part of the evaluation and ranking criteria.

END OF Q&A