Addendum #1
SCUSD RFQ #19-20-007
Districtwide Ongoing Architectural and Engineering Services
03/03/2020

CHANGES AND/OR CLARIFICATIONS OF THE SPECIFICATIONS AS FOLLOWS:

ITEM NO. 1.1 - BID DATE INFORMATION CHANGE

1. Revise:
   - Deadline for submittal of all questions and clarifications: **Tuesday, March 17, 2020 by 4:00 pm**.
   - District final response to questions and clarifications: **Thursday, March 19, 2020 by 4:00 pm**.
   - Deadline for submittal of Responses: **Tuesday, March 24, 2020 by 4:00 pm**.
   - Invitation to Interviews: **Monday, March 30, 2020**.
   - Interviews: **Monday and Tuesday, April 6-7, 2020**.
   - Recommendation to Board of Trustees for Award of Agreement: **Thursday, April 9, 2020**.
   - Board of Trustees to Award Agreement: **Thursday, April 23, 2020**.
   - Notice of Award: **Friday, April 24, 2020**.

ITEM NO. 1.2 - PRE-BID RFI

1. **Question:** In Attachment A: Respondent Qualification Statement, relevant projects are required to be within the past 7 years. However, this is not stated in Section 2 of the RFQ - Respondent’s Relevant Experience (page 9). Does this 7-year timeframe also apply to Section 2? If not and we can submit projects beyond 7 years, would we be a viable candidate if all of our relevant projects fall below $10M?
   **Answer:** The 7-year timeframe does not apply to Section 2 of the RFQ and listing projects beyond 7 years is acceptable for this section. Listing only relevant projects below $10M for Section 2 will not disqualify the RFQ response.

2. **Question:** Is there a current master plan in place or list of projects that forms the basis of future work? Can we get a copy of it?
   **Answer:** All unbegun Measure H, 2014 and Measure BB 2018 projects will be future projects for this RFP and include the following:
   - Expand New Valley High School to Monticello Campus
   - Reconstruct Peterson Middle School Fields
   - New Patrick Henry School Campus Including Special Education Facilities
   - Reconfigure Laurelwood Campus
   - New School Shade Structures (3)
   - Replace Roofs
   - Upgrade Fencing, Gates (1)
- School Playground Paving (2)
- Replace Portable Buildings with Permanent Structures
- Replace Children's Center Buildings at Bracher and Briarwood
- Reconfigure Westwood for Preschool Special Education Program
- Replace Single Glazed Windows (3)
- Restroom Additions and Upgrades (3)
- Drop-off and Pick-up Traffic Improvements (3)
- Improve School Fields (3)
- Replace Elementary School Offices to Improve Student and Parent Support Services (3)
- Replace Elementary School Multipurpose Buildings and Kitchens (3)

Notes:
(1) Elementary, Middle, and High Schools
(2) Most Elementary Schools
(3) Bracher, Briarwood, and Westwood

In addition to these projects, the District wants to create a pool of prequalified firms that can provide architectural and engineering services for future projects by the Bonds, Facility Development and Planning, and/or Maintenance Departments.

3. **Question:** How much funding do you have left on your current bond and/or are there plans to pursue a new bond in the near future? If a future bond is in the works, is there an amount that’s been set?
   **Answer:** Since future projects will be by multiple District departments, funding sources will vary by project. There is currently no future bond in the works.

4. **Question:** How many firms do you plan to select, and how will projects be awarded from the pool?
   **Answer:** The District plans on selecting anywhere from 4 to 6 firms for the pool. Future projects will be awarded based on firm experience, pricing, and suitability. The District may request proposals from several firms in the approved pool for a specific project.

5. **Question:** Page 6 of the RFP states that professional liability insurance is $2M, yet the pre-qualification questionnaire states $2M / $4M? Please clarify if $4M aggregate is required.
   **Answer:** The $4M aggregate is not required.

6. **Question:** If we do not meet the $4M aggregate for professional liability, is it acceptable to purchase the increased insurance at no additional cost to the owner once selected for a project?
   **Answer:** The $4M aggregate is not required.

7. **Question:** Will the District be issuing a separate RFQ/P for Materials Testing and Special Inspections? Or should we submit our qualifications and team up with an architect firm under the "Architectural and Engineering Services" RFQ?
**Answer:** The District will not be issuing a separate RFQ/P for Materials Testing and Special Inspections at this time. The District has a list of consultants for this purpose and will issue and RFP/Q as needed. This will not be part of Architectural /Engineering Services.

8. **Question:** Is there a page limit for the RFQ response?  
**Answer:** 60 pages.

9. **Question:** In Item J – Section 7 – Sub-consultants: Will a listing suffice or resumes/brochures of their firms required?  
**Answer:** Sub-consultant resumes are not required, but are recommended to be submitted.

10. **Question:** In Attachment A, for items 2.6 and 2.7: Is the cost of construction calculated on a per DSA project basis? Can we include projects that are built in multiple phases submitted under different DSA applications?  
**Answer:** The cost of construction is for the overall project. Projects that are built in multiple phases submitted under different DSA applications are acceptable.

11. **Question:** Sections 2.24 and 2.25 regarding Attachment A, Respondent Qualifications Statement: (Respondent Reported Claims and Professional Liability Claims). For what period of time (i.e. 5 years?) is this District looking for regarding claims history?  
**Answer:** The District is looking for reported claims for the entire history of the firm.

12. **Question:** Similarly, in Sections 2.7 and 2.8 in the Qualifications Statement and Section 2. Respondents Relevant Project Experience: Sections 2.7 and 2.8 request a list of all projects for the past 7 seven years above $25 million and also, those delivered in the multi-prime method. Our firm has worked on numerous projects in the last seven years that fit this criteria and while it is not a problem to list them all in Section 2, is there a recommended limit on the number of project examples that the District would like to review, i.e. up to 20?  
**Answer:** The recommended limit is up to 10 projects.

13. **Question:** The insurance requirements listed under the minimum requirements for commercial general liability insurance have limits which are higher than what is typically carried by A/E firms. Is the District willing to accept an excess/umbrella policy in order to meet the $2 million/$4 million limits as stated?  
**Answer:** The $4 million is no longer a required, see question 6 above.

14. **Question:** The insurance requirements listed under the minimum requirements for automobile liability insurance have a general aggregate limit listed. In the state of California, general aggregate limits do not apply to automobile coverage. Is the District willing to delete the general aggregate requirement?  
**Answer:** The $2 million automobile general aggregate is required, the District will not waive.

15. **Question:** Does the District expect architectural firms to provide and manage required
commissioning services, or will the district hire commissioning firms directly? If the architectural firms are to provide and manage required commissioning services, do you require CxA subcontractor information and qualifications at the time of submission?

**Answer:** No, the District will hire commissioning firms directly.