

RFQ for 2006 and 2011 for Prop A Bond Green Schoolyard Program

Landscape Architectural Design Services

ADDENDUM #1

March 14, 2014

The following questions were posed to District Staff regarding the above referenced RFQ. Answers to these questions are provided below. In addition, a correction has been made to the RFQ. See below for more information.

CORRECTION TO RFQ DOCUMENT: The RFQ for 2006 and 2011 for Prop A Bond Green Schoolyard Program Landscape Architectural Design Services included a discrepancy between the evaluation criteria and the “RFQ Score Sheet” (Attachment B). This correction is meant to remove this discrepancy. Please see the last page of this Addendum for the corrected RFQ Score Sheet.

CORRECTION TO: RFQ SECTION “III. CONTENTS OF PROPOSALS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA”, SUB-SECTION “3. AGENCY, RELEVANT CODE, AND ADA EXPERIENCE”. Change the wording to the following:

Discuss your design team’s experience over the last five (5) years with the following:

- a. Division of the State Architect (DSA)
- b. CALGREEN, LEED, CHPS, Build It Green, The Sustainable Sites Initiative and other relevant green design and sustainability programs
- c. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

CORRECTION TO: ATTACHMENT B “RFQ SCORE SHEET”, SUB-SECTION “SECTION 3 – AGENCY, RELEVANT CODE & ADA EXPERIENCE”. Change the wording to the following:

Discuss your design team's experience over the last five (5) years with:

	Points
- Division of State Architect (DSA)	2
- CALGREEN, LEED, CHPS, Build It Green, The Sustainable Sites Initiative and other relevant green design and sustainability programs	4
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)	4
Sub-Total	10

QUESTIONS REGARDING RFQ

Question #1: Is this RFP separate from the RFP for design of sites that came out February 4?

Answer: This is a major change. **The original RFQ is cancelled** and this RFQ replaces the original (2006 bond schools) and includes the 2011 bond schools.

Question #2: Each design team will need to demonstrate their capacity to simultaneously manage up to four school processes with a construction value between \$70,000 and \$100,000 per school. The question: \$70,000 - \$100,000 per school seems like a low budget for the type of improvements you describe in the RFQ. Is this an accurate estimate of the construction budgets?

Answer: The construction value of \$70,000 - \$100,000 per school site is accurate. Most projects have two or more school sites bundled together to attract contractors' interest.

Question #3: What is the likely sequence of the projects in the 2011 funded category? The scope of services sequence moves from Master Planning through Design Development to Construction Drawings/Spec's and Construction Administration. We are curious about the district's thoughts about the likely time frame of this progression.

Answer: The likely sequence for the 2011 bond school sites will be as follows. Note that this schedule is very broad and general. Specific dates will be finalized and communicated annually. (The 2006 bond schools do not have a master planning component.)

For the first round of schools whose construction will occur during summer 2016:

- Master planning phase: January 2015 – May 2015
- Design phase: September 2015 – December 2015/January 2016
- Bid phase: February 2016 – May 2016
- Construction phase: June 2016 – August 2016
- Close-out phase: September 2016 – close of project

The school term ends at the end of May and typically, there is no community engagement during the summer months. It may be necessary to have the initial Principal's meeting with each school site during the beginning of the school term (August/September 2014) in order to set the schedule for the master planning meeting dates during the spring. Each school site will operate differently in their approach to scheduling.

If a design firm has some ideas around efficiencies between the master planning phase and the design phase, these ideas can be discussed on a project by project basis. Again, each school community is unique and operates differently. The bid and (summer) construction phases are not flexible.

Question #4: *Could two companies as a collaborative apply with one member's office in SF, and the others in San Jose?*

Answer: As identified in the RFQ, teams of designers can join to perform the services as outlined. The legal status of the nature and relationship of the joint venture should be solidified prior to the preparation and signing of the contract with the District. The business address needs to be within the stated maximum distance

from the District. If, for example, there is a lead firm and all other firms will work directly under the lead firm, the District will contract with the lead firm. Therefore, the lead firms address will need to meet the stated maximum distance from the District.

Question #5: On page 11 in part 3b we are asked to provide our experience regarding a number of green building programs. What about "The Sustainable Sites Initiative"?

Answer: The Sustainable Sites Initiative is one we are not familiar with. Please include your experience with The Sustainable Sites Initiative in your response to the RFQ. Please note that experiences in any of these programs will be reviewed with the perspective of how it relates to the efforts and goals of the Green Schoolyard Program. In addition, the RFQ score sheet will be corrected to reflect this addition as well as correct the other agency experiences are incorrectly listed.

Question #6: Regarding Page 12 of the RFQ, Item D. "Estimate the number of hours associated with each phase of the project." We can't really do this until there is a specific project to give a proposal for. How would you like us to handle this item?

Answer: We are asking applicants to develop a program and estimate the hours associated with that program per phase. We recognize that there may be differences between schools as well as designer approach to the planning and design process. However, we do ask that you provide an **estimate** of how many hours your team will need to dedicate to a site per phase. We have provided some direction regarding the design phase (number of meetings) but this does not include the time and resources a design team will need to:

- 1) gather other pertinent information and translate this work in to the final products,
- 2) construction administration and
- 3) any other work associated with the project.

This is for you to estimate and include in your response to the RFQ. This estimate will also help us have a general understanding of how the designers plan to schedule their program per phase.

CORRECTED ATTACHMENT B - "RFQ SCORE SHEET"

ATTACHMENT B (Corrected)

RFQ Score Sheet

CRITERIA	TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS VALUES
Section 1 - Cover Letter	
Design Team Overview - What sets team apart from others?	5
Sub-total	5
Section 2 - Professional Qualifications /Relevant Experience	
Firm's understanding of Master Planning/LA/Design services required for these projects and outline/description that clearly demonstrates the firm or team's specific expertise in areas outlined in RFQ.	15
Firm's professional qualifications, certifications and licenses	10
Relevant Experience: 5 clients listed with contact information, project description, project duration, original budget/schedule, final cost & completion date, project photos	15
Sub-Total	40
Section 3 - Agency, Relevant Code & ADA Experience	
Discuss your design team's experience over the last five (5) years with:	
Division of State Architect	2
CALGREEN, LEED, CHPS, Build it Green, The Sustainable Sites Initiative and other relevant green design and sustainability programs	4
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)	4
Sub-Total	10
Section 4 - Project Staffing	
Design Team Member One Paragraph Resumes	8
Discuss approach to staffing, sub-consultant management of delivery of high-quality services while managing multiple projects.	8
Hourly Rate for each team member + other project costs	7
Estimated Number of hours associated with each project phase	7
Sub-Total	30
Section 5 - Insurance	
Provide copies of relevant, current insurance coverage certificates from design team carrier(s)	
Workers Comp (\$1 Million)	1
General Liability (\$1 Million/occurrence)	1
Auto Insurance (\$1 Million/occurrence)	1
Professional Liability (E&O) Insurance (\$1 Million/claim, \$2 Million aggregate)	1
Sub-total	5*
Section 6 - Prior Claims	
Provide statement describing any and all claims -both insured and uninsured- that your design team has paid in the past 3 years.	5
Signature of officer or principal of each firm "team member" accompanied by statement "Under penalty of disbarment I certify that this information is complete and accurate."	5
Sub-total	10
Grand Total	100

* if all four (4) types of insurance certificates are provided, the design team will receive five (5) points