

**SBCUSD FACILITIES
INFORMATION BULLETIN**

JULY 16, 2009

FOR

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS #57

FOR

**ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
FOR DSA APPROVED TWO STORY CLASSROOM BUILDINGS**

**SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT**

Here below are the questions received by San Bernardino City USD relative the subject RFQ. The District's answer follows each question.

QUESTION 1: Regarding Section 7.1 q – “Glazing shall be single glazed polycarbonate”- would this potentially conflict with the HPS grant title 24 calculations, would this District consider alternatives?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

The District would not consider alternatives. A possible exception may be polycarbonate outer light with single or insulated glass inner light(s), budget permitting. The District feels thicker wall and roof insulation is a better investment than insulating glass considering vandalism, security issues, and replacement costs.

QUESTION 2: Regarding Section 7.1 s – Has the District considered “lease/lease back” as a delivery method?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Yes, for proprietary designs. For conventional DSA approved AE designs, conventional general contract delivery method is preferred.

QUESTION 3: Section 10.2 - Proposal Format Requirements. It is a bit unclear how the proposal is bound.

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Proposal format requirements are as follows:
One (1) original (unbounded, no tabs, un-punched)
Two (2) copies (bounded, punched in 3 ring binder)
CD enclosed or attached to the original unbounded proposal

QUESTION 4: Section 10.4 Section 3: Consultant Firm Data Item G – What is meant by “Consultant and Sub Consultant firms Statements of Qualifications”?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Architect plus all engineers, other consultants as the particular firm may use (cost, acoustic, kitchen, HPS, code, etc.)

QUESTION 5: Section 10.4 – Section 3.1 Consultant Firm Experience - Are items A.i through A.vi only referring to experience with two story classroom buildings (PC or Site Adapted)?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

It is the respondent's choice. Experience with 2 story classroom PC or site adapted 2007 CBC DSA approved projects must be listed.

QUESTION 6: Do any of the sites being considered have any pending DSA closeout issues from previous projects?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

These sites might have pending DSA closeout issues from previous projects. Lincoln and Wilson have ongoing modernization projects. DSA closeout issues may be a factor in for the final selection of the sites for this project.. The DSA closeout responsibility rests with the District.

QUESTION 7: Are there any fire alarm issues?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Yes. Vermont and Muscoy have Simplex 4010 addressable FACP. The District is moving towards GE Security Fireworks systems. The respondent should assume for now, the additions can tie into the existing addressable Simplex 4010 panels or an expansion module thereto. At Lincoln and Wilson assume the Edwards panel will have been installed as part of the modernization and the additions can tie into it.

QUESTION 8: Does the DSA PC permanent building called out for in the RFQ include modular buildings from modular building manufacturers?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

The District has stated that a "relocatable type" building is not favored. However, in response to an inquiry (see below) proposing a metal deck with concrete floor (5 inches thick) sitting on grade directly, we indicated that it had to meet all applicable codes and have DSA approval. We also said that we require slab on grade construction (i.e. no crawl spaces).

The above answer means that we would rather not have modular wood frame construction, but if the RFQ response meets all the above criteria and the responding architects still want to submit a proposal we will review it. Our thinking is that if a two story stick built wood frame building is acceptable with a slab on grade, then certainly a steel frame modular building or modular second floor should be considered.

QUESTION 9: Scope of Services Section 7.1.b. states building shall have concrete foundation and slab on grade. Our solution will consist of a concrete floor within a steel composite panel, flush to grade. As it seems the intent is to eliminate any wood material from the floor construction, will the District accept concrete composite floors? By the way, the concrete is 5" thick compared to the typical 4" thick of competitors.

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Presumably, this system has DSA approval under 2007 CBC. If so it meets the requirements for permanent construction without a crawl space (the goal.) As this is an RFQ, please submit.

QUESTION 10: Paragraph 2 of Section 1 of the RFQ states, "The firms that wish to submit statement of qualifications must be either the Architect of Record for the DSA approved PC system being proposed or have authority to utilize a currently DSA approved design for a two story classroom building and prepare supporting documents and modifications necessary to meet district, DSA and other governing agencies requirements and approvals." In contrast to this statement, Item 7.1.s. states, "The District will not issue a sole source resolution, so other methods, such as performance specifications and other methods must be employed where proprietary PC designs are proposed." It is our interpretation that a responding Architect who is the Architect of Record could only propose a sole-source solution.

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

This can be said of any DSA stamped site specific design. That is a DSA approved design for a specific site is a "one off" by definition. This means the District's Board of Education will not declare that only one product is acceptable with no equals. So it will, the respondent responsibility to describe the method by which it intends to structure the bid.

QUESTION 11: Will the District accept bidding alternatives that are suggested in Item 7.1.s, even if the architect is not the "Architect of Record or has authority to utilize....."?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

The respondent to the RFQ, who is not the Architect of Record for the PC, would have to have authority to use the PC design from whoever is the legal owner of that design. In addition the firm would have to fulfill all DSA requirements for the reuse of another architect's design. In the case of the Site Adapt, the Respondent would have to be the Architect of Record and have authority from the "owner" of the documents to reuse the design. If the respondent is not the Architect of Record for the site adapted design, the respondent would also have to have authority to reuse the design and would have to fulfill all DSA requirements for substituting themselves in as the Architect of Record.

QUESTION 12: The RFQ for Architectural Services for the 2-Story Classroom Buildings indicates different addressees to receive the submission. The "Notice Inviting Requests" indicates that submissions will be addressed to you. Page 4, "Submission of Proposals" indicates Mr. Ali Kiafar is to receive the submissions.

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

As per page 4 of the RFQ, please submit proposals to Ali A. Kiafar, PhD, REFP, Program Executive.

QUESTION 13: As much as we would like to submit for this project, your criteria for having the architect be the AOR for the PC design is extremely challenging. If I am mistaken about the criteria please let me know and I would happy to pursue submitting an RFP.

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Being the AOR for a PC design is NOT the only option. There are two others. It is clearly said in the RFQ: "The firms that wish to submit statement of qualifications must be either the Architect of Record for the DSA approved PC system being proposed or have authority to utilize a currently DSA approved design for a two story classroom building and prepare supporting documents and modifications necessary to meet District, DSA and other governing agencies requirements and approvals. As a less preferred alternative, District may consider adaptive reuse of two story classroom building designs which have current DSA approval under 2007 CBC. To be selected as the A/E firm for the District's subject projects, respondents must demonstrate that site adapted designs will have obtained DSA approval by January 10, 2010."

QUESTION 14:

Where can I get a copy of the OPSC fee schedule?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

The SAB Architect Fee Schedule may be obtained at their website at www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/opsc/publications/handbooks/lpp_hdbk.pdf

QUESTION 15: A respondent included the following statement in their request for information: Questions for the SBCUSD Portable Placement SUSAN: WHAT IS THE QUESTION HERE???

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

This is not a portable project. It is permanent construction of 2 story classroom buildings with rest rooms, elevator, stairs etc. Portables are specifically prohibited.

QUESTION 16: From the requirements on page 5 of the request, it would seem that the buildings are not yet purchased or stock piled. If there is an inventory of buildings within the District that they desire to be used, please enumerate what the building make up of those buildings. .

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

Not relevant. See response QUESTION 15.

QUESTION 17: The cost associated with the FA ‘tie in’, at each campus, is based on the capacity of those campuses. Will the District rely on the consultant’s field assessment of those standing systems by this consultant and are those campuses as-builts available. Is the District assuming that there is enough alarm capacity at the target school site(s) or do they know this information based on the amount of classroom capacity they intend to deliver?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

This RFQ is for Architectural and Engineering services. The architectural firm selected and their consultants will have to design the fire alarm system for the additions

QUESTION 18: In that the first listed criteria for judging the consultant is that consultants history with 2 story design, if our company is limited to mostly one story designs, does that seriously reduce our chances of prevailing as the selected consultant?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

To qualify the firm must be an architectural firm with DSA approved under the 2007 CBC code) two story designs. The architect must be the architect of record for the design or have authority to reuse the design from the legal owners of the design. See the answer to similar question above.

QUESTION 19: Because the District has not published answers to questions prior to a few days before the RFQ deadline, can one expect an extension of the stated deadline?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

No. There is no requirement to provide answers to the questions submitted to the District. This Bulletin is a courtesy document for the firms interested in responding.

QUESTION 20: The writings are referred to ‘proposal’ but the title is RFQ- there is no price quotation other than the delivery of the current hourly rates- is this true.

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

No. See Sections 7 and 7.2 as well as bid result or estimate requirements of Section 3.1.A.iii.

QUESTION 21: Although number 7 on page 4 of 11 begins to describe the Scope of Services, it refers to an ‘Exhibit A’ that was not attached to the package sent us by the District. Is there such an exhibit and may we have it as soon as possible?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

The first sentence in Section 7 - SCOPE OF SERVICES is revised to read: “Services will include but not necessarily be limited to comprehensive full service architectural and engineering services required for two story classroom buildings on one or more District school sites as per ~~Exhibit A~~— Scope of Work described in this section.”

QUESTION 22: What is the expectation of SBCUSD regarding the information that must appear in the RFQ pertaining to DBVE? We received the notification too late to do an advertisement for DBVE consultants, and we are not DBVE ourselves.

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

This is information only. As per Section 9.7 - "Prior to and as a condition precedent for final payment under any contract for services, consultant shall provide documentation satisfactory to the district, identifying the amount of compensation paid to disabled veteran business enterprises in connection with consultant's performance of the agreement."

QUESTION 23: In the RFQ packet, a "Fingerprint and Criminal Background Check Certification" form was attached. Is this form to be included with our submittal?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

This is for information only. As per section 9.6 - " As a condition precedent to the District's execution of agreements, Consultant shall submit a completed and signed District's Fingerprint and Criminal Background Check Certification form (Attachment B) in accordance with Department of Justice (DOJ) fingerprint and criminal background investigation requirements of Education Code Section 45125.1."

QUESTION 24: In the RFQ packet, a "Facilities Business Outreach Registration" form was attached. Is this form to be included with our submittal? Is it necessary for our firm to register with SBCUSD prior to our submittal?

DISTRICT RESPONSE:

There is no need to submit the form with their proposal per Section 10.4 - Section 11 - "Consultants and sub consultants are requested to submit the Business Outreach Program (BOP) registration form (Attachment D). The proposing firm does not have to be registered prior to the submission of their proposal.