



RESPONSES AND CLARIFICATIONS TO
RFP NO. 172 FOR FULL SERVICE ARCHITECTURAL AND
ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR TRACK IMPROVEMENTS
September 1, 2015

1. Would it be possible to visit each of the High School's stadiums listed on the RFP? I would like to review the site condition and take a few photos. Let me know how I should go about request access to these stadium sites.
A: Yes. Please coordinate with project manager, Brian Watt.
brian.watt@sbcusd.k12.ca.us.
2. Are to be any restrooms, concessions or ticket windows?
A: Yes. It is anticipated that restroom improvements will be as required for DSA acceptance of the work and concession improvements will be necessary at certain tracks.
3. Does the scope of this RFP include improvements to field event venues such as long jump, pole vault, shot put, discus, etc.?
A: Not anticipated at this time.
4. Does the scope of this RFP include renovation/improvements to the football fields?
A: The fields will have been refurbished prior to commencement of this work.
5. Does the scope include lighting of the fields and track?
A: Not anticipated at this time.
6. Does the scope include new scoreboard, timing system, and/or any other electronic systems?
A: Not anticipated at this time.
7. Is it the District's intent to award all track projects to one firm? If so, will all 4 projects be scheduled concurrently?
A: The District intends to award all track projects to one firm, but retains the right to award to more than one firm. The District will rely on the selected firm(s) to make recommendations regarding the schedule of the projects.
8. Does the District have any future plans to convert the natural grass athletic fields to synthetic?
A: No.
9. Q: Under Contents of the Proposal, Section H – Local Business Participation – we usually work with consultants that specialize in athletic field projects but are not local businesses to San Bernardino, will this disqualify our firm?
A: No; this will not disqualify any firm, however local participation is encouraged.



RESPONSES AND CLARIFICATIONS TO
RFP NO. 172 FOR FULL SERVICE ARCHITECTURAL AND
ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR TRACK IMPROVEMENTS
September 1, 2015

10. Exhibit A – Scope of Services – paragraph p (sub-consultants) lists Environmental Services. Our firm has never and cannot contract the services of an Environmental consultant. Please clarify this requirement.
A: Any Environmental Services will be provided by the District.
11. Is the District upgrading their version of Primavera CMS to the latest version?
A: Not anticipated at this time.
12. Exhibit A – Scope of Services – Paragraph R– Clarify the need for handbooks/guidelines, commissioning plans, RFP, contracts.
A: Provide documentation as typical for design services.
13. The RFP included a copy of the Architectural Services Agreement. Is this agreement for reference at this time or are we to accept it as part of the response to RFP. If so, will the District accept modifications to the agreement?
A: The agreement is only a sample. Upon award an official contract will be issued. However, if the proposing firm has suggested modifications, they should be listed in the proposal.
14. If the AOR is not a local business, will any of the sub-consultants be required to complete the LBOP form?
A: The LBOP form is optional and is not required from the AOR or any sub-consultants.
15. Are drawings available for our use depicting the campus accessibility items including path of travel and nearest restrooms?
A: There may be some plans available for path of travel within the structures but not for the fields. The District will procure the services of a surveyor to provide a survey of the areas.
16. What are the known drainage improvements required?
A: To be determined as part of this contract.
17. Item 4. a. c. states "Design services for \$300,000 (for all four sites combined) in owner-initiated or unforeseen contractor change orders shall be anticipated and included in the proposed fee." Should this be an optional line item in our fee proposal, or is it to be lumped as part of the overall fixed fee?
A: This should be listed as a separate line item, but included in the bottom line fixed fee proposal.
18. Exhibit A, item a. refers to Environmental Clearance Reports. Do or will any reports exist for any of these projects? If so, are they available for review now?
A: It is not believed that these exist at this time.



RESPONSES AND CLARIFICATIONS TO
RFP NO. 172 FOR FULL SERVICE ARCHITECTURAL AND
ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR TRACK IMPROVEMENTS
September 1, 2015

19. The scope in the RFP mentions "required accessibility improvements". Are the accessibility improvements limited to the path of travel from the adjacent parking lots only? Also, when were the last improvements on the sites completed for accessible issues?
A: Accessibility improvements will be as required for DSA acceptance of the work. The latest improvements will vary by site.
20. Are these sites certified by DSA?
A: There are only 2 projects that need to be certified. One at Cajon HS 04-112213, and one at San Bernardino HS 04-111358 (this one is closed without certification and it is pending removal of portables). All application numbers for Pacific HS, and Arroyo HS are closed.
21. What are the known bleacher repairs/ upgrades?
A: Unknown, but it is anticipated that the existing wood seats, stairs, and floors will be replaced with aluminum.
22. Under the General Terms and Conditions listed in the proposal, Local Business Participation requires at least 10 percent of all contracts to be set aside for local business. Is this applicable to the Architectural and Engineering teams pursuing this project?
A: This is not a requirement however it is preferred.
23. The Local Business paragraph under the General Terms and Conditions section of the RFP indicates the District is looking for business within the District boundaries and cities of San Bernardino and Highland. However, Attachment 6 has a check box under item 1 that indicates businesses located within San Bernardino County may qualify as a local business. Can you clarify if a local business located in San Bernardino County will fulfill the requirements of the Local Business Outreach Program?
A: For purposes of evaluation of these proposals, preference will be given to firms located within the District, with secondary preference given to firms located within 15 miles of the District's boundaries. This accounts for approximately 5% of the initial ranking evaluation.
24. Will the District be selecting a short-list of qualified A/E teams to interview for the projects or is it the District's intention to award based off the qualifications presented in the RFP?
A: The District retains the right to award without interviews, but it is anticipated that a short list of firms will be developed and the firms will be interviewed.



RESPONSES AND CLARIFICATIONS TO
RFP NO. 172 FOR FULL SERVICE ARCHITECTURAL AND
ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR TRACK IMPROVEMENTS
September 1, 2015

25. Does the District plan to give all four projects to one firm or retain the option to divide the projects amongst multiple firms?
A: The District intends to award all track projects to one firm, but retains the right to award to more than one firm.
26. Has there been a sports facility master plan done for any of these campuses?
A: No.
27. Has there been any ADA surveys done from the fields to the public right of way, accessible parking, restrooms, and locker rooms so that we can better understand the project scope limits at each campus?
A: Not at this time.
28. Is it the District's intent that Cajon, Pacific, and San Bernardino will include complete home and visitor bleacher demolition and replacement?
A: The District's intent is that the bleacher structures will remain and be reused, but that the seats, stairs, and floors will be replaced, and risers below the seats will be added.
29. Will restroom and locker room upgrades be included in the project scope at each campus, or have these areas servicing the track and field's been recently upgraded?
A: It is unknown whether these areas will need to be improved. Accessibility improvements will be as required to obtain DSA approval of the work.
30. Does the District envision changing the footprint of the tracks and expanding the boundaries to accommodate the additional lanes? This may impact the field lighting standards.
A: If additional lanes are added, the District is aware that the tracks would need to be widened, presumably toward the outside. The District is also aware that it may be infeasible to add additional lanes at any of the tracks, but will rely on the recommendations of the selected firm.
31. Have needs assessments been conducted for each school site? Does this include accessibility issues such as bleacher assessments, lighting, restroom facilities and parking?
A: Needs assessments have not been performed.
32. Will topographic survey and geotechnical investigation information be provided before consultant bids are due?
A: No. However, they will be provided before the consultant work begins.



RESPONSES AND CLARIFICATIONS TO
RFP NO. 172 FOR FULL SERVICE ARCHITECTURAL AND
ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR TRACK IMPROVEMENTS
September 1, 2015

33. The RFP requires proposing firms to have experience with DSA valued over \$10,000,000. The RFP also states that the design budget for these tracks is only \$300,000. What is the full budget for this job? Will teams with less than \$10,000,000 in DSA projects be considered if they have considerable recent track improvement experience?
A: The RFP does not state that the design budget is only \$300,000. – Dollar value is in reference to initiated or unforeseen change orders from the general contract. See RFI question 17. Firms that do not meet the minimum qualifications of the RFP will not be considered.
34. If bleacher and other accessible improvements are required, would the District consider splitting the bleacher improvements from the track improvements? Without knowing the condition of the bleachers, restroom facilities, parking, etc. - it is difficult to assign numbers and assemble the appropriate project team for the work to be performed.
A: The District intends to perform bleacher improvements as part of the same project as track improvements. Any improvements deemed necessary by the selected Architectural Firm will become part of this project and its scope. Accessibility improvements will be as required to obtain DSA approval of the work.
35. Do existing bleacher facilities have elevators?
A: No, and it is not anticipated that elevators will be required.
36. Are emergency lighting and other safety features in working order?
A: It is believed that emergency lighting and field lighting is in working order at all listed facilities.
37. Do the tracks currently have complete subsurface drainage systems? Or will a new subsurface drainage system need to be designed?
A: Although it is believed that the tracks do have some sort of subsurface drainage, it appears likely that it is not sufficient at most of the tracks. There is some drainage in the field area that can be utilized in design of a drainage system.