



Responses and Clarifications to  
RFP No. 201 Educational Specifications and Master Planning Services  
June 27, 2017

1. Is Demographics to be considered part of the proposal, or does the District have a contract with a Demographics consultant already?

A1. No; demographics is not to be a part of the Scope of Work.

2. Is it the anticipation of the District to go out for a future bond?

A2. While a future bond is a possibility, the District has not yet made a decision on that option.

3. Does proposing or being selected as the Master Plan Architect exclude us from design for future projects listed under the master plan?

A3. No

4. On the last page of the RFP (Page 22 – Excluded Services) it lists site selection, however on page 20, there is a section titled site selection under Phase 3. Please clarify if it is in fact to be included or not.

A4. Site selection should be included as an optional service. Excluded Services on Page 22 has been revised and is attached to this document.

5. Please provide square footage of schools.

A5. See attached Exhibit D – Buildings Square Footage.

6. Does the District want a needs assessment done at all 89 sites?

A6. The District has not yet decided to pursue assessments of all 74 school sites, or if the focus will be a subset of that total.

7. Are the attachments considered in the page count?

A7. Responses to Attachments 1 through 6 will not be included in the page count.

8. Is the district currently using a CMMS or work order system?

A8. Yes, the District uses an SAP work order system.



Responses and Clarifications to  
RFP No. 201 Educational Specifications and Master Planning Services  
June 27, 2017

9. In the RFP, the requirements for the educational specifications section is clearly laid-out; however, all phases of the master plan portion are labeled “optional”. Does that mean that the master plan portion may not move forward?

9A. Yes

10. All phases of the master plan portion are labeled “optional” - does that mean this RFP is primarily for Educational Specifications with an optional master planning portion?

10A. Yes

## **Phase 5 – Master Plan Implementation (Optional phase)**

In the final phase of Master Planning services, the consultant may be requested to assist in the implementation Of the District’s Master Plan.

Services may include clarifying educational specifications to designers on future projects and performing third party reviews on future project designs to facilitate compliance to the District educational specifications and Master Plan initiatives.

**Deliverables:** Master Planning related support services as requested by District. These services would be performed on a Time & Materials basis.

### **Excluded Services**

SBCUSD does not envision requiring the following services:

- 1) ~~Site selection for recommended new facilities~~
- 2) Available funding studies; analysis of tax base
- 3) Any work related to buildings not owned by the District
- 4) Evaluation of conditions concealed by construction
- 5) Destructive investigation
- 6) Materials testing
- 7) Condition inspection of underground utilities
- 8) Energy audits
- 9) Design services

**Exhibit D to RFP No. 201**

<b>Elementary Schools - Building Area</b>			<b>Site Area</b>
	<b>No. of Buildings</b>	<b>Square Feet</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
Alessandro	2	41,353	10.01
Allred	10	12,009	1.64
Anderson	4	24,142	4.46
Anton	12	51,206	12.00
Arrowhead	7	28,160	5.11
Barton	27	40,045	10.35
Belvedere	30	37,409	9.10
Bradley	20	52,867	9.73
Brown	6	54,650	8.30
Burbank	18	31,777	7.86
Carmack	1	21,742	2.30
Cole	16	33,974	10.01
Cypress	21	42,148	8.58
Davidson	19	30,394	6.80
Del Rosa	37	43,213	8.88
Dominguez	9	32,136	10.20
Eliot	2	4,755	See Arrowview MS
Emmerton	9	44,895	13.36
Fairfax	16	27,342	5.54
Gomez	8	45,975	13.90
Harmon	1	26,518	2.24
Henry	7	42,063	13.70
Hi-Pac	17	36,030	8.92
Hillside	32	41,021	7.00
Hunt	34	44,990	9.33
Inghram	28	29,197	6.34
Jones	12	51,980	10.60
Kendall	23	24,072	5.53
Kimbark	2	37,634	7.28
Lankershim	22	53,929	10.17
Lincoln	11	58,723	6.77
Little Mountain	8	59,076	5.90
Lytle Creek	22	43,358	7.70
Marshall	19	30,920	5.00
Monterey	23	39,030	7.19
Mount Vernon	13	40,308	5.00
Muscoy	23	49,833	8.11
Newmark	21	34,169	7.28
North Vrdmnt	16	47,724	10.39
Northpark	8	42,475	8.94
Norton	9	58,808	13.30
Oehl	6	40,810	9.35
Palm	19	50,547	10.68
Parkside	25	30,490	5.45
Riley	12	46,733	8.59
Rio Vista	30	41,584	6.45
Roberts	22	44,292	9.25
Roosevelt	20	49,576	7.50
Salinas	27	34,418	9.05
Thompson	17	37,325	9.07
Urbita	22	29,366	5.90
Vermont	21	44,758	7.00
Warm Springs	28	38,649	10.59
Wilson	12	35,708	5.92
Wong	7	54,980	17.18
<b>Total</b>	<b>893</b>	<b>2,171,286</b>	<b>446.80</b>

\*Areas are approximated based on District record. Verification may be required.

**Exhibit D to RFP No. 201**

<b>Middle Schools - Building Area</b>		<b>Site Area</b>	
	<b>No. of Buildings</b>	<b>Square Feet</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
Arrowview	27	105,600	17.77
Chavez	15	91,220	20.56
Curtis	14	93,479	27.23
Del Vallejo	32	90,543	21.18
Golden Valley	32	74,986	16.30
M.L. King	20	72,724	14.86
Paakumá	4	96,397	10.00
Richardson	22	42,392	18.32
Rodriguez	12	50,276	11.93
Serrano	4	88,114	21.11
Shandin Hills	8	91,954	18.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>897,685</b>	<b>197.93</b>

\*Areas are approximated based on District record. Verification may be required.

**Exhibit D to RFP No. 201**

<b>High Schools - Building Area</b>		<b>Site Area</b>	
	<b>No. of Buildings</b>	<b>Square Feet</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
Arroyo Valley	34	245,310	51.30
Cajon	35	228,095	53.59
Indian Springs	24	226,981	56.90
Middle College	7	43,730	5.50
Pacific	49	193,918	49.34
San Andreas	22	45,513	20.37
San Bernardino	61	222,838	40.01
San Geronio	38	225,666	44.19
Sierra	28	26,868	10.86
<b>Total</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>1,458,919</b>	<b>332.06</b>

\*Areas are approximated based on District record. Verification may be required.