

Solana Beach School District

309 North Rios Ave.
Solana Beach, CA 92075

March 15, 2019

Response to Questions:

**Request For Qualifications,
To Establish a Pool of Firms – Architectural Services
&
Request For Proposal,
For Architectural Services for Solana Santa Fe Elementary School -
Modernization/Expansion**

Solana Beach School District
Response to Questions

Below are answers to questions received by 2:00 P.M. on March 12, 2019 from architectural firms in relation to the Solana Beach School District's Request for Qualifications to Establish a Pool of Firms—Architectural Services, and Request For Proposal for Architectural Services for Solana Santa Fe Elementary School—Modernization/Expansion. Questions are not corrected for spelling or grammar; however, brackets are used at times in an attempt to improve clarity of meaning:

1. I had a question regarding the 2 RFQs listed on the District's website. From my understanding the RFQ to Establish a Pool of Architects was originally due on March 8, 2019, then the deadline was extended to March 19th and the RFP for Architectural Services for the Solana Santa Fe Elementary School Modernization/Expansion was added to your website as well. Do we need to submit both RFQ/Ps if we want to be considered for the pool and for future projects?

Answer:

- *The District has overlapped the competitive processes to (1) establish a pool of Pre-Qualified Consultants by releasing a revised "Request for Qualifications to Establish a Pool of Firms—Architectural Services" on 2/28/19, and (2) **select from that pool** an architectural firm for the Solana Santa Fe Elementary School Modernization/Expansion by releasing a revised "Request for Proposals for Architectural Services for Solana Santa Fe Elementary School Modernization/Expansion" on 2/28/19.*
 - **RFQ:** *To be included in the competitive process used to establish a pool of architectural firms,*
 - *A Statement of Qualifications (SoQ) **must** be submitted in response to the revised Request for Qualifications posted on the District's website on 2/28/19.*
 - *This pool will contain a limited number of Pre-Qualified Consultants that can assist the District in the implementation of the Long-Range Facility Master Plan in connection with modernization of existing facilities and construction of new facilities throughout the District.*
 - **RFP:** *To be included in the competitive process used to select an architectural firm for the Modernization/Expansion project at Solana Santa Fe Elementary School,*
 - *An SoQ **must** be submitted in response to the RFQ listed above, **and***
 - *A proposal **must** be submitted in response to the revised Request for Proposals posed on the District's website on 2/28/19.*
2. We would like to be considered in the pool to provide Architectural Services to the District, as well as be considered to provide Architectural Services for Solana Santa Fe Elementary School. Our original impression was that the RFQ for the Architectural Services Pool and the RFP to provide Architectural Services for Solana Santa Fe

Elementary School were one document, but we see that they are separate RFQ/RFP documents. In order to be considered for both, can the District please confirm if they would like us to respond to each of these separately?

Answer: Please see answer to #1.

3. Is the RFP (for Solana Santa Fe) only soliciting to those included within the current short-listed architectural firms?

Item 1 states: "The Solana Beach School District ("District") is issuing this Request for Proposal ("RFP") to the District's short-listed Architectural Firms to provide Architectural Services for the design of a Modernization/Expansion project at Solana Santa Fe Elementary School."

Answer: Please see answer to #1.

4. I have a quick question for the [Solana Santa Fe RFP], under the Introduction, it said, "Solana Beach School District ("District") is issuing this Request for Proposal ("RFP") to the District's short-listed Architectural Firms to provide Architectural Services for the design of a Modernization/Expansion project at Solana Santa Fe Elementary School." Please confirm if this proposal is for a previously selected pool of architects.

Answer: Please see answer to #1.

5. [This question] applies to both the Solana Santa Fe RFP and the SBSBD pool of architects RFQ:

Can you please confirm "Exhibit A" referenced in both the RFP and RFQ is the draft architectural contract listed on your website here:

https://www.sbsd.k12.ca.us/cms/lib/CA01001886/Centricity/Domain/47/a.UPDATED_Agrmt_%20SBSBD_%20SSF%20Mod%20Project_%20Architectural%20Services.pdf

Answer: "Exhibit A," referenced in the RFP in item F, does refer to the Draft Agreement for Architectural Services listed on the District's website under the URL you provided.

6. The [RFQ] states "Responses should be limited to no more than 25 pages". Are those 25 pages allowed to be double sided or are you requesting the 25 pages are only single sided pages? Also do you count section tabs as pages (there are 10 sections)?

Answer: Please use single-sided pages in your response. Section tabs are not counted.

7. Can the [RFQ] response be 25 double sided pages?

Answer: Please see answer to #6.

8. Can you confirm whether or not the Table of Contents and Cover Letter [in the RFQ] will be included in the 25-page maximum?

Answer:

- *The Table of Contents **will not** count toward the 25-page limit.*
- *The Cover Letter **will** count toward the limit.*

9. Will the resumes requested in Section 2.7 Project Team Summary [of the RFQ] be included within the overall 25-page count?

*Answer: Section 2.7 reads, "Identification of Architectural firm's project team and their specific expertise, experience, and resources to ensure suitable architectural services. Indicate key team members, years with the firm, **resumes**, and California Registration Numbers, as applicable." (Bold added.)*

*Strike the word "resumes." The intent is not to ask for full-page resumes for each member of the project team. Rather, the District is asking for specific expertise, experience, years with the firm, and California Registration Number, as applicable, for each member of the project team. This information **will** count toward the 25-page limit.*

10. Given the 25 page limit [of the RFQ], is it possible to include team resumes as an appendix and not have this section count towards the 25 page limit?

Answer: Please see answer to #9.

11. [We] would like to confirm we heard/understood correctly [at the site walk]:

There was mention of a Facilities Plan being sent out, we thought we heard today [at the site walk]. Was that posted on a website or sent to the attendees? (we have yet to see or receive anything).

Regarding FAQs, we understand March 15 will be the release of the FAQs, however, we heard that some would be coming out within a day or two from yesterday's walk, in addition to the 15th.

Answer:

- *On 3/6/19 a link to a DropBox folder was emailed to all who submitted a letter of intent or who signed the sign-in sheet at the non-mandatory site walk on 3/5/19. This was sent from servicedesk@sbsd.net. This folder contained the Long-Range Facilities Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan suggestions per site, site diagram of building area, and the sign-in sheet from the non-mandatory site walk.*
- *The District did not indicate that answers to questions would be provided sooner than 3/15/19.*

12. During the site walk, it was noted that the District [Master] Plan would be distributed. We have not yet received the District Master Plan yet, is it still available?

Answer: Please see answer to #11.

13. Is the District able to give a project listing that is anticipated for the Pool of Architects?

Answer: Please see School Facilities Project List for Measure JJ on the District's website.

14. Is a master plan or update to the long-range facilities master plan anticipated as a part of this RFQ's scope of work? If so, would the firm that is selected for this effort be precluded from doing the project work that is identified as an outcome of the master plan?

Answer: An update to the District's Long-Range Facility Master Plan is not included in the School Facilities Project List used for Measure JJ.

15. Please confirm we do not need to list sub-consultants.

Answer: Please follow these instructions:

- *For the RFQ:*
 - *For section 2.2, please delete "...and all sub-consultants."*
 - *For section 2.7, sub-consultants are not required to be included in the Project Team Summary.*
 - *For section 2.10, proof of coverage for sub-consultants is not required.*
- *For the RFP:*
 - *Identification of sub-consultants is required in numerous sections. For example, sections B, C, and D.*

16. We wanted to confirm that our sub-consultant team is not required to be included at this time in Item 2.7 Project Team Summary.

Answer: Please see answer to #15.

17. With regard to the program budgets [in the RFP], can the District further clarify what the intent of the two options? Additionally, we have recently seen pricing come back for relo/modular options more expensive than stick-built buildings. Is the District opposed to a stick-built solution?

Answer: No, the District is not opposed to a stick-built solution.

18. [In the RFP] should we include the fee for a site master plan within both of these pricing options [relo/modular and stick-built]? Or should we provide a separate fee above and beyond the dollar amounts provided for the two options?

Answer: Yes, the site plan should be included in the program budget for both pricing options.

19. For anticipated tasks [in the RFP], there are no line items for the site master planning process. Should this be included in the “planning/conceptual phase/project scope/set budget” items?

Answer: The site master planning scope process, as described in item E of Exhibit B in the Draft Agreement for Architectural Services, could span both “SBSD Set Design Team Meeting and Community Engagement Schedules” and “Planning/ Conceptual Phase/ Project Scope/ Set Budget.”

20. For anticipated tasks [in the RFP], the third item’s estimated completion date (“SBSD set design team meeting and community engagement schedules”) has passed. Please clarify.

Answer: The date you reference on page 4 of the RFP, third item in the timeline, is incorrect. The District has started to assemble a design team and will begin dialogue with the school community mid-March, 2019. The architect selected for this project will join the process.

~ ~ ~ END ~ ~ ~