

Response to RFI's
for Request for Qualifications, Lease-Leaseback for Athletic Sports Complex at Luther
Burbank High School and Athletic Fields at Various Schools

Date	Questions and Answers
<i>The following represents questions received by the District through the close of business on May 8, 2009.</i>	
5/12/09	1. Can you please provide your method of scoring, and ranking submittals for the Luther Burbank Lease-Leaseback Athletic Sports Complex project? The RFQ appears to indicate that scoring will weigh more heavily on team approach and collaboration, as opposed to specific project history (i.e.; K-12 public school projects under CA. Ed. Code section 17406).
	The District considers both of these areas equally important to the successful completion of the project. All information submitted will be considered during the review process.
	2. Request the School District waive the requirement of Union Shop Companies and accept proposals from Open Shop Companies that pay prevailing wages.
	Staff does not have the ability to waive Board of Education Resolution #2410. We will accept proposals from open shops as long as they comply with the provisions of Resolution #2410.
	3. If we are to include audited financial reports from both the design firm and contracting firm (roughly 10-12 pages each) and resumes from both firms (minimum of 3 from each firm), we will have already exceeded the page limit. Are these documents to be counted against the page limit?
	No. Specific supporting documents required by the District will not count against the page limit.
	4. Please clarify the District's answer to 05/01/09 question 3 – at what stage (or by what date) in the selection process is an entity considered "on a short list"? Please specify what are the "required documents" referred to in same answer.
	A 'short list' will be determined after the initial screening and the review of the proposals. The "required documents" refers to the financial documents.
	5. Part II, Question 3 of the Questionnaire Subparagraph c. states "Entity has the ability and is qualified to furnish and install a fire suppression system consisting of, but not limited to,

	<p>fire hydrants, fire sprinklers, post indicator valves and fire department hook up stand pipes."</p> <p>If the "Entity" plans to subcontract this scope of work to a qualified subcontractor, should we affirm this statement?</p>
	Yes.
5/7/09	<p>1. Will Beals be acting as the bridging entity? Is Beals precluded from bidding/submitting because of their contractual relationship with the owner?</p>
	No to both questions.
	<p>2. Question 16 in Part IV, Scorable Questions does not apply to architects. How is an architect firm to answer in order to achieve a passing score?</p>
	For an architect, the answer would be "No" followed by a brief statement stating that these bonds do not apply to design firms.
	<p>3. Soft costs may be higher than the 10% design and professional contingencies stated in Beals Assessment. Will other soft costs be added if needed?</p>
	Yes.
	<p>4. Will each project have a separate contract?</p>
	Yes.
	<p>5. How many entities will be pre-qualified?</p>
	We do not know the number of teams that will be pre-qualified.
05/01/09	<p>1. Is there a limit to the total number of pages that may be submitted in the proposal?</p>
	Yes, proposals should be limited to the forms included in the RFQ and no more than twenty-five (25) additional pages not including the submittal cover and table of contents.
	<p>2. Do CMs have a role in the Luther Burbank Sports Complex project?</p>
	CMs are not precluded from developing an entity to perform the work under this RFQ. We are currently constructing a joint use project with the City of Sacramento and the entity for the developer/contractor includes a CM and general contractor. In this case, the contractor works under the CM and the contractor carries the bonds.
	<p>3. Are audited year-end fiscal reports required for all portions of the Entity as described in the RFQ? Would an audited year-end fiscal report be required of any party working under the District's</p>

	Architectural/Engineering Services Agreement?
	Audited financial statements are required for any “Entity” (GC, CM, Developer or any combination). Any party signing the District’s Architectural/Engineering Services Agreement will be required to provide an audited financial statement. “Entities” MAY delay the submission of an audited financial statement until they have been notified that they are on a “short list”. Failure to provide the required documents at that time will disqualify the “Entity” from further consideration.
	4. On pg 5, “Contract Documents” section refers to a number of binding contract documents we will need to sign as the LLB Entity. Can these be provided for legal counsel review prior to RFQ submission?
	The Architect/Engineer contract, lease-leaseback agreement, site lease and sublease will be posted on the website. The project stabilization and the District’s General Conditions are currently posted on the website. The pre-construction contract is still being developed and will be posted at a later date.
	5. On pg 6, under Section VI, it is mentioned that each company that is part of the Entity must fill out SEPARATELY all questions and RFI’s. Are the questions and RFI’s you are referring to the document from pages 9-21 (Phase I – Questionnaire)? What about the items 1-10 on pages 6-8? Is the Entity as a whole only to submit one response to these items?
	Each “Entity” should respond to the questions to the best of their ability. Points will not be deducted when the District determines that the question is not applicable to the “Entity”.
	6. On pg 8, item #10, you reference an audited year end fiscal report. Do all firms that make up the entity need to submit an audited report? As a privately held S-corporation design firm, we do not undertake the expense of having our annual statements audited by our accountants due to the considerable expense. Please clarify, as I doubt most privately held design firms and smaller contractors could comply with this request.
	See Question and Answer #3 above.
	7. Pg 22 (Phase I Determination) appears to be a scoring form. Are you asking the Entity to fill this document out?
	Yes, the “Entity” should complete this scoring form.
	8. The entire scoring questionnaire is largely written for a Contractor, yet the RFQ is requiring all firms comprising the Entity to complete it.

	<p>Many of these questions are not applicable to a company who is not a California licensed contractor (i.e. an A/E firm).</p> <p>A. How will the scoring be judged for those firms?</p> <p>B. Are you requiring each firm comprising the Entity to have at least 95 points?</p> <p>C. What about a sub consultant such as an electrical or M/E/P engineer?</p> <p>D. As the document is written, their requirement to answer all questions, assuming that this includes the questionnaire, they would need to achieve 95 points, which will be unlikely (or at the least, they will be getting points for questions that are only applicable for a general contractor bidding public contract code projects). Please clarify. How the questions apply to the design portions of the LLB Entity is an item that I believe also requires some clarification.</p>
	<p>See question and answer #5 above.</p>
	<p>9. Much of the requirements and questions in the RFQ are specific to general contractors. Will architects be required to comply with the audited financial statements requirements?</p>
	<p>See Question and Answer #3 above.</p>
	<p>10. What is the Budget for these projects?</p>
	<p>See cost estimates provided in the Beals' Assessment Report</p>
	<p>11. What is the origin of the Funding for these projects?</p>
	<p>Multiple sources from the City of Sacramento and Sacramento City Unified School District</p>
	<p>12. If an Architect Teams with a General Contractor are we then considered an Entity?</p>
	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>13. Are both parties required to complete the attached questionnaire in the RFQ?</p>
	<p>Yes, see answer #5 above.</p>
	<p>14. If as the Architect member of an association with a GC (entity) and we are required to complete the questionnaire, there are several questions that have nothing to do with an architect and are only related to a contractor - How does the District and City want us to respond? Should we just type in Not Applicable next to any questions that qualify? These questions are: Part 1. Requirements for Qualification: Items 2., 4., 5., 6., 7., 8.; Part 2. Organizational Performance, Compliance with Civil & Criminal Laws: Items 9., 11., 12., 13., 14., 15.,</p>

	16., 17., 18., 19., 20
	See answer #5 above.
	15. Is the Architect part of the team required to use the form for Part 3 to show prior experience, or can we provide all the required information in our own format that also allows use to show pictures?
	See answer #1 above.
	16. On page 15. The certifications: These appear to be items that the General Contractor member of our team should sign. Is this a correct assumption?
	No, the Architect must complete the question and sign PART III. RECENT CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS COMPLETED.
	17. Could you please describe the contract structure between the Owner, General Contractor and Architect?
	Refer to Education Code 17406, SCUSD website for sample agreements and see I. INTRODUCTION Section 1. (Page 2) of the RFQ.
	18. Our year end financials, prepared by Perry-Smith, Accountants, are what is referred to as an “Accountant’s Compilation Report”. Please let me know if they are adequate for this RFQ.
	See answer #3 above.
04/27/09	1. RFQ requires an “audited financial statement”. Is a CPA reviewed financial statement acceptable?
	No. An audited financial statement certified by the auditor is required.
	2. Would the “various” schools be a separate contract?
	No. Our desire is to award the contract to one entity so we can maximize economy of scale and Rotate, Refine, Replicate to minimize change orders.
	3. What is the estimated construction cost?
	See the Assessment Report, Beals Alliance, Feb. 2008. It contains descriptions and construction cost estimates.
	4. Is a bond required and how much?
	Yes. It should cover the cost of the project
	5. Please provide a better description of the project and what you intend to award.
	See the Assessment Report, Beals Alliance, Feb. 2008. It contains project descriptions.

	6. Are we supposed to use a District bid form or just a lump sum GMP?
	We will negotiate for a lump sum GMP. Part of that process will be an “open book” review of bids. The District may want to see a standardized form but will make that determination after selection.
	7. Is there a restriction on the numbers of proposals /teams that may be submitted?
	There are no restrictions on the number of proposals or teams that may be submitted.
	8. What is the overall scope of the project? 1) How school locations? 2) How many Synthetic Fields? 3) Are you looking for the Entity to be a CM, GC and Designer or just a GC and Designer? Or, is it up to the Entity to decide the make-up of the team?
	1 & 2. See the Assessment Report, Beals Alliance, Feb. 2008. It contains school locations and descriptions of the project. 3. The Entity is to decide on the make up of their team.
	9. The Beals Assessment Report Table of Contents references... VI. Appendix A. NFHS Requirements B. Case Studies of Existing Facilities
	See Revised Assessment Report Dated April 30, 2009
	10. Is the work on pages 66 & 67 of the Beals Assessment Report complete? Are other phases planned?
	See Revised Assessment Report Dated April 30, 2009