

January 23, 2019

SOLICITATION ADDENDUM NO. 1
RFP 19-0001
Facilities Condition Assessment

THE FOLLOWING CHANGES/ADDITIONS TO THE ABOVE CITED SOLICITATION ARE ANNOUNCED:

This Addendum modifies the Request for Proposal (RFP) document(s) only to the extent indicated herein. All other areas not changed or otherwise modified by this Addendum shall remain in full force and effect. This Addendum is hereby made an integral part of the RFP document. Proposers must be responsive to any requirements of this Addendum as if the requirements were set forth in the RFP. Failure to do so may result in Proposal rejection. See the RFP regarding requests for clarification or change and protests of this Addendum, and the deadlines for the foregoing.

This addendum is to be acknowledged in the space provided on the Proposer Certification Form supplied in the solicitation document. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this addendum may be cause to reject your Proposal.

The closing date **REMAINS UNCHANGED: January 31, 2019 at 2:00 PM Pacific Time**

CHANGES:

ATTACHMENT H – Building List and Facility Inventory is attached to this Addendum and added to the Solicitation documents in SECTION V – ATTACHMENTS.

CLARIFICATIONS:

Clarifications and Questions from the January 8, 2019 Pre-Proposal Conference

The goal of this Solicitation is to assess the quality of our buildings and assets. The District is looking for Proposers who have completed similar large conditions assessments and can guide us through the process. The work is planned in phases with each phase informing the scope of subsequent phases. The desired outcomes are identified in the Solicitation.

Question: Does the District have a framework schedule for each of the phases?

Answer: No. The plan is to have all phases completed within two (2) years, but we don't have a schedule tied to each phase.

Question: Has the District had a similar assessment done in the past?
Answer: No. We have not completed a comprehensive assessment like we are planning with this work. The District's custodial and maintenance staff performs an internal Building Condition Assessment (BCA) where we internally evaluate the District's buildings on a three (3) year cycle. This BCA informed the current Bond passed in 2014 that we are in the process of completing.

Question: Is destructive testing on the table, i.e. for roofing and seismic?
Answer: The District will probably consider this for roofing, but KPFF is currently performing a seismic assessment of our buildings. We will want KPFF's seismic assessment integrated into this Facilities Condition Assessment.

Question: Will the District be filing for a Facilities Assessment grant?
Answer: Yes.

Question: In SECTION IV, Paragraph 4 of the Solicitation, what Affidavit and Certifications is the District looking for?
Answer: The Affidavit, Certifications and Forms referenced are all provided in SECTION V – ATTACHMENTS.

Question: Is the District using a Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS).
Answer: The District currently uses Megamation. Part of the work of this Solicitation will be to determine the best solution to meet our needs.

Question: Will the Consultant be expected to provide the software solution?
Answer: No.

Question: Are written recommendations required?
Answer: Yes. Refer to SECTION IV, Paragraph 5.e. of the Solicitation.

Question: Can you provide more detail as to what the District is looking for regarding fields, synthetic turf, tracks, and playgrounds?
Answer: The Consultant will need to assess the life cycle costs of each of these, considering their life span, maintenance and replacement costs. We want to be able to plan for their life cycle replacement.

Question: Will G-Max testing be a part of this assessment?
Answer: Yes.

Question: Will ADA compliance and life safety be a part of the work?
Answer: Yes. We will want any compliance issues to be addressed. The Consultant will need to work with the District's ADA Coordinator.

Question: Does the District have existing documentation?
Answer: Yes. Part of Phase 1 will be to review what the District has, meeting with District staff, and tapping into the wealth of knowledge of our trades staff.

Question: Phase 3 is not very specific. Can you elaborate?

Answer: The specific work of Phase 3 will be informed and further defined during the first two (2) phases of the work.

Question: Will performing this work disqualify the proposer from future design work?

Answer: No. All documents prepared as part of this assessment will become public information and will be made available to all prospective proposers for future design work.

Question: How will e-Builder be tied into this work?

Answer: e-Builder will be used for contract administration, including invoicing, change orders, uploading deliverables, etc.

Question: Will the pre-proposal attendance list be published?

Answer: Yes. It can be found on the District's Purchasing webpage:

<https://www.beaverton.k12.or.us/depts/business/purchasing/Pages/default.aspx>

Questions submitted via e-mail

Question: Does the District intend to continue using Megamation as their facilities management software or is the District trying to shift towards a new software management system?

Answer: The current contract for Direct Line Megamation expires in May of 2020. A new solicitation for a CMMS will be issued within that timeframe. It is important that regardless of whatever format the information is collected in, that it does not drive or prohibit the use of some other vendor's CMMS. All data should be tabulated into database format that can be imported/uploaded into any CMMS system. There should be some method of identifying where equipment or each database entry is located.

Question: Is the following standard acceptable for the Facility Condition Assessments: E2018-15 Standard Guide for Property Condition Assessments: Baseline Property Condition Assessment Process

Answer: We will not be following this standard.

Question: Schedule of completion (What is the schedule for completion and are there any restrictions to accessing the buildings?)

Answer: Ideally the work will be complete in two (2) years. However, this will depend on the outcome of Phase 1. There are restrictions on building access. Background checks are required. Generally, a District Representative will need to be present to access buildings.

Question: Can you provide building details (sq ft, year of construction, [if available, year of major remodels], etc.)

Answer: Yes. A list of facilities is attached.

Question: I notice on Attachment A – Proposer Certification, question #4 references certification from the Oregon State Board of Architect Examiners, the Oregon State Landscape Architect Board, or the Oregon State Board of Examiners for Engineering and Land Surveying. Is this certification a mandatory requirement for submittal?

Answer: This certification is not a mandatory requirement, but we would like it included if available.

Question: On page 14, there is a list of forms/attachments to be included with our proposal. Do any of these forms need to be completed by subconsultants as well, or are they only for the prime consultant of the proposal to fill out?

Answer: The forms are for the Prime Consultant to complete.

Question: For Attachment B – Affidavit of Non-collusion/Compliance with Tax Laws, (1) B. asks for the Employer’s Oregon ID Number. We are a Washington State based firm and do not have an Oregon ID Number just a Washington one, but we do have an Oregon Registry Number. Would the Oregon Registry Number work in place of the Oregon ID Number or should we list our Washington ID Number?

Answer: Any in-state or out-of-state employer with employees who are working in Oregon - and paying those employees for services - must obtain a Business Identification Number (BIN) for reporting and paying payroll taxes. This is the number that is needed on this form. Refer to the Oregon Department of Revenue for more information.

Question: Below is our interpretation regarding confidentiality. Could you confirm these assumptions are correct? And/or provide guidance?

Q: Pages in the proposal that are confidential shall only contain verbiage to “Refer to confidential information enclosed”, cite a specific statutory basis for the exemption, and the reasons why it should be confidential. - Can you clarify “a specific statutory basis”?

A: Statutory exemptions are provided in ORS 192.501 (renumbered 192.345) and ORS 192.502 (renumbered 192.355) which list public records conditionally exempt from disclosure and public records exempt from disclosure respectively.

Q: If the original proposal and eight complete copies have confidential pages, the confidential pages are required to be submitted in a separate envelope. -Do you wish to have nine total copies of the confidential pages submitted as their own submittal? (nine confidential packets with staples in the top left corner)

A: Yes.

Q: If so, are the confidential pages to be numbered as they fall in the proposal?

A: Yes.

Question: Are you planning on using Technical Assistance Program (TAP) grant from state OSCIM program to partially pay for the audit? If so, do you need to be a TAP certified assessor to respond or is that just a bonus for the companies that do respond to this RFP that are certified TAP companies?

Answer: We may be using a TAP grant. It is not a requirement that the consultant be TAP certified.

Question: Under “Description of Services: D) Phase 4 – Integration”, what does the District mean by “building management system”? Are you referring to building controls or a work order management system?

Answer: Work order management system.

Question: Does the District intend to replace their current work order management system? If so, is the District hoping to integrate facility condition data into the current system or the new system after it is implemented?

Answer: This is to be determined. Please see the answer to the first question under “Questions submitted via e-mail”, above.

Question: Which data systems does the District hope to integrate under “Description of Services: E. Desired Outcomes”?

Answer: This would primarily be the work order management system. It may include other systems to be determined.

Question: Will the meeting notes or any questions posed during the pre-proposal conference be posted to ORPIN?

Answer: The clarifications and answers to the questions posed during the pre-proposal conference are provided above.

Question: Does the school district desire the assessments include any of the following elements:

- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance - *Yes*
- Educational Adequacy - *To be determined*
- Seismic performance (i.e. ASCE Tier 1 checklist) - *No. This has been completed.*
- Fire/Life Safety/Building Code Compliance - *Yes*
- Energy Performance - *No*
- Maintenance practice review - *To be determined*
- Indoor Air Quality - *No*
- Building and campus perimeter security - *No*

Answer: Answers to each specific item are indicated above in *italics*.

Question: Under item 4. Description of Services, bullet C. Phase 3 – Condition Assessing, number 2 states “Assign probable costs to conditions assessment.’ Is this referring to providing ROM (rough order of magnitude) cost estimates to address identified deferred maintenance concerns?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Will the school district provide a detailed Excel spreadsheet listing all buildings included in the scope with names, sizes, date of construction and site area?

Answer: See attached ATTACHMENT H – Building List and Facility Inventory.

Question: I understand that Attachment A is the first page of the proposal. Would the District prefer to see the other attachments immediately following Attachment A or prefer that they be included in an appendix?

Answer: Please include the other attachments immediately following Attachment A.

Question: Are the references requested in Section 5e of the solicitation the same as the references in Attachment E? (That is, does the solicitation request at least 3 references or at least 6 references?) If they are the same references, can Attachment E be inserted here?

Answer: The three (3) references can be the same. Each section asks for somewhat different information. Please include the Attachment E forms with the rest of the attachments.

Question: Will the successful proposer be able to negotiate any of the contract terms, or are the terms in the sample contract final and non-negotiable?

Answer: Certain contract terms reflect state statute and may not be altered. Any exceptions taken or proposed changes to the contract terms included in the sample contract attached to the RFP must be listed in the consultant's proposal. The District will consider any exceptions in its evaluation and reserves the right to accept or reject any exceptions at its sole discretion. If no specific exceptions are taken to the contract template, the Proposer is indicating his willingness to abide by this contract. As stated in SECTION III, Paragraph 7.b. of the RFP, "The District reserves the right to negotiate a final Contract that is in the best interest of the District."

-END of Addendum

Linda Niman
Purchasing Manager

RFP 19-0001 Facilities Condition Assessment
ATTACHMENT H - Building List and Facility Inventory



BEAVERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
BUILDING LIST

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	ADDRESS - Linked to Google Earth aerial view	NOTES
ALOHA-HUBER PARK	5000 SW 173RD AVE, BEAVERTON, 97078	Main building
BARNES	13730 SW WALKER RD, BEAVERTON, 97005	Main building, Gym
BEAVER ACRES	2125 SW 170TH AVE, BEAVERTON, 97003	Main building, modular
BETHANY	3305 NW 174TH AVE, BEAVERTON, 97006	Main building
BONNY SLOPE	11775 NW MCDANIEL RD, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building
CEDAR MILL	10265 NW CORNELL RD, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building, modular
CHEHALEM	15555 SW DAVIS RD, BEAVERTON, 97007	Main building, modular
COOPER MOUNTAIN	7670 SW 170TH AVE, BEAVERTON, 97007	Main building, modular
ELMONICA	16950 SW LISA ST, BEAVERTON, 97006	Main building, modular
ERROL HASSELL	18100 SW BANY RD, BEAVERTON, 97007	Main building, modular
FINDLEY	4155 NW SALTZMAN RD, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building
FIR GROVE	6300 SW WILSON RD, BEAVERTON, 97008	Main building
GREENWAY	9150 SW DOWNING RD, BEAVERTON, 97008	Main building, modular
HAZELDALE	20080 SW FARMINGTON RD, BEAVERTON, 97007	New building in 2018
HITEON	13800 SW BROCKMAN RD, BEAVERTON, 97008	Main building
JACOB WISMER	5477 NW SKYCREST PKWY, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building
KINNAMAN	4205 SW 193RD AVE, BEAVERTON, 97078	Main building
MCKAY	7485 SW SCHOLLS FERRY RD, BEAVERTON, 97008	Main building
MCKINLEY	1500 NW 185TH AVE, BEAVERTON, 97006	Main building, modular
MONTCLAIR	7250 SW VERMONT ST, PORTLAND, 97223	Main building, modular
NANCY RYLES	10250 SW CORMORANT DR, BEAVERTON, 97007	Main building
OAK HILLS	2625 NW 153RD AVE, BEAVERTON, 97006	Main building
RALEIGH HILLS K-8	5225 SW SCHOLLS FERRY RD, PORTLAND, 97225	Main building
RALEIGH PARK	3670 SW 78TH AVE, PORTLAND, 97225	Main building
RIDGEWOOD	10100 SW INGLEWOOD ST, PORTLAND, 97225	Main building
ROCK CREEK	4125 NW 185TH AVE, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building
SATO	7775 NW KAISER RD., PORTLAND, 97229	New building in 2017
SCHOLLS HEIGHTS	16400 SW LOON DR, BEAVERTON, 97007	Main building
SEXTON MOUNTAIN	15645 SW SEXTON MOUNTAIN DR, BEAVERTON, 97007	Main building
SPRINGVILLE K-8	6655 NW JOSS AVE, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building
TERRA LINDA	1998 NW 143RD AVE, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building, modular
VOSE	11350 SW DENNEY RD, BEAVERTON, 97008	New building in 2017
WEST TUALATIN VIEW	8800 SW LEAHY RD, PORTLAND, 97225	Main building, modular
WILLIAM WALKER	11940 SW LYNNFIELD LN, PORTLAND, 97225	New building in 2019
MIDDLE SCHOOLS		
CEDAR PARK	11100 SW PARK WAY, PORTLAND, 97225	Main building
CONESTOGA	12250 SW CONESTOGA DR, BEAVERTON, 97008	Main building
FIVE OAKS	1600 NW 173RD AVE, BEAVERTON, 97006	Remodel in progress
HIGHLAND PARK	7000 SW WILSON AVE, BEAVERTON, 97008	Main building
TIMBERLAND	650 MW 118TH AVE, PORTLAND, 97229	New building in 2016
MEADOW PARK	14100 SW DOWNING ST, BEAVERTON, 97006	Main building
MOUNTAIN VIEW	17500 SW FARMINGTON RD, BEAVERTON, 97007	Main building
STOLLER	14141 NW LAIDLAW, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building
WHITFORD	7935 SW SCHOLLS FERRY RD, BEAVERTON, 97008	Main building
HIGH SCHOOLS		
ALOHA	18550 SW KINNAMAN RD, BEAVERTON, 97078	Main building
BEAVERTON	13000 SW 2ND ST, BEAVERTON, 97005	Main building, cafeteria, annex
MOUNTAINSIDE	12500 SW 175TH AVE, BEAVERTON, 97007	New building in 2017
SOUTH RIDGE	9625 SW 125TH AVE, BEAVERTON, 97008	Main building
SUNSET	13840 NW CORNELL RD, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building
WESTVIEW	4200 NW 185TH AVE, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building
OPTION SCHOOLS		
ARTS & COMMUNICATION MAGNET ACADEMY (ACMA)	11375 SW CENTER ST, BEAVERTON, 97005	New building in 2020
HEALTH & SCIENCE SCHOOL/CAPITAL CENTER	18640 NW WALKER RD, BEAVERTON, 97006	Main building
INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF BEAVERTON (ISB)	17770 SW BLANTON ST, BEAVERTON, 97078	Main building, modular
MERLO STATION CAMPUS	1841 SW MERLO RD, BEAVERTON, 97003	Main building
TERRA NOVA	10351 NW THOMPSON RD, PORTLAND, 97229	Main building
ANCILLARY BUILDINGS		
ADMINISTRATION CENTER	16550 SW MERLO RD, BEAVERTON, 97003	Main building
ADMINISTRATION - ALOHA BRANCH	17880 SW BLANTON ST, BEAVERTON, 97078	Main building
MAINTENANCE CENTER	2180 SW 170TH AVE, BEAVERTON, 97003	Main building
TRANSPORTATION 5TH STREET NORTH	10615 SW 5TH ST, BEAVERTON, 97005	Main building
TRANSPORTATION 5TH STREET SOUTH	10550 SW 5TH ST, BEAVERTON, 97005	Main building
TRANSPORTATION ALLEN	10420 SW ALLEN BLVD, BEAVERTON, 97008	Main building
TRANSPORTATION AND SUPPORT CENTER (TSC)	1270 NW 167TH PL, BEAVERTON, 97006	Main building

BEAVERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
FACILITY INVENTORY

Site	Year Built	Building Size (SqFt)	Site (Acres)
ACMA (6-12)	2020		8.94
ACMA PAC	2010		8.94
Admin. Aloha Branch	1999		2.86
Administration Center	1972	35,995	3.27
Aloha High School	1968	260,677	31.21
Aloha Huber Park (K-8)	2006	106,046	9.95
Barnes	1927	75,900	8.20
Beaver Acres	1955	79,507	13.60
Beaverton High School	1915	264,016	26.23
Bethany	1971	49,913	10.69
BHS Merle Davies	1938		
Bonny Slope	2008	80,405	8.34
Capital Center (HS2)	1970	105,883	18.55
Cedar Mill	1950	41,055	5.62
Cedar Park	1965	117,054	16.80
Chehalem	1971	54,316	10.00
Conestoga	1994	128,179	25.01
Cooper Mountain	1954	54,821	8.07
Elmonica	1980	50,734	8.76
Errol Hassel	1979	60,345	9.20
Findley	1997	72,052	9.96
Fir Grove	1954	60,666	12.00
Five Oaks	1976	143,039	32.23
Greenway	1979	54,991	9.45
Hazeldale	2018	89,000	7.20
Highland Park	1965	116,892	19.00
Hiteon	1974	78,972	12.00
ISB (6-12)	1944	75,585	15.45
Jacob Wismer	2001	72,863	8.39
Kinnaman	1975	80,837	7.86
Maintenance Center	1971	21,390	6.54
McKay	1929	48,736	5.44
McKinley	1962	61,265	10.02
Meadow Park	1963	116,682	19.39
Merlo Station (9-12)	1993	51,125	4.20
Montclair	1970	38,526	7.20
Mountain View	1969	133,942	23.18
Mountainside	2017	342,000	46.15
Nancy Ryles	1992	71,119	7.00
Oak Hills	1967	49,890	9.02
Raleigh Hills (K-8)	1927	56,647	10.00
Raleigh Park	1959	45,166	15.50
Ridgewood	1958	54,059	7.00
Rock Creek	1975	51,505	17.37
Sato	2017	89,000	9.87
Scholls Heights	1999	68,941	8.70
Sexton Mountain	1989	67,318	10.83
Southridge	1999	256,070	32.39
Springville K-8	2009	87,206	10.02
Stoller	1999	143,788	16.89
Sunset	1958	253,727	38.06
Terra Linda	1970	51,636	10.44
Terra Nova (9-12)	1938	11,800	3.83
Timberland	2016		
Trans. 5th Street Station N	2001	5,139	3.43
Trans. 5th Street Station S	1965	25,800	2.94
Transportation Allen	1969	9,779	5.36
TSC	1973		
Vose	2017	89,000	8.81
West Tualatin View	1955	43,447	7.05
Westview	1994	281,183	44.65
Whitford	1963	116,962	23.41
William Walker	2019	51,092	9.20