

April 17, 2020

SOLICITATION ADDENDUM NO. #3
RFP 19-0052
Cooper Mountain Elementary School Seismic Upgrades Design

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 **IS UNCHANGED: April 23, 2020 at 2:00 PM Pacific Time**

CLARIFICATIONS:

Question: Will the District share the cost estimate spreadsheet that was used to develop the project budget?

Answer: Budget spreadsheet will be provided to successful proposer. Current construction budget for the project is approximately \$2.5 Million

Question: How was the preliminary project budget arrived at?

Answer: Preliminary budget was established through the schematic design required to obtain the seismic grant.

Question: When was this estimate made and has cost escalation been accounted for?

Answer: This estimate included escalation to a construction start of Summer 2021.

Question: Will a contractor retained as the estimating sub-consultant under this Architectural Services Contract be eligible to submit a bid for the construction of the project?

Answer: While the District cannot provide an answer to a question regarding a solicitation that has not yet been posted (e.g., the ITB for the construction project), such a sub-contractor might face barriers to submitting a hard bid for the construction project. For example, the firm developing the cost information may well be privy to information not available to the general marketplace. Additionally, there are provisions in law generally prohibiting firms that helped develop a solicitation from being awarded a contract under it. We recommend that your firm seek the advice of a qualified expert regarding your question.

Question: Is the full extent of architectural finish removal and reinstallation included for the Areas of Work?

Answer: All impacted finishes due to structure upgrades will need to be removed and reinstalled or replaced as needed.

Question: Will hazardous material abatement have its own budget, or is it built into the published construction budget?
Answer: **Abatement is included in the overall \$2.5 M**

Question: (Page 13, item iv) Provide the status of any required license or certification. Will BSD please clarify specifically what is needed here and from which members of the project team?
Answer: **Confirmation that the team is licensed/certified to do work in Oregon and the City of Beaverton.**

Question: (Page 13, item f) Provide a minimum of three references... (Page 25, Reference Form) Proposer shall provide five (5) references. Which is correct?
Answer: **Minimum of three (3) references are required.**

Question: Is the cover letter, table of contents or similar to be included in the 16 page limit?
Answer: **Yes**

Question: Are resumes for primary contractor team members and sub-consultant team members to be included in the 16-page limit?
Answer: **Separate resumes are not required to fulfill the Experience, Personnel nor Subconsultant proposal contents. If resumes are provided, they shall be included in the 16 page limit.**

Question: For RFP 19-0052, the proposal states the contractor will be procured in a Design-bid-build process. Can you please clarify whether for our proposal submission, you are asking for a contractor/architect team?
Answer: **This is for Design only.**

Question: Section 9.b of the RFP references price. Please confirm that the district is not requesting a fee be included with this proposal.
Answer: **A fee proposal is not a requirement of this RFP response.**

Question: (Page 13, item. e iii) **Re: Litigation/arbitration/mediation – Last 5 years.** / (Page 22, Attachment D – Financial Resources, Questions 3 & 4) **Re: Litigation/arbitration/mediation – Last 10 years.** What timeframe would you like us to address for these items?
Answer: **See answers in bold above.**

Question: Does Attachment B need to be notarized?
Answer: **Yes.**

Question: When will Beaverton School District provide a Geotechnical Report?
Answer: **Geotechnical report will be provided prior to end of Design development.**

Question: Will the School District engage a Hazardous Materials group (for analysis and abatement) or is this scope to be included in the proposal?
Answer: **BSD will engage a Hazardous materials consultant for testing and preparation of hazardous materials bid documents**

Question: On page 13, what is the difference between question d.i and d.ii? Is one relating to the firm and the other relating to the individuals?
List the Proposers' key staff to be assigned to the project and describe their experience in providing similar services on comparable projects;
Describe the amount and type of resources, and list the number of experienced staff persons Proposer has available to perform the services described in the Statement of Work Section;
Answer: **Yes, the key staff is the team proposed to work on the project and the resources is for the firm**

should additional team members need to be identified/added to the team.

Question: On pages 12 and 13, can you explain the difference between question b.ii and d.iii? (I see in question b, we need to include the primes information, but then both questions seem to ask the same for the subconsultants information. Would you like the subs information to be included under section b or section d?)

Under Experience: Describe Proposers' and their sub-consultants demonstrated ability to successfully complete similar services on time and within budget, including whether or not there is a record of satisfactory performance under OAR 137-048-0120 (2) (the Districts or other public agency record of Consultants performance);

Under Sub-Consultant: Describe the sub-consultant(s) demonstrated ability to successfully complete similar services on time and within budget, including whether or not there is a record of satisfactory performance under OAR 137-048-0120 (2) (the Districts' or other public agency record of Consultants performance);

Answer: **In section B, please provide information related to project experience worked as a team if any. In section D, focus on individual sub consultants.**

-END of Addendum

Peter Madaus
Contract Specialist