Roseville Joint Union High School District

Ignite – Inspire - Prepare

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: ADDENDUM 1

Request for Qualifications Title:	Request for Proposals for Lease-Leaseback Services West Park High School Phase IV Upgrades
Addendum number:	1
Issue Date of this Addendum:	August 5, 2026

1.0 PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM:

The Roseville Joint Union High School District ("RJUHSD") is issuing this Addendum to the Request for Proposals named-above (the "RFP") to respond to questions and requests for clarifications RJUHSD received regarding the RFP (see Section 3.0 below).

2.0 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

This Addendum constitutes an integral part of the RFP and is to be read in conjunction with the RFP. Unless specifically changed by this Addendum, all other requirements and terms of the RFP remain unchanged. It is the responsibility of all Proposers to conform to this Addendum and modify their proposals accordingly.

3.0 QUESTIONS OF THE RFP:

1. **Question:** The Price Proposal Form (Attachment D) references the Facilities Lease (Attachment J) for Insurance. Section VI of Exhibit E therein requires Builder's Risk Insurance. Builder's Risk insurance is calculated on a project-by-project basis considering project factors like schedule, building type(s) and adjacencies, roofing and cladding systems, fire and security services, and insurance market conditions. Most insurers will not quote insurance sooner than 30-60 days in advance of binding the policy for coverage. We understand the Plans that would make these factors known are under development by DLR. Accordingly, will the District consider deferring the cost for Builders Risk Insurance to time of TBR when information is clearly known and a policy may be reasonably quoted?

   Response: Builders Risk is a requirement for physical construction and will apply to both Increment 1 and 2. Builders Risk Insurance shall not be included with the response to this RFP.

2. **Questions:** The Scope of Work (Section IV, item 1.a) says to include a $15K Allowance for each Increment to cover site investigation. This is reiterated in Preconstruction Services (Exhibit H, item B.2) within the Facilities Lease (Attachment J). Should this $15K be inserted on line 3 (Increment 1 and Increment 2) of the Price Proposal Form (Attachment D)?

   Response: Insert $15,000 on line 3 of both Increment 1 and Increment 2 Price Proposal Form (Attachment D)

3. **Question:** The Price Proposal Form (Attachment D) includes a $75K "Base Allowance" for Increment 1 and a $125K "Base Allowance" for Increment 2. Since these Base Allowances do not appear to be addressed in Exhibit H (Preconstruction Services) to the Facilities Lease (Attachment J), can the District please describe the scope of work these Allowances are intended to cover so we do not propose redundant scope/costs.

   Response: The District anticipates a robust constructability review to be performed for each Increment. The Base Allowance shall be utilized to support the constructability review efforts. However, it is anticipated the allowances may be insufficient to cover all costs associated with performing exhaustive constructability reviews. All additional costs necessary to provide the anticipated level of effort beyond the allowance will be added on line 7 of both Increment 1 and Increment 2 Price Proposal Form (Attachment D). Please note, If the ongoing constructability review indicates poor performance in this area, the District may elect not to move forward with the preconstruction services contractor for Increment 1 and 2 .

4. **Question:** The Scope of Work (Section IV, item 1.a) says, "(one formal Constructability report for each of Increments 1 and 2)." In our review of the Preliminary Master Schedule (Attachment O) we note there are multiple DD and CD milestones for Increment 2 occurring during our preconstruction service period. Accordingly, at what design milestone does the District require the one (1) Constructability Review for Increment 2? Alternatively, if the District desires multiple Constructability Reviews for Increment 2, please specify the design milestones at which they will occur.

   Response: The District anticipates the constructability review to be a living document and performed on an ongoing basis continuing up to DSA approval of the documents. The District's goal is for the contractor to perform a thorough and exhaustive constructability review of each increment. Upon DSA approval a formal constructability report is to be provided to the District.

5. **Question:** Preconstruction Services (Exhibit H, item B.4) within the Facilities Lease (Attachment J) says, "Entity shall provide estimating services as needed in connection with Phase IV, Increments 1 and 2." At what design milestone(s) does the District require cost estimate(s) for Increment 2?

   Response: Increment 1 – 100% CD/DSA submittal
   Increment 2 – 100% DD, 50% CD and 100% CD/DSA submittal.

6. **Question:** Paragraph A.2 and B.1 within Section 14.01 of the General Terms and Conditions Exhibit D (within Facilities Lease, Attachment J) proposes to cap a daily rate for Compensable Delay at $2000/workday. Will the District alternatively consider an equitable daily rate based on the General Conditions component in Contactor's Price Proposal (Attachment D), or Contractor's demonstrated costs at the time a Compensable Delay is requested, if any?

   Response: The District will not consider any changes.

7. **Question:** The Preliminary Master Schedule (Attachment O) shows DSA approval for Increment 1 is expected **1/22/27** (line 27). However, the RFP (page 2, 4/18) says DSA approval for Increment 1 is expected **3/2027**. Please confirm **1/22/27** is correct for DSA approval of Increment 1.

   Response: DSA approval of Increment 1 is anticipated for late March 2027

8. **Question:** The Preliminary Master Schedule (Attachment O) shows construction for Increment 2 running **1/10/28**-6/1/29 (line 68). However, the RFP (page 2, 4/18) says construction for Increment 2 will run **3/2028**-6/2029. Please confirm **3/2028** is the correct start of construction for Increment 2.

   Response: March 2028 is the anticipated construction start for Increment 2.

9. **Question:** The RFP (page 1, 9/18) asks for five (5) hard copies of the Proposal in a three-ring binder. Will the District accept the Proposal in spiral bound copy in lieu of three-ring binder?

   Response: A spiral bound copy in lieu of a three-ring binder will also be acceptable.

10. **Question:** Page 9/18 of the RFP asks to a include Proposal Security consisting of cash, CA bank's Cashier's Check or Certified check, a Proposal Bond (Attachment E) in an amount no less than 10% of Respondent's Price Proposal. And page 13/18 requests it within the sealed Price Proposal. This is a usual requirement for a best value proposal - does it apply to this RFP?

    Response: Response: The requirement for a Proposal Security noted in attachment D is waived and is not to be included with the submission.

11. **Question:** The Site Plan (Attachment A) graphic is very small and difficult to read. May we please receive the Architectural Site Plan in its native sheet size?

    Response: The requested graphic will be available for download from the Districts Facilities web page located with the other RFP documents.

12. **Question:** The RFP's Price Proposal scoring (Section V) includes General Conditions costs as part of the Total Price(from attachment D), which are evaluated at the time of Proposal submission. Can the District clarify whether it would consider evaluating General Conditions costs based on a detailed line-item staffing methodology and approach (submitted and scored as part of the Technical Proposal) rather than as a fixed dollar figure included the Price Proposal at this early stage?

    Response: No changes will be made. The Districts anticipation is the contractor has experience with this type of project and understands the staffing requirements necessary for a successful project.

13. **Question:** Please confirm that the District is requesting proposal security for 10% of the total price for Phase IV services, found on the Price Proposal (Attachment D) directly above the Phase IV Financing Rate.

    Response: Response: The requirement for a Proposal Security noted in attachment D is waived and is not to be included with the submission.

14. **Question:** Please confirm whether the District would like five (5) copies of the Price Proposal as requested on page 9 or one (1) copy as requested on page 1?

    Response: Follow page 9 requirements (5 hard copies and one electronic copy)

15. **Question:** In the body of the submittal table, TAB 14 requests the Non-Collusion Affidavit and below, in the Price Proposal Table, the second row requests a Non-Collusion Declaration. Please confirm whether the District would like the form to be duplicated in both places.

    Response: A Non-Collusion affidavit (Attachment G) shall be provided with both the body of the submittal and the price proposal.