MURRIETA VALLEY
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Murrieta Valley Unified School District
41870 McAlby Court
Murrieta, CA 92562

DISTRICT RFPQ ADDENDUM NO. 2

Date: October 29, 2026

To: All Proposers

From: Vanessa Petersen, Purchasing Coordinator

Re: 2026-27-02 Lease-Leaseback RFPQ for Preconstruction and Construction Services

This addendum is issued for the purpose of amending and clarifying certain requirements of the RFPQ and is hereby made a part of and incorporated into the Contract Documents. Unless specifically stated otherwise herein, all other provisions of the RFPQ and Contract Documents remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

RFPQ ADDENDUM NO. 2 DESCRIPTION:

Questions and Answers

1. In regard to Attachment No. 4, "Compensation Form – Percentage rates", because the RFPQ covers future projects that may vary in size, scope, duration, complexity, and risk, please clarify whether the District will accept percentage ranges for the cost categories included on the Compensation Form, including Fee & Profit, Contractor Bonds, Subcontractor Bond/SDI, Insurance, Builder's Risk Insurance, Earthquake Insurance, and Contractor contingency. The percentage for these costs categories typically vary based on the value of the project, type of construction, and construction duration. If ranges are not permitted, please confirm whether the percentage submitted at the RFPQ stage is intended to be a fixed rate applicable to all future projects awarded under the qualified pool, regardless of project-specific conditions.

   Answer: *MVUSD will not accept percentage ranges on Attachment No. 4, Compensation Form. Contractors shall provide a single percentage for each cost category identified in the form, including Fee & Profit, Contractor Bonds, Subcontractor Bond/SDI, Insurance, Builder's Risk Insurance, Earthquake Insurance, and Contractor Contingency. The percentages submitted in Attachment No. 4 are intended to be used by the MVUSD as part of its evaluation of qualifications and compensation during the RFPQ process and will establish the proposer's stated rates for future consideration.*

However, project-specific pricing, General Conditions, financing, contingencies, and Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) development will occur during subsequent project-specific RFP processes and negotiations. MVUSD reserves the right to evaluate all proposed costs and pricing as part of any future procurement and project award process. Contractors should submit their best representative percentages based on their anticipated approach to Lease-Leaseback projects under this RFPQ.

2. Per Submission of SOQ language on page 6, the SOQ must be one (1) electronic copy in PDF with bookmarks (Note: 50 MB size limit) and five (5) hard copies, however, per the Phase II - Contractor's SOQ language on page 10 the SOQ shall be no larger than 50MB in size, inclusive of résumés, forms and pictures with no details of physical copies.

   Can you please advise whether or not the SOQ is to be printed and delivered or if only an electronic submission is acceptable.

   Answer: *All SOQ submissions must be hard copies and delivered to our District Office at 41870 McAlby Court, Murrieta, CA 92562. The electronic copy is in addition to the hard copies and can be submitted as a PDF file via email to vpetersen@murrieta.k12.ca.us or included on a usb with your hard copy submissions.*

3. Attachment No. 4, Compensation Form (Fees & Markup Percentages)
   SOQ Section 13, Compensation, asks contractors to submit a completed Attachment No. 4, Compensation Form, and notes that the District is not requesting a specific proposal or final price for a project at this time. Some items in the Fees & Markup Percentages section, such as Fee/Profit, Insurance Costs, and Builders Risk may vary depending on a project's value, scope, construction type, phasing, and duration.

   To help us provide the most accurate and useful information, would the District be able to share an assumed project value, construction type, and duration to use when completing these percentages?

   Answer: *The district is intentionally not providing an assumed project value, construction type, or duration for purposes of completing the Fee & Markup Percentages section. As stated in the SOQ, the District is not requesting a project-specific proposal or final pricing at this stage of the procurement process.*

   Proposers should provide their standard fee and markup percentages that would generally apply to Lease-Leaseback projects and can be evaluated consistently across all respondents. Project-specific fees, insurance costs, builder's risk, and other cost components will be reviewed and negotiated, as applicable, during subsequent project-specific phases.

4. The General Requirements section on Page 4 of the RFPQ states that the pool of qualified contractors will be maintained for two years, with options to extend it for an additional one or two years, for a possible total term of four years.

   Please confirm that the hourly rates included with our SOQ are required to remain fixed for the entire four-year period, from 2027 through 2030.

Additionally, if a project is awarded sometime between 2028 and 2030 and its schedule extends beyond the pool's maximum four-year term, how will hourly rates be adjusted for services provided after that period?

Answer: *The hourly rates and fee information submitted in Attachment No. 4, Compensation Form, are being requested solely for evaluation and qualification purposes as part of the district's best value determination under this RFPQ and do not constitute a commitment by the district to award any project or engage any Contractor for services. Each future project solicitation may include project-specific pricing, compensation, fee, general conditions, staffing, and financing requirements that will be evaluated through a separate Request for Proposal process.*

Accordingly, Contractors are not required to hold the Attachment No. 4 hourly rates fixed for the entire qualification period. Compensation applicable to any future project will be established through the project-specific procurement process and resulting agreements.

5. Article 2 - Basic Services, 2.1.4(4)(v) - As written, it is unrealistic to expect that no RFIs or minor clarifications will be required during a project's construction phase.

   We suggest revising this language to require that the documents be completed without material design revisions, scope additions, or design-related change orders to correct a deficiency that a reasonable constructability review would otherwise identify, while recognizing that normal RFIs and field clarifications may still occur.

   Answer: *The district acknowledges that routine Requests for Information and field clarifications may occur during construction. The intent of Article 2.1.4(4)(v) is not to prohibit ordinary RFIs, but rather to establish a high standard of care during the preconstruction phase that minimizes design deficiencies, scope gaps, coordination conflicts, and other issues that could reasonably be identified through a competent constructability review. No modification to the RFPQ is required. The district interprets Article 2.1.4(4)(v) as requiring Contractors to perform diligent constructability and coordination reviews intended to minimize material design revisions, design-related change orders, and significant scope additions attributable to deficiencies that could reasonably have been identified during preconstruction services.*

END OF DISTRICT RFPQ ADDENDUM NO. 2