

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR LEASE-LEASEBACK SERVICES
RFP #760
RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS

1. **Question:** On Page 1 of 5 paragraph two, the district includes this language:
“It should be noted that the District may consider cutting-edge design and construction methods that take advantage of new technologies and learning space configurations for the possible implementation of hybrid learning. The District may further be interested in having one of more projects constructed using panelized or componentized construction. For these reasons Design Firms with a background in working with contractors using methods of Building Information Modeling ("BIM ") or Integrated Project Delivery ("IBD") are also encouraged to submit proposals. In such a case, Design Firms may respond to the RFQ in a manner consistent with the idea that the Design Firm will be the lead entity, with an implementing general contractor.”

It implies the district will consider a design firm taking the lead in the pursuit, however there are no questions or a point system for the consideration of the Design firm as a lead. In a Design Build or similar pursuit, there are usually questions geared towards the design portion. This RFQ in general is geared towards standard lease- lease back, with the district teaming up the builders selected with the design firms selected from a different process/ pool. How would a design firm taking the lead submit their qualifications and how would the combined design firm + builder team be evaluated for this specific RFQ?

Response: *The RFQ is for contractors to provide Lease-Leaseback services. The District expects design firms to work with contractors who will be submitting the RFQ and the design firm can be the lead entity for that contractor. No separate RFQ/RFP is required from the design firm.*

2. **Question:** Regarding the 50 page limit for the proposal, are the following counted towards the page limit: Cover Letter, Table of Contents, The tab separators between each section (A, B, C, etc.) as pages even though they really have no content other than providing the title of each section, Exhibit A, Financial statement, Letter of Bondability?

Response: *Yes. Please submit proposals according to submittal requirements. The District hopes that clarity and consistency will be maintained in the Proposals.*

3. **Question:** Are the scores for Yes and No answers about our insurance coverage on page 13 of the Prequalification Questionnaire reversed?

Response: *Yes (“Yes” = 5 points/“No” = 0 points)*

4. **Question:** Does the 50 page limit include the Prequalification Questionnaire pages?

Response: *No*

5. **Question:** Does the 50 page limit include the financial statement, bonding letter, and bank line of credit letter we submit to attach to the Prequalification Questionnaire?

Response: *Yes. Please submit proposals according to submittal requirements. The District hopes that clarity and consistency will be maintained in the Proposals.*

6. **Question:** Please clarify what you are seeking in our response section C7 “Provide Signatory Status of Officers of the Firm.”

Response: *Title of Officer(s) signing the RFQ.*

7. **Question:** Are we correct that we need not submit the certificate on page 28 of the Prequalification Questionnaire if we submit an Audited Financial Statement?

Response: *Yes*

8. **Question:** On page 10 of Exhibit A, Prequalification Application, it asks to ‘list all public agency construction projects your firm has performed in the last seven (7) years.’ The form then has space to list seven projects. Our firm has completed several hundred projects in the last seven years. Would the district prefer we list our most relevant seven projects to fit the space provided in the prequalification form? Or would the district prefer we duplicate the provided space for all several hundred projects? And if so, would filling out a spreadsheet with the required project information suffice?

Response: *Please list the seven most relevant projects.*