

**San Rafael City Schools RFQ/P # 01-17
Addendum 3**

Question 3. We need to know exactly which part of the project costs will need to be financed and for what time period. Project costs being those that we will list under proposal Tab 8 – Pricing and Contingency, items 1 through 7 as well as the GMP cost.

Response: Per Addendum 1, the District will not be financing any portion of the Tenant Improvement Payments, only the lease payments will be financed. Each Proposer needs to supply their proposed financing terms, including amount, interest rate, and duration. The proposed financing terms will be evaluated by the District when reviewing Proposals to identify the successful Proposer. The final financing terms will be negotiated, if necessary. Proposers should use their past experience with school districts when proposing the amount, interest rate, and duration.

Question 4. Section VII.C.4.j of the RFQ/P requires the respondent to hold a B License. We request that an Addendum be issued to modify this section to allow either an A License or a B License.

Response: The District will accept either a class A or a class B license for those proposing on RFQ/P # 01-17.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK; LAST QUESTION FOLLOWS ON NEXT PAGE]

**San Rafael City Schools RFQ/P # 01-17
Addendum 3**

Question 5. [We are] concerned over a number of inconsistencies between the Request for Qualifications and the current Request for Qualifications and Proposals. We believe the differences between these two documents and other language reduces our competitiveness and we are asking for a revision in the Lease-Leaseback Construction Services (Developer) RFQ/P language as well as additional time to respond fully to the qualifications requested.

Specifically:

Reference	Language	Description	Recommended Change
Section 6, Tab 6, Page 10 of 18	... list all projects involving public or private schools ... Within 5 years.... Exceeded \$7M per project	This language differs from the RFQ limits set of 5 Year/ 5M and accounts for 30 potential scoring points	The project value amount and requirement for schools only may not necessarily reflect the complexity or applicability of a project. Please delete RFQ Limit of \$7M and schools requirement.
Section VIII Selection Criteria, Page 15 of 18	Best Value Evaluation items including "Life Cycle", "Collaborative for High Performing Schools (CHPS)" and Energy Savings Goals	This language is typically related to vertical construction and vertical school construction expertise, thus represents 20 potential scoring points.	These criterial [sic] items may favor scoring of vertically integrated proposers, rather than heavy civil firms. Please delete or revise scoring criteria, or provide qualitative requirements to guide the proposer

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to participate, and are seeking to gain a fair and competitive process for all respondents. Overall, we see these two items as accounting for a potential of 50 scoring points. This places us at a competitive disadvantage when compared with vertical or vertically oriented constructors, even with [our] excellent reputation for delivering cost effective, quality projects with similar execution challenges.

Please advise if an addendum can be issued to modify the RFQ/P and if the deadline for submittal can be extended.

Response: There are no inconsistencies between the "Request for Qualifications" and the "Request for Qualifications and Proposals," because the documents quoted above are actually for two different scopes of services. The District's Request for Qualifications ("RFQ # SRCS CM-001") is specifically for Construction Management services. The District's Request for Qualifications and Proposals ("RFQ/P # 01-17") is specifically for construction services.

The District is engaged in a fair and competitive process with RFQ/P # 01-17. All Proposers will be evaluated based on the same criteria from RFQ/P # 01-17, and not based on criteria used for other RFQs, or criteria use for other scopes of services.

It is not unfair or uncompetitive for the District to request that all Proposers provide relevant past experience involving school projects with a similar project cost. It is not unfair or uncompetitive for the District to uniformly apply Board-approved evaluation criteria to all Proposers.

RFQ/P # 01-17 will not be modified as requested.