



Town of Los Gatos
Request for Qualifications for
**DESIGN SERVICES FOR ADA RESTROOMS AND HUMAN
RESOURCES (CIP NO. 821-2117) AND ADA UPGRADE
PUBLIC RESTROOMS – ADULT RECREATION BUILDING
(CIP NO. 821-2601); AND ON-CALL ARCHITECTURAL
SERVICES**

**Clarifications/Responses to Questions Received
(Posted on 6/29/2021)**

1. Task C – In architectural terms, the two concept designs are called Schematic Design (SD). SD used in the RFQ should be DD (Design Development).

The scope of services can be further clarified during contract negotiations with the selected consultant. The Proposer can recommend modifications to the Proposed Scope of Services in the RFQ.

2. Are the restrooms on both levels in the ARC identical or different (only one floor plan was provided)?

They are different. The Town has the original building plans that can be viewed, but the scanned copy is not very legible.

Some evaluation and prioritization would be required with stakeholders to determine which restrooms would need to be upgraded as part of the project.

3. Is there no Task D?

That was an administrative error. Task E in the Proposed Scope of Services can be relabeled as Task D and so on.

4. Task E – Normally Fire Sprinkler plans are a design-build function. Is that acceptable or is a fire sprinkler consultant required to make a plan and calcs for the CD submission?

If required, fire sprinklers can be design-build or deferred permit submittals.

5. Technology systems – is a consultant required to deal with this, or will the service be provided by the Town? No information was provided as to what systems exist and how they function. Normally the owner/client provides this service, not the architect.

Current, there are no technology systems requirements for the restrooms. That could change during contract negotiations.

6. Normally the owner/client provides the Part 1 of the specifications (General Conditions and Bidding Documents); will that be done?

Yes, but the consultant would need to coordinate technical specifications so that there are no conflicts or issues with the Town's General and Special provisions, which are largely based on Caltrans 2010 Standard Specifications.

7. Task F – Normally government clients handle the bidding and the architect responds to RFI's. Is that the case here?

That is correct. If bids come in higher than the estimate, value engineering services are expected from the consultant.

8. Rather than “Value Engineering”, we recommend that add-alternates be identified that may or may not be awarded in order to determine a contract that falls within the available funding.

In general, the Town could work with this proposal.

9. Fee proposal – Qualifications based selection, the consultant selection process generally followed by most government agencies, does not consider the fee until after selection is made. This is the process followed by the City of San Jose, the County of Santa Clara and the State. We recommend deleting the requirement for a fee proposal from the RFQ.

The Proposer would not be disqualified based on the preliminary fee estimate (or for not submitting one). The Town is trying to understand the general costs involved in the design services. At minimum, hourly rates of key personnel would need to be provided.

10. For a project with a construction value of \$700k, there is too much “bureaucracy” in the tasks for a relatively small fee. Please reconsider reducing the requirements for submittals and meetings to a more affordable level.

The Town is willing to work with the selected consultant to get the project within the budget. Again, the scope of services can be further clarified during contract negotiations, and the Proposer can recommend modifications to the Proposed Scope of Services in the RFQ.