

LA MESA-SPRING VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Business Services Department

4750 Date Avenue
La Mesa CA 91942

ADDENDUM 1
MARCH 6, 2025

RFP #24/25-004

Facilities Condition Assessment Services

THIS ADDENDUM IS ISSUED AS ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND/OR AS A CHANGE IN SPECIFICATIONS OR INSTRUCTIONS TO ALL PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS INTERESTED IN THE ABOVE-MENTIONED REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL.

This addendum contains two (2) items:

ITEM 1: (located in this document): Responses to requested information.

Question 1: Should the proposers only include K-12 experience. Will consideration be given to proposers that include other experience as well as K-12. Higher Education would be a good example.

Response 1: Higher Education experience will be considered. Responding firms should note, however, that K-12 experience is preferred.

Question 2: Can the District please clarify how the 30 points allocated for the fee proposal will be distributed among bidders?

a. Specifically, will the lowest-cost proposal automatically receive the full 30 points with other proposals scoring zero, or will a different methodology be used (a sliding scale, or a tiered approach)?

b. Also, if the 100-point interview is waived does this mean that the 30 points for the fee double in relative value? 30/100 vs. 30/200?

Response 2:

A. The points awarded for fee are based on value. For example: The lowest fee will not automatically receive the highest score if all of the services requested in the RFP are not included. Likewise, a higher fee may receive a better score if that higher fee is the only proposal that includes all of the services requested in the RFP.

B. In the unlikely event that the interview is waived, the total possible points for the interview are removed from the matrix and the highest possible score will be 100 points.

Question 3: Page 18, #21, of the RFP requests a one-time fee for software use. It is standard practice to structure software pricing as an annual subscription, often with optional add-ons. This model provides ongoing system maintenance, updates, and support that are done remotely. We are not aware of any software service providers who still offer onsite hosting. This means that an owner would need to buy hardware in addition to software and would not have access to remote updates and their individual “instance” would fall out of date. Would the District be open to considering an annual, or multi-year, pricing structure that aligns with industry standards?

Response 3: The District will consider subscription based pricing. The responding firms should structure this fee schedule such that the year one (initial costs) are included in their proposal and the subsequent years are clearly scheduled on an annual basis for four (4) additional years.

Question 4: We noticed that addenda are scheduled to be released on 3/10, with the submission deadline set for 3/18. Given this timeline, if the addenda introduces significant changes, there may be limited time to edit our response. Would the District consider extending the submission deadline to allow respondents time to fully address any changes?

Response 4: The District will consider extending deadlines only if significant information is added via an addendum.

Question 5: We recognize the RFP’s page limits for proposal sections. Given the complexity of the requested information, specifically in section 20.3 of the RFP, would the District consider expanding section limits to allow for a more detailed and appropriate response?

Response 5: Responding firms should follow the page limits published in the RFP. If respondents feel strongly about including additional information, an “Appendix” is allowable without deduction.

Question 6: In the RFP, the District is asking for a web-based solution for asset management and capital planning. Is the District looking for software-as-a-service (SaaS) offerings or software to own and maintain by the District? SaaS solutions require an annual subscription fee which covers hosting, maintenance, and support.

Response 6: Please see Response 3 regarding how to propose the subscription cost of a service.

Question 7: Could you please let us know what the budget for this project is?

Response 7: The budget will not be provided as part of the RFP. Responding firms should structure their fee to provide all services outlined in the RFP.

Question 8: Also, is it possible to submit the proposal online?

Response 8: Electronic online bids are not permitted. The bid shall be enclosed in a sealed envelope, addressed and hand delivered or mailed to the La Mesa Spring Valley School District.

Question 9: Do any of the school campuses have vertical transportation like lifts, elevators, etc?

Response 9: Yes, there are 19 chair lifts, two elevators, and one dumbwaiter.

Question 10: Are there any specialty facilities like auditoriums/ performing arts which may require specialty consultants like acoustics or theater design on any of the campuses?

Response 10: Not for the purposes of this assessment.

Question 11: Will the District or DSA require a seismic risk assessment for each campus?

Response 11: Respondents should include a seismic risk assessment for the District's use. The fee for this assessment should be a separate line item or an alternate cost.

Question 12: The Fee proposal is limited to 1 page but requires we list each team member, the hourly billable rate, total estimated project hours and extended costs on Attachment E but indicates to provide additional sheets if needed. There are 21 campuses in total. Is the intent to add up all hours per team member across all 21 campuses? It might be clearer and easier to understand if we could provide fees per campus, list the team members with estimated hours per campus/ school and provide a standard hourly rate sheet. In either case, we may need more than 1 sheet beyond Attachment E. Is Attachment E counted as 1 page?

Response 12: See Response 13.

Question 13: The main content of the proposal page count total per the RFP is 27 pages with Appendices as unlimited. Can the additional fee proposal pages be included under the appendices and reference via Attachment E?

Response 13: The detail of the fee proposal can be included in the appendices with reference to Attachment E.

Question 14: If we respond to certain sections under the page count, can we utilize the remaining pages for other sections as long as we stay under the 27 page limit? I.e. Section 20.4 Windows and/or Web based software database section has a 10 page count. If we completed that section in 8 pages, could we apply the remaining 2 pages to a different section like 20.3 Experience and project team summary proposed staffing or 20.7 project plan?

Response 14: Respondents should follow the RFQ format. If additional pages are required, an appendix is allowed, but judicious use of the appendix is the responsibility of the respondent.

Question 15: It is unusual for an FCA RFP to have a specific software development component. Most Owners would either have an existing CMMS or asset management program or would procure through a separate RFP for the necessary software. This is a very unique RFP. Has the District engaged in discussions with a specific vendor or consultant to provide both the FCA and software development as outlined in this RFP?

Response 15: No. The RFP is requesting a digital database of the information gathered as part of the FCA not a CMMS or Asset management program.

Question 16: It is understood that the District does not want ongoing subscription or maintenance fees related to a software solution. If the industry standard for this type of contemporary digital solution involves recurring costs, does the district have specific examples of software solutions they have seen that meet the functional needs and the one-time cost requirement? If yes, which ones?

Response 16: See response 3.

Question 17: As a percentage of overall consultant scope fee, what is the District's approximate expectation of FCA service vs software solution?

Response 17: There is no expectation. The district is requesting a software solution to manage and analyze the findings of the FCA.

Question 18: What is the current technology stack that district staff utilize to perform their work? Any existing database solutions, cloud or on-prem servers, cloud content management platforms, web or mobile applications related to facility management?

Response 18: The Current CMMS is through Facilitiron and is web and application based.

Question 19: How many staff would need to access the provided digital database solution?

Response 19: Respondents should assume five users with edit/update rights.

Question 20: How many staff would need view-only privileges with the digital database solution?

Response 20: Unknown at this time. For the purpose of responding to this RFP, assume an additional five users with view only rights.

Question 21: How many staff would need edit/update privileges with the digital database solution?

Response 21: See Response 19.

Question 22: Does the district have any cyber security or data backup requirements that the solution must adhere to?

Response 22: If the solution provided is hosted Web-based, the District will require secure https access (Standard practice) and User Permissions-based access with MFA options.

If the solution is a Windows-based database that the District will host, the requirement is Microsoft SQL databases that District staff can manage and backup.

Question 23: Does the district envision the solution needing to be operational from a mobile device? If yes, are there aspects that must remain functional without Wifi or cellular connection?

Response 23: The District is not requesting access from mobile devices.

Question 24: What types of asset information does the district expect to be updating after the initial consultant assessment is complete?

Response 24: The District is requesting the ability to update the database after completion of capital projects or deferred maintenance projects, which materially change the information in the original assessment.

Question 25: How often does the district expect needing to internally update asset information in the system?

Response 25: See Response 24. Additionally, information may be updated quarterly if needed.

Question 26: Does the district require that the system support multi-user editing at the same time (i.e. co-authoring of the data)?

Response 26: This feature would be the District's preference, however, inability to co-author data in real time is not a disqualifying factor.

Question 27: Does the District require reporting outputs from the digital database solution? If yes, in what format(s) and any key metrics?

Response 27: Yes, Excel and PDF. The District is open to suggestions on key metrics, but the data base should account for industry standard metrics. An example would be the Facilities Condition Index or industry standard comparable metric.

Question 28: Are reference photographs related to assets required to be included in the digital database solution?

Response 28: Yes

Question 29: Can the school district provide campus maps of each school site showing the buildings and their layouts?

Response 29: The successful firm will be provided this information.

Question 30: Are all permanent structures the same age at each site?

Response 30: No, Permanent structures vary in age. Unfortunately, a reliable matrix of this information is not available. The District anticipates coordinating with the successful firm in order to create this information.

Question 31: How many permanent modulars are at each site and how many relocatable modulars at each site? We assume there may be more than one classroom in each.

Response 31: Please see the RFP for the site information.

Question 32: The District is requesting " A comprehensive Facility Condition Assessment and assessment reports for each facility assessed. (One hard copy and electronically)." Can buildings be combined, like modulars, or do you want a separate report for each?

Response 32: Buildings can be combined as long as information regarding the facility is clearly defined.

Question 33: In Section 1. Introduction: Can the District clarify its expectation regarding software licensing? Specifically, does the District require a perpetual license for the proposed

asset management solution, or would a term-based license that provides access for a reasonable duration be acceptable? Additionally, does the District anticipate covering any ongoing costs for support, updates, or hosting beyond the initial purchase?

Response 33: See Response 3.

Question 34: *In Exhibit A – Description of Services, 5. Photograph all conditions and prepare drawings and notes on all site visits.:*

Will the District provide as-built drawings at the start of the project? What is the general condition of the drawings that will be provided? Will it be an expectation of the vendor to update drawings to reflect what we find in the facility assessment?

Response 34: As-built drawings will be provided to the successful firm. The condition of the as-built drawings varies from original paper drawings to digital drawings in TIFF and PDF format. There is no expectation that the responsible firm will be required to update the drawing to include existing conditions, however, notation of variance between as-built drawings and existing conditions, where applicable, should be anticipated.

Question 35: *In Exhibit A – Description of Services, 10. Provide cost estimates for correction of each project identified by industry standards, published construction and facilities maintenance, construction and repair cost estimating data, reflecting appropriate adjustments for local labor and material costs. The cost estimating system shall be embedded within the overall database.:*

Can the district clarify the requirement that the cost estimating system be embedded within the overall database?

Response 35: The intent is that the District will receive an estimate to correct deficient conditions identified in the FCA such that a Facilities Condition Index or similar industry standard metric can be generated. Additionally, the database should include the ability to prioritize facility conditions and adjust for future value replacement costs.

Question 36: What is the District's planning horizon that should be used for the expected duration of online software access without incurring additional licensing fees?

Response 36: See Response 3.

Question 37: Is there an approved budget for this project?

Response 37: Please see Response 7.

Question 38: Can the due date get extended?

Response 38: Not at this time.

Question 39: Is the District currently using a computerized maintenance management system?

Response 39: Yes, Facilitron.

Question 40: What format will the District be providing the maintenance requests and maintenance services for each school?

Response 40: PDF and Excel.

Question 41: *In Exhibit A – Description of Services, Scope of Work Data Collection, the District is asking for the assessment of underground utilities.:*

Typical assessments are a visual inspection, so can the District clarify how they envision the underground utilities to be assessed?

Response 41: The selected firm is expected to coordinate with District Staff to identify issues known by staff. Because the nature of the underground investigation is not quantifiable at this time, the responding firms are not expected to include costs for these investigations. However, in the event the District can provide, at its cost, video or photographs of U/G conditions, that information should be included in the FCA report and database.

Question 42: *In Exhibit A – Description of Services, Scope of Work Condition Assessment Tasks No. 5, the District is asking for the Consultant toprepare drawings and notes on all site visits.:*

Can the District please clarify if they want to Consultant to develop as-builts or just notify on the available drawings where the deficiency is located?

Response 42: See Response 34

Question 43: *In Exhibit A – Description of Services, Scope of Work Condition Assessment Tasks No. 9,:*

Can the District further describe their expectation for a Windows and/or web-based support database? Is the District looking for a PMIS System that will help the District with project planning, including scheduling, resource allocation, and cost management; tracking progress, identifying risks, and monitoring costs; managing tasking, coordinating resources, and automating workflows; and/or help with data analysis, reporting, and performance review OR a CMMS system that centralizes maintenance information; tracks assets, materials, and resources; helps plan, schedule, and monitor maintenance tasks; and supports various maintenance operations, such as reactive, planned preventative, and predictive maintenance?

Response 43: The software solution the District is requesting should manage the information collected during the FCA regarding conditions and costs associated with correcting the deficiencies identified in the FCA. An industry standard metric such as the Facilities Condition Assessment will be required as well as the ability to sort through and analyze data based on the system type, condition, site, cost, age, etc.

The District is not looking for Project Management Software or Computerized Maintenance Management Software.

Question 44: To support sustainability initiatives, will the District accept digital responses to reduce the impact of printing and shipping proposal documents?

Response 44: Please provide hard copies as defined in the RFP

Question 45: *In section 20 – Response Content, a lot of information is being requested in each section especially in Section 20.3.:*

Can you please remove or significantly increase the page limitations?

Also, for resumes and schedules, etc. can you please confirm that these items can be added as Appendices and will not count against page limits, if they remain?

Response 45: See Response 5.

Question 46: *Attachment E – Fee Proposal:*

Can you please provide an editable version (ideally Word) so that we can add rows for additional names staff. Please confirm that the intention is for all non-labor and non-software costs (e.g. travel disbursements) are to be included in the Other Cost section of the form.

Response 46: Detail and additional information pertaining to the fee may be included in the appendix.

Question 47: Please confirm if the signatures must be original or if a digital signatures by the signing authority are satisfactory.

Response 47: Digital signatures are allowed.

Question 48: With regards to the fee for the software, most SaaS software is typically invoiced based on an annual license fee. How many years does the District want included with the proposal? Please confirm that the District wants the annual license fee to be multiplied by the number of years of the license requested to get the single one-time software fee.

Response 48: See Response 3

Question 49: With regards to the review of work order history, can the District please confirm which CMMS system is currently used and if work orders are tracked against individual pieces of equipment. Also are individual pieces of equipment affixed with a bar code or QR code that can be used by the assessor to identify specific pieces of equipment?

Response 49: Bar codes are on most major components.

Question 50: To allow for proper costing (assessing one 40,000 sq.ft. building requires a different level of effort than assessing 5 x 8,000 sq. ft, buildings even though the total square footage is the same) can the District please provide the following information for each of the permanent located at each site:

Date of Construction, Square Footage, Number of major additions

Response 50: Please see the site information in the RFP.

The District will coordinate with the selected firm to refine and update this list as required.

Question 51: Are Relocatable and Modular Classrooms to be included in the FCA scope of work?

Response 51: Yes

Question 52: For item 12 on page 27, can you please provide quantifiable metrics for these items for purposes of pricing?

Response 52: A deliverable of the FCA is for the selected firm to quantify the FCI.

Question 53: Can the District confirm whether Attachments A-F should be included in the Appendices package? If so, should the Fee Proposal (Attachment E) be included in both the Fee Proposal package and the Appendices package?

Response 53: All Attachments can be included in the Appendices package; however, a fee proposal limited to one page is a requirement of the response. Detail and additional information pertaining to the fee may be included in the appendix.

Question 54: Does the District consider the Department of Veteran's Affairs a regulatory agency?

Response 54: Not for the purpose of this RFP.

Question 55: Can the District please define what relocatable classrooms and modular classrooms are?

Response 55: Relocatable Classrooms are portable and typically placed on grade with access ramps to finish floor. Modular classrooms are typically composed of modular construction assembled in the field and placed on permanent foundations.

Question 56: In reference to Page 27, Task 5, drawings are typically not included in an FCA due to their cost-intensive nature. Could the District clarify the specific drawings required?

Response 56: The intent was not to have the successful firm create drawings.

See corrected Task 5 below:

Photograph all conditions and prepare notes for all site visits.

Question 57: Please specify the assessment level of detail.

Response 57: Assessment tasks are defined in the RFP. Destructive measures to access facilities will not be required.

Question 58: There are terms within the proposal that are outside the scope of our professional liability coverage (including a heightened Standard of Care and defense-based indemnification obligations). What is the best way to address these concerns/exceptions? Are we able to submit a comment memo outlining our proposed exceptions to the proposal and its subject terms and conditions? Section 12 of the RFP indicates that any exceptions or deviations from the requirements of the RFP must be declared in the proposal response, however in Sections 24 and 36, it indicates that a submittal containing terms such as "will negotiate", "negotiable" or similar terms would be considered non-responsive.

Response 58: Exceptions can be noted; however, they should be specific in nature and not generically declare they are negotiable without defining the exception being taken.

Question 59: If the District will be relying on the use of proprietary software for this project, that usage would be subject to an End User License Agreement. Is the District agreeable to this?

Response 59: Any agreement, software or otherwise, shall not limit the District's access to, or ability to share at will, the data or analysis collected during the FCA. If the responding firms have concerns regarding proprietary software, they should include their End User License Agreements in the Appendix of their response to this RFP.

ITEM 2: (located in this document):

Revised Condition Assessment Task #5 on Page 27: Delete "drawings and"

Exhibit A – Description of Services

Condition Assessment Tasks:

5. Photograph all conditions and prepare ~~drawings and~~ notes on all site visits.

End of Addendum 1

Sign and return with proposal

Signature Acknowledgment