


David A. Alexander  
Superintendent

Taft Kleinpeter  
Board President  
District 5B

Troy Gautreau, Sr.  
Vice President  
District 7A



Robyn Penn Delaney, District 1  
Scott Duplechein, District 2  
Julie Blouin, District 3  
Marty J. Bourgeois, District 4A  
John Murphy, District 4B  
John DeFrances, District 5A  
Jared Bercegeay, District 6A  
Louis Lambert, District 6B  
Patricia Russo, District 7B

---

**RFQ-23**  
**Professional Services for 2020 Bond Funded Projects and  
Facilities Maintenance Projects**

**Addendum 3**  
**Issue Date: 11/16/2020**

Please note the additional questions with responses for the above referenced Request for Qualifications. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause you. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

**Procedures:**

1. Page 17 of 44; Scorecard Factors:
  - a. Item 1. Firm/Team Qualifications and Experience:
    - i. Replace the first note with the following: **"Firm/Team shall be evaluated based on project specific artificial turf experience and resources. ~~Include as much information on the artificial turf system types used, without indicating a specific manufacturer.~~"**
2. Page 18 of 44; Scorecard Factors:
  - a. Item 9. Special Conditions/Requirements Specified in RFQ:
    - i. Remove the second note in its entirety.
3. APSB Standard Form: 11-A:
  - a. Item B
    - i. Indicate the name of the firm associated with the project, if you have a Joint Venture.

**Questions:**

1. QUESTION: Can we add a cover page to this packet, or is that considered grounds for disqualification for adding an extra page?  
ANSWER: A cover page is not indicated in the APSB Standard Form.
2. QUESTION: For the LA License # section on the box envelope, is this to be filled out only by a GC? Since we are an architecture firm submitting for one of the architecture RFQs, should we instead be putting one of our employees license # in this section?  
ANSWER: LA License # is for Public Works Sealed Bid projects, which is not applicable for this RFQ, as indicated in Addendum 02, Question #12.

3. QUESTION: Proposal Submittal: Section 1.6: It is noted the acceptable formats below, however, I wanted to clarify if the number should read RFQ-23-00\*(depending on the application submitted) in order to differentiate the different packages submitted. This goes for using the preferred method (label) as well.

ANSWER: The outside of the RFQ envelope/box must be labeled with the information provided in 1.6 Proposal Submittal of the RFQ. Specific project numbers shall be indicated on the APSB Standard Form.
4. QUESTION: Proposer Inquiry Periods: Section 1.8: In the first paragraph there is note of a "Pre-proposal conference", however, this is not listed in Schedule of Events. Please clarify if this will occur before Receipt of Qualification Date or at all.

ANSWER: A Pre-proposal conference did not occur.
5. QUESTION: Part 2. Evaluation - Scorecard Factors: Verbiage is used in items 1 and 9 referencing artificial turf. It appears that this is a typo from a previous RFQ. Please confirm.

ANSWER: This item is clarified in this addendum under Procedures, Items 1 and 2.
6. QUESTION: On Page 4 of 44, Section 1.2 Purpose, fees associated with projects RFQ-23-001 – 011 will be based on the percentages outlined in the Owner approved fee schedule including in this section. Please clarify if the fee percentages shown are for design services only or inclusive of all services required of the respective project including surveying, geotechnical, environmental, and construction services.

ANSWER: Fee percentages indicated cover Basic Services provided by the Architectural/Engineering Firm. Typically, surveys, geotechnical services, independent testing, and environmental services shall be provided by the Owner for projects RFQ-23-001 thru 011.
7. QUESTION: Question regarding RFQ-23-10 – Dutchtown High School Rear Access Road: Is a jurisdictional delineation available for the site? Will the consultant be responsible for any permitting associated with wetland mitigation or will this service be provided by the School Board?

ANSWER: The jurisdictional delineation is not available for the site, and it will be provided by the Owner. The wetland mitigation permitting process is underway, and it will also be provided by the Owner.
8. QUESTION: Addendum No.2 added the Form 11-A, does this form only need to be filled out by the "Prime" Firm submitting on the specific RFQ? Do the subconsultants listed on form 7 need to provide a filled out Form 11-A as well? If so does this only apply to the major consultants, Civil/Structural, MEP?

ANSWER: Form 11-A will be filled out by Prime or Joint Venture only.

9. QUESTION: Please clarify item “d.” on Form 11-A, is this asking us to subtract the portion of the consultant’s fees from our overall A/E Fee for the specific projects?  
ANSWER: Item “d” is asking for the Contract Fee agreed between the Owner and the Firm.
10. QUESTION: For Section 11A of the Standard Form, do you want us to limit our list of current workload to relevant projects to the one we are submitting for, or do you want a comprehensive list?  
ANSWER: Provide a comprehensive list of all projects.
11. QUESTION: Also, in regards to section 11A, do you want this list to include projects for the Prime AND all our sub-consultants (if we are submitting for a project that requires sub-consultants)?  
ANSWER: Form 11-A will be filled out by Prime or Joint Venture only.  
Clearly define the name of the firm in item “b”, as clarified in this addendum under Procedures.
12. QUESTION: In the Evaluation Criteria provided in the RFQ, experience with “artificial turf” is referenced a couple of times. Assuming this is a hold over from RFQ 22, can you provide an updated Evaluation Criteria for this RFQ?  
ANSWER: See Question 4 in this addendum.
13. QUESTION: Are the projects submitted for Section 10 required to have been performed by the Prime firm or can an associate firm (that will be submitted as a sub-consultant) be included in this section also?  
ANSWER: Prime and Joint Venture’s project experience can be indicated in Item 10 of the APSB Standard Form. Sub-consultant’s project experience is not required.
14. QUESTION: Could the School Board post/ send a fillable version (i.e. Word or fillable PDF) of the standard RFQ form shown on pages 22-28 of the RFQ?  
ANSWER: See Question 1 in Addendum 2.
15. QUESTION: The RFQ clearly states that if I respondent chooses to submit on multiple projects, a separate proposal should be submitted for each project. Please confirm that this also applies to the various services listed within the “Indefinite Deliveries Contract – Professional Services” and that a separate form should be submitted for each of the Professional Services categories which a respondent would like to submit.  
ANSWER: Correct. Individual proposals need to be submitted for RFQ-23-13-001 thru 010, as well as the other projects within Appendix A.

16. QUESTION: Item 9 in the instructions for completing the APSB form (page 20). How many resumes may be included? Are copies of professional licenses required?  
ANSWER: Care should be taken to limit resumes to only those key persons or specialists and who will have major project responsibilities. Proof of professional licenses is required in this item, and a maximum of three (3) additional pages for professional licenses of personnel pertaining to the project may be utilized to complete this item.
17. QUESTION: Concerning Section 1.21 “Use of Subcontractors” on page 12: The section states “Information required of the prime contractor under the terms of the RFQ, is also required for each subcontractor...”. Does this mean all subcontractors must complete the entire *STANDARD FORM APSB Professional Services* to be included with Prime’s submission?  
ANSWER: No, Sub-consultants do not need to complete a separate APSB Standard Form, but Sub-consultants must be represented in the Prime/Joint Venture’s APSB Standard Form response.
18. QUESTION: In Section 9 in APSB Standard Form, are proposers allowed up to two pages per resume?  
ANSWER: No. One (1) page per resume for key personnel and three (3) pages for all professional licenses, as indicated in Item 9 on Page 20 of 44.
19. QUESTION: In Section 10 of APSB Standard Form, are proposers limited to the single provided page to list all 5 projects, or may Section 10 be expanded to more than one page?  
ANSWER: Proposers are limited to one (1) page for Section 10 to list five projects, but one (1) additional page PER PROJECT may be utilized to show renderings or photos of the specific project.
20. QUESTION: Is there a limit to length of each project description provided in Sec. 10 or a limit to number of pages for Section 10?  
ANSWER: See answer to Question 19 in this addendum.
21. QUESTION: Concerning the note to instructions for Section 10, is it correct to conclude that proposers are allowed only a single page to show collective photos for all projects included? Or is one page of photos allowed per project?  
ANSWER: See answer to Question 19 in this addendum.
22. QUESTION: Concerning instructions for Section 10, is it correct to conclude photos must be limited to the additional page, and NOT included in the chart of Section 10 itself, or may illustrative photos be included in the Sec. 10 table provided?  
ANSWER: See answer to Question 19 in this addendum.

23. QUESTION: Concerning Addendum 1, statement 2 - The Addendum states “ Replace Quantity of (8)... “ with “Quantity of (6)”, yet in the copy of the RFQ posted online, the quantity in question is already “6”. Just seeking confirmation. How many copies are to be delivered if delivered by hand?

ANSWER: Provide quantity of (6) for each proposal.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 3.

---

Company Name

---

Signature of Preparer

---

Name of Preparer (Print)

---

Phone Number of Preparer

**\*PLEASE INCLUDE THIS FORM IN YOUR RFQ PACKAGE!**