



**DESIGNER
 REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (“RFQ”)
 AMENDMENT ONE
 FOR THE PROJECT TITLED:
 New Tennessee State Museum
 SBC Project #529/050-01-2015**

DATE: July 16, 2015

1. This RFQ Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFQ dates.

EVENT	TIME (central time zone)	DATE (all dates are state business days)	Updated / Confirmed
1. Post RFQ on STREAM website		June 26, 2015	Confirmed
2. Written Question Deadline	2:00 p.m.	July 9, 2015	Confirmed
3. STREAM Responds to Written Questions		July 16, 2015	Confirmed
4. Proposal Deadline	2:00 p.m.	July 23, 2015	Confirmed
5. STREAM Written Evaluations Complete		July 30, 2015	Confirmed
6. STREAM Issues Notice of Short-Listed Respondents		July 31, 2015	Confirmed
7. Interviews with Short Listed Respondents		August 10, 2015 & August 11, 2015	Confirmed
8. Information available for State Architect		August 13, 2015	Confirmed
9. Executive Subcommittee Approval Sought		August 24, 2015	Confirmed

2. **State responses to questions and comments in the table below to amend and clarify this RFQ.**

Any restatement of RFQ text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFQ document.

QUESTION / COMMENT	OWNER’S RESPONSE
1. What will be Lord Cultural Resources’ involvement during the design and construction process?	Lord will participate with the Project Manager as Agent (PMaA) to assure that the interests of the State are preserved throughout the design and construction process.
2. At what phase of the design process do you anticipate the selection of the museum exhibit designer?	We anticipate the Exhibit designer to be procured prior to the start of schematic design of the building.

QUESTION / COMMENT		OWNER'S RESPONSE
3	What would you consider "specialty consultants" to be?	Any consultants deemed to be required by the designer of record to complete design of the project.
4	What costs, if any, do you anticipate the 1.3 multiplier would cover?	All professional building design services for this project.
5	Would you consider a modest increase in the submittal page limit?	The page limit is to remain at 50 pages.
6	Will the State want the new State History Museum to achieve a LEED certification?	The State does not require that the new State Museum achieve a LEED certification.
7	The RFP refers to projects done within the last 5 years as eligible for inclusion in the experience sections. That would be a time frame 2009/2010 to the present, a time which was historically noted as the Great Recession and was—in reality for the design and construction business—an authentic depression. We would therefore like to ask if it would be possible to change the RFP to include projects over the last 10 years? Projects the size and nature of the new museum are usually many years in design/construction; limiting it to 5 years may not allow the inclusion of very pertinent, similar endeavors.	Amend B.2a to 10 years; any projects within the last 10 years are acceptable; however, more recent projects will be given greater consideration.
8	Would you share with us the composition of the Selection Committee? We assume it will include representatives from the State Museum. Will it also include representatives from the State Museum Commission and/or from the State Museum Foundation.	It is not appropriate to divulge this information.

9	On the SBC-1, there are two important numbers listed. One is \$32,500,000 for Built-In Equipment....and the other is \$6,000,000 for Movable Equipment. Would you be able to provide more clarity on these two numbers? IE, if the \$32.5-m is for museum exhibits, does that number include any/all of the electrical and environmental conditioning requirements for those exhibit elements? And if this first number is for the exhibits (fabrication/installation, etc.) then would you be able to share the makeup/description of the Movable Equipment (\$6m)?	See answer to question #11 below.
10	The Proposal should be emailed in a vertical format, 8.5 x 11". Correct?	Vertical formatting is not required, but page size is to remain 8.5" x 11".
11	The RFQ document states a MACC of \$90 million and the SBC-1 form indicates the MACC is \$120 million. What is the MACC for this project?	The MACC for the building construction covered by this designer is \$90 million; the MACC for the project is \$120 million. Any work outside of building design is outside the scope of this procurement.
12	Will the Designer Agreement be the January 2007 SBC-6/6a, or will a 2015 versions be utilized? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 2015 version, please provide a copy for reference; when was this approved by the SBC? 	The only Designer Agreement in effect is the 2007 SBC-6/6a.
13	The State of Tennessee BIM Requirements Ver. 1.0 was made available, however, the RFQ does not state if these requirements are to be implemented. Will the design team be required to implement the State's BIM requirements?	Yes, the State's BIM requirements as attached to the RFQ are a requirement of this project.
14	The State of Tennessee HPBr Manual was made available, however, the RFQ does not state if these requirements are to be implemented. The HPBr Manual is labeled "Draft." Will the design team be required to use the Draft HPBr Manual?	Yes, the State's HPBr requirements as attached to the RFQ are requirements of this project.
15	Item C2b, identifies the Environmental engineer as a "standard discipline". However, SBC-6a, Clause 2-1-1b identifies environmental, survey and geotechnical services as Designer-provided consultants subject to reimbursement. Will SBC-6a, clause 2-1-1b and all sub-clauses apply to this project?	See answers to questions #3 & #4 above.
16	Are there any IDIQ consultants under contract with the State that will be utilized such as ADA, AV, IT, and Exterior Envelope?	This is yet to be determined; the answer to this will not affect the scope of work required by the designer of record for this building.
17	Will a security consultant be provided by the Owner (State)?	The Owner (State) will not provide a security consultant.
18	Will the State provide a traffic study or has one already been performed?	The State will not be providing a traffic study.

<p>19 The Functional Program developed by Lord Cultural Resources notes in Article 2.5 Planning Assumptions that all parking on site is only below grade and ideally a maximum of two levels above grade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the underground parking included within this project? • Has a specific number of required parking spaces been identified? • Is the area required for the parking garage included in the 130,000 Gross Sq. Ft. identified in RFQ and SBC-1 documents? • Is the cost of the underground parking included in the MACC? 	<p>Underground parking is not included within this project.</p> <p>There has not been a specific number of required parking spaces identified.</p> <p>The area required for the parking garage is not included in the 130,000 gross sq. ft.</p> <p>The cost of underground parking is not included in the MACC.</p>
<p>20 Is demolition of the portion of the Farmers' Market site to be included in the scope of this project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please confirm limits of demolition. 	<p>Demolition of any portion of the Farmers' Market is not part of the current scope.</p>
<p>21 Recognizing the complexity of this project, we respectfully request a two week extension to the Proposal Deadline (August 6, 2015) to allow all proposers and their consultants the necessary time to respond to the answers provided by the State to the questions submitted.</p>	<p>Given the project schedule, no extensions can be granted.</p>
<p>22 It appears that the RFQ documents show differing information regarding the MACC. The Project Request SBC-1 form listed the MACC as \$120,000,000. However, the Designer Request for Qualifications listed the MACC as \$90,000,000. Is the \$120,000,000 MACC correct?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please clarify if the fee will be based on \$120M or \$90M, per question #11. 	<p>See answer to question #11 above.</p>
<p>23 It appears the fee shown on the Project Request SBC-1 form is based on \$120M at the standard state fee rate without the 1.3 factor noted in the Designer Request for Qualifications. Please confirm the amount of fee intended for the A/E team.</p>	<p>See answer to question #11 above.</p>
<p>24 Please confirm that the off-site Collections Storage Facility building is not included within the current scope.</p>	<p>An off-site Collections Storage Facility is not part of the current scope.</p>
<p>25 Please clarify if any additional programming services will be required as part of the A/E team's Basic Scope of Services.</p>	<p>No additional programming services are anticipated.</p>
<p>26 Is there a DBE requirement for this project?</p>	<p>There are no DBE requirements for this project.</p>
<p>27 Per typical State projects, Survey and Geotechnical services are provided by the Owner. Is that the approach for this project?</p>	<p>Yes, these services will be provided by the Owner.</p>

28	What portion of the PMaA/Cx/test/cons allocation of \$14.85M on the Project Request SBC-1 form is allocated for the PM fee?	This is outside the scope of the building design services.
29	What is included in the Exhibit Design Fee of \$6M <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is that the designer fee only or does it include exhibit installation costs? • Does the exhibit design fee (\$6M) include the A/E Designer coordination fee for exhibit installation? 	This is outside the scope of the building design services.
30	What is included in the Built-in Equipment costs of \$32.5M? Is this the budget for the Exhibits and their installation?	This is outside the scope of the building design services.
31	Is there a separate designer fee for the Interior Furnishings Designer?	This is outside the scope of the building design services.
32	What is the project budget for Exhibit installation build-out?	This is outside the scope of the building design services.
33	Is there an Owner Contingency vs. a Construction Contingency?	Yes, on this project there will be both an Owner contingency and a Construction contingency.
34	Will the selected CM/GC be responsible for and provide cost estimating throughout the project design process?	Designer and CM/GC are independently responsible for their own budgets and estimating.
35	There is a discrepancy on the MACC amount listed in the RFQ. Page 1 lists it as \$90,000,000 and SBC-1 shows \$120,000,000. Could you please clarify the correct amount?	See answer to question #11 above.
36	Page 3 of the RFQ mentions that the maximum points possible for the written RFQ response is 65 points. Are the sections of the written response individually weighted? If so, what are the point allocations for each section?	There have been no individual weights established.
37	Given the RFQ response is limited to 50 pages total and a large team will be required to provide all of the necessary services to complete project, is it safe to assume that resumes for "key firm and consultant personnel" can be limited to resumes for just the Principal and Project Manager for each firm/consultant/specialty consultant?	Proposer is responsible for deciding how best to provide responses within the 50 page limit.

38	<p>A paragraph on Page 2 of the PMaA RFQ (SBC # 529/050-01-2015) states: "In order to avoid any potential conflicts of interest, neither the company nor any affiliates of the company providing PMaA services will be permitted to perform any other services on the Project." That RFQ has no definition of the word "affiliate".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For further clarification, can you define what you meant by "affiliate"? 	<p>See 12.02.C.a of the policy and procedures of the State Building Commission for the definition of the word affiliate.</p>
39	<p>As a State of Tennessee-certified SMWDVBE we would like to fulfill the State's mission to "give ALL qualified businesses, including those that are owned by minorities, women, Tennessee service-disabled veterans, and small business enterprises, the opportunity to do business with the State as contractors or subcontractors" by proposing with both PMaA and Designer Respondents to provide non-duplicative services as "subcontractors" to each Respondent. As subcontractors we are not owned or employees of any Respondents. We are also not engaged in any potential conflicts of interest listed in paragraph 4.3 of the PMaA RFQ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this context and to meet these goals, can we propose on both PMaA & Designer Respondent teams to provide non-duplicative services to the project? 	<p>Companies can propose on both PMaA and Designer respondent teams, however you may only be awarded as part of one contract.</p>