



University of California, Santa Barbara



DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

Building #439, Room E

Santa Barbara, California 93106-1030

Date: December 12, 2011

To: Potential Proposers

From: Telli Foster, University Representative

Subject: University Responses to Proposer Questions – Set No. 1
Request for Proposals/Project No. 981770
Architectural Services for the KITP Residence Facility Project

The following questions were submitted to the University by potential proposers, or are otherwise being offered by the University in order to clarify the requirements set forth in the above referenced RFP package.

Set No. 1

Q1. Should subconsultants be referenced by the principal proposer in response to RFP Instructions to Applicants, Section 2 (i.e., list of projects), or should subconsultant information be addressed only in Section 5, Supplementary Information, of the RFP?

A1. Both. Section 2 responses should include subconsultant participation insofar as “team member’s roles” are concerned, and Section 5 responses should “provide [more detailed] information on proposed engineering staff and consultants...and an organization chart.”

Q2. Should RFP Instructions to Applicants Section 4, Cost Control, be completed by the principal proposer?

A2. The principal proposer should provide a comprehensive cost control plan that applies to the proposed team. The level of detail included in that plan will be left to the discretion of the principal proposer.

Q3. What is the anticipated length of stay for visiting scientists and their families at the KITP Residence Facility?

A3. Scientists and their families will visit the facility from one week to one year.

Q4. Will the project described in the RFP be required to achieve LEED certification?

A4. Yes.

Q5. Do sub-consultants have to fill out the “Statement of Qualifications” form, or just the prime consultant?

A5. The prime consultant must complete the Statement of Qualifications form, listing all proposed sub-consultants.

End of Set No. 1