

UC

University of California, Santa Barbara

SB

**DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION SERVICES**

Building #439, Room E

Santa Barbara, California 93106-1030

Date: November 4, 2011

To: Potential Proposers

From: Telli Foster, University Representative

Subject: University Responses to Proposer Questions – Set No. 1  
Project No. 988704 – Davidson Library Tower Seismic Improvements

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. Can the University provide the Degenkolb Seismic Evaluation (date, 7/26/11) referenced in the RFP?

**A1. That item was posted on the University website project page located at the following address: <http://facilities.ucsb.edu/contracts/proposals/>.**

Q2. Will an architect be required for this project?

**A2. The University will leave the composition of proposed teams to the discretion of each proposer/team. Historically, proposals for this type of work have been submitted by architects who list a structural engineer among its sub-consultants.**

Q3. Does the University have a list of architects that have shown an interest in the project?

**A3. The University does maintain a list of firms that have downloaded the required prequalification forms from the University website. Interested parties, upon written request, may acquire a copy of the current listing by contacting the Project Manager, Telli Foster, at [telli.foster@dcs.ucsb.edu](mailto:telli.foster@dcs.ucsb.edu).**

Q4. What is the nature of the expected scope beyond the seismic work?

**A4. The non-seismic work will be driven by code requirements. The University anticipates that the work will involve an ADA upgrade and also life safety improvements.**

Q5. Has there been scoping done by Pfeiffer Architects on the library tower, and, if so, why is this going back out to RFP and not being continued by Pfeiffer?

**A5. The University has draft studies, but does not have a scope document that is complete, has been vetted for accuracy, and can be shared. The subject RFP is intended to result in the initiation of a completely independent project from the work that Pfeiffer is doing on the Davidson Library addition and two story renovation project.**

Q6. What are the limits of the current project by Pfeiffer versus the 'Tower' project?

**A6. The University expects that the seismic joint between the two story building and the tower will be the line of demarcation between the two projects.**

Q7. Degenkolb and other firms may have completed studies for this project. Does the University have a preferred seismic rehabilitation scheme or approach to this project?

**A7. Degenkolb and JAMA have both looked at the problem. The University does not have a scheme that is complete and has been vetted for accuracy. See also A5 above.**

Q8. Do all sub-consultants to the proposal have to fill out the "Statement of Qualifications" form, or just the prime consultant?

**A8. The prime consultant must complete the form and list all proposed sub-consultants.**

**End of Set No. 1**