



September 7, 2017

Thomas Small
Joe Susca
City of Culver City
City Hall
9770 Culver Boulevard
Culver City, CA 90232

RE: CLARIFICATION NO. 1 – Preliminary Fee Breakdown
Culver City Hall Centennial Gardens

Dear Thomas & Joe:

We want to thank you for the opportunity to participate in the Culver City Centennial Garden Project. Following our public presentation and subsequent conversation regarding fees and cost estimates, we offer the following clarification.

The underlined introduction to Section II, Phase Two of the RFP states that finalists are '*invited to prepare a proposal to complete the following additional work.*' Item 2: Cost Estimate constitutes a component of 'the work' to be accounted for in the fee proposal. Therefore, wHY did not include a formal cost estimate with our proposal.

Section V, Item E in the RFP also requests 'Any additional fees or expenses the firm seeks reimbursement for' be 'listed as separate line items.' As such, wHY's submitted fee proposal and work plan reflect a \$60,000 Masterplan and Concept Design exercise for the full site. This would include a pricing exercise to determine budget for the entire scope and phasing per Item 2, Section II, Phase Two of the RFP. The work plan for this phase is described in detail in the body of our proposal.

wHY's fee to deliver Items outlined in Items 1 through 7 of Section II, Phase Two of the RFP was proposed as 15% of construction cost. Specialty consultants, including, but not limited to surveyor, civil engineer, lighting designer, irrigation design, permitting, soils and geotechnical engineering services are not included in this proposal. A \$600,000 construction budget was given as reference to the project cost for Phase 2 (as described under Item ii, Section II, Phase Two in the RFP: '*the Lafayette Place facing side*') in response to information provided in Question 3 of the June 16 Response to Questions.

Based on new information from our conversation following the public presentation, if the City anticipates a \$680,000 construction budget for the work in phases 2-4 (Items ii-iv under Section II, Phase Two of the

wHY Los Angeles
9520 Jefferson Boulevard
Culver City, California 90232
310.839.5106

wHY New York
473 W. Broadway, Unit 3
New York, New York 10012
646.682.9280

www.why-site.com

RFP, essentially the entire City Hall site), wHY will provide Phase 1 deliverables (per Item i under Section II, Phase Two of the RFP) same fee listed above. However, as our conceptual design shared with the City during the August 30th presentation did not reflect a \$680,000 budget, but rather a longer-term vision, we could revise the concept design based on input from the City and Staff.

In either case, wHY recommends a preliminary phase of work to determine the budget and implementation phasing appropriate to the goals and expectations of all stakeholders.

This is very exciting and we are working hard to put forward the most efficient and effective process and project for the City! We will continue to work with you to align vision and budgets.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Thomann', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Mark Thomann
Director, wHY Grounds
