

Addendum 1



REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

CHILDREN'S MUSEUM / SCIWORKS MUSEUM

PROPOSALS WILL BE RECEIVED UNTIL

****** December 2, 2016 @ 12:00 Noon EST ******

November 22, 2016

Please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum and include with your Proposal.

Company

Authorized Signature

Date

Question/Responses

Listed below are questions just as they were received with the County's responses:

- Question:** Will there be a pre-proposal meeting for this project?
Response: No, there will not be a pre-proposal meeting for this project.
- Question:** What is the budget for this project as a whole?
Response: The current base budget for the project is \$27,340,000.
- Question:** What is the budget for this phase of the project?
Response: A specific budget for this phase of the project has not been established. The budget will be determined through the fee negotiation process with the successful firm and ultimately by the Board of County Commissioners when it awards the contract.
- Question:** Has a proposed construction budget been established?
Response: The percentage of the base budget that overall construction is anticipated to require

has not been estimated as this time.

5. **Question:** From County meeting minutes and public documents, it appears that \$17,340,000 has been established as the target budget for the new joint Children's Museum / SciWorks Museum facility. Please confirm that this target allocation is intended only for the general construction costs of the architectural core, shell and site work and that it is not intended to also include exhibits?

Response: The Capital Project Ordinance adopted by the Board of County Commissioners appropriated funds in the amount of \$17,340,000 for use toward the construction of a New Family Museum. These funds are intended for use toward any project costs required to construct the building which includes site and building design and construction as well as exhibit design and construction. The portion of this funding that will actually go specifically towards general construction costs is undetermined at this time.

6. **Question:** If \$17,340,000 is the target budget for the building, has a separate target budget been established for the exhibition fabrication/installation budget?

Response: As stated above, the \$17,340,000 funds appropriation is intended for use toward any project costs and not necessarily targeted solely to the building. The current base budget, \$27,340,000, is intended to include costs associated with design and fabrication/installation of exhibits. The percentage of the base budget that each of these project elements is anticipated to require has not been estimated as this time.

7. **Question:** Is construction funded?

Response: Construction is not funded in its entirety. However, programs and initiatives are in place to pursue the difference needed for total construction funding.

8. **Question:** Are funds in place to complete this overall project, e.g. architectural / engineering / exhibits planning, design and general construction and the site works / plus exhibition fabrication and installations? Or will it require additional public funding?

Response: The design phase and a portion of the construction phase are funded. Programs and initiatives are in place to pursue additional resources to fund the remainder of the project.

9. **Question:** Since a Construction Manager will be brought onto the team and will be preparing a Schematic Design cost estimate, are you looking for the design team to have an independent cost estimate prepared to compare to the Construction Manager's?

Response: The decision whether or not to have the design team prepare a cost estimate independent of the Construction Manager's schematic design cost estimate has not been made. The merits of doing so can be discussed with the selected firm during scope of work and fee negotiations.

10. **Question:** Does the County or perhaps the newly formed *joint-museum* (as a combined private non-profit organization) expect to issue a separate RFQ for Exhibition Design, Educational and Interpretive Planning or is there already a pre-selected firm or party that will be providing these services to the selected architectural / engineering team?

Response: There will not be a separate RFQ issued for exhibit design services by the County or the Museum. Exhibit design services are to be included in the overall architectural/engineering scope of work. There is not a pre-selected firm or party that will be providing exhibit design services to the selected architectural/engineering team.

11. **Question:** Is the expectation that a simultaneous design process for the exhibits, interpretive planning and educational programming will be undertaken to coordinate with the architectural/engineering design process?

Response: The County prefers to see each firm's approach to coordinating the

architectural/engineering design process with the exhibit, interpretive planning and educational programming design process presented in the Design Approach. In other words, each firm will describe their approach to ensure optimal integration of these two processes to deliver a complete, turn-key facility, including exhibits, that satisfies the goals and objectives of the project within the project schedule and budget.

12. **Question:** Will the Museum be undertaking the development and design of the exhibitions in-house or will a separate RFP be issued for exhibition design services?

Response: No, the Museum will not be undertaking the development and design of the exhibitions in-house. There will not be a separate RFQ issued for exhibition design services. Exhibit design services are to be included in the overall architectural/engineering scope of work.

13. **Question:** Has exhibit programming been done? If not, is it part of this project's scope?

Response: Exhibit programming has not been done. Exhibit programming is to be included in the overall architectural/engineering scope of work.

14. **Question:** Will exhibit fabrication and installation be included in the construction budget?

Will exhibit fabrication be bid through the Construction Manager?

Response: Yes, exhibit fabrication and installation will be included in the overall construction budget. Yes, it is anticipated that exhibit fabrication will be bid through the Construction Manager.

15. **Question:** With regards to "programming and space planning," is that scope of work intended to include the conceptual development of the interpretive program to help ensure optimal integration of program, technical infrastructure, and the architectural environment?

Response: The County prefers to see this item addressed by firms in their Design Approach. In other words, each firm will describe their approach to ensure optimal integration of program, technical infrastructure, and the architectural environment whether it is through conceptual development of the interpretive program or another option.

16. **Question:** Is the architecture firm encouraged or discouraged from including sub-consultants with experience in interpretive planning and exhibit design as part of their team? Is there a preference or a requirement for firms to include an exhibit design firm with the consultant team?

Response: Firms are neither encouraged or discouraged from including interpretive planning and exhibit design sub-consultants/firms as part of their team nor is there a preference or requirement for firms to do so. Rather, the County is looking for firms to submit qualifications for what they believe is the best design team to deliver a complete, turn-key facility, including interpretive planning and exhibit design, that satisfies the goals and objectives of the project. The makeup of any given design team is left to the discretion of each proposing firm to decide.

17. **Question:** Would any specialty sub-consultant on the architect's team be precluded from bidding on future proposals related to the project, such as exhibit design or AV systems integration?

Response: The specialty sub-consultant's involvement on the architect's team would not automatically preclude bidding on future project related proposals. However, this type of circumstance would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure appropriate involvement and interest in the project is maintained.

18. **Question:** If Forsyth County elects to separate Exhibit Design from this first RFQ, and a team decides to still include an Exhibit Designer on their team, will that Exhibit Designer be excluded from pursuing a subsequent RFQ/RFP for Exhibit Design Services?

Response: The exhibit designer would not automatically be excluded from pursuing a subsequent RFQ/RFP for exhibit design services. However, this type of circumstance would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure appropriate involvement and interest in the project is maintained. The County is including exhibit design in the overall architecture package. There will not be a separate RFQ issued for these services.

19. **Question:** What is the timeframe for starting and then completing this phase of the project?

Response: It is anticipated that the successful firm and the County will agree upon a schedule that will have the design phase of the project beginning in the Spring of 2017 and progressing continuously and expeditiously until completion.

20. **Question:** Is there a target schedule for the project? When does the county wish to begin construction?

Response: The overall schedule is estimated to occur over an approximate 3 year period with design anticipated to begin in the Spring of 2017 and construction estimated to begin in the Summer or Fall of 2018 based on available funding.

21. **Question:** Can you tell us how many firms have been invited to the RFQ process? Can you share the list of firms? Can a list of interested firms be provided?

Response: While some firms received a direct mailing notifying them of the RFQ opportunity, the notice was also posted publicly on the City/County Purchasing Department's website and the State of North Carolina's Interactive Purchasing System website. Therefore, there is not a defined number or list of firms invited to the RFQ process. We will share the list of firms that were sent a direct mailing along with those who have requested information on the project since the RFQ was advertised. There is no representation of any firm's level of interest by sharing this information. The listings will be made available on the State of North Carolina's Interactive Purchasing System website, the City/County Purchasing Department's website, and the link below.

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B1T9W2pW_1HOajlkMW5RXzUxZGc?usp=sharing

The link and bid number for the State website:

<https://www.ips.state.nc.us/281-IF17133>

The City/County Purchasing website can be found at the link below. There is a "Bids" icon on this site that will link you to a listing of current opportunities which includes this project.

<http://www.cityofws.org/Departments/Finance/Purchasing>

22. **Question:** How many firms do you anticipate including in your "short list"?

Response: The number of short-listed firms is undetermined. The RFQ process is intended to narrow the list of proposers down to the number of firms for the short list.

23. **Question:** As seeing this project is the merging of the two museums, is there a document that can be shared that describes the history of these two emerging museums?

Response: Yes. Documents are available through the link below and found in the Merger Documents folder.

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B1T9W2pW_1HOajlkMW5RXzUxZGc?usp=sharing

24. **Question:** Is there information available on the business model for the new organization?

Response: No, information on the business model for the new organization is not available.

25. **Question:** Is the business model more of a science center with an early learning component or a children's museum with STEM content? Do you have a target age range?

Response: There is no other museum local to Forsyth County that meets the needs for a science center or a children's museum. Therefore, a successful project must facilitate a well

balanced approach for providing services and programs that meet the needs of a science center and a children's museum under the new organization's structure. The merged entity will combine the best features of both museums; fusing arts, literacy and STEM orientations into an integrated approach to learning. No, there is not a target age range. The target audience is families with children.

26. **Question:** Does the design team need to include design services for incorporating live animals? If so, please describe which animals are to be included.

Response: Yes, design services shall be included for incorporating live animals. Examples of animals for inclusion are: reptiles, small mammals, birds, and fish on the interior and a river otter on the exterior.

27. **Question:** Given the desire for a total of 70,000 square feet, has an Economic Plan or Masterplan/Museum Plan been developed either by the Owner or by a Museum Planner? If so, will that plan be made public?

Response: No, an Economic Plan or Masterplan/Museum Plan has not been developed by the Owner or by a Museum Planner. The 70,000 square feet is an approximation of the museum's gross area and not necessarily intended to be the final building size. Firms will be challenged to utilize their design creativity to optimize use of space in programming and ultimately determining the overall square footage of the facility.

28. **Question:** Is a new at-grade or structured parking deck being considered as part of the project scope? If so, what approximate size?

Response: The County is interested in exploring the feasibility of incorporating parking facilities into the project. It is anticipated that the successful firm will facilitate exploring opportunities to do so and make recommendations to the Owner based upon the firm's findings and conclusions. Details regarding the sizing of parking facilities have not been established.

29. **Question:** Where will parking for visitors be? Is a physical connection to the parking deck to the south anticipated?

Response: Visitor parking is anticipated to be in existing decks, lots, and on street spaces as well as any feasible options identified and incorporated into the project from the exercise above. The Owner will look to the selected design firm to explore ideas for incorporating parking facilities into the project; such as a connection to the parking deck to the south.

30. **Question:** The following question in VI.A.1: "*Describe the percentage workload commitment of assigned staff that the County can expect on these projects*" could be interpreted in two different ways, please clarify which one is correct:

- a) Considering 100% of the staff to be assigned to this specific project, what percentage of that 100% is being carried by each of the assigned staff?
- b) Of the total 100% capacity of each person assigned to the project, what percentage is going to be allocated to this specific project?

Response: Item b is correct. Of the total 100% capacity of each person assigned to the project, what percentage is going to be allocated to this specific project?

31. **Question:** Is any planning for property on the north side of Third Street a part of this project?

Response: No, planning for property on the north side of Third Street is not a part of this project.

32. **Question:** How much community involvement does the County envision during the programming and design processes? Are community input sessions anticipated as part of the designer responsibilities?

Response: The County prefers to see each firm's position and approach to community involvement and its merits specific to this project addressed in their Design Approach. Specific means, methods, and opportunities for obtaining community input will be discussed with the

selected firm during scope of work and fee negotiations.

33. **Question:** Will the new museum have a single Executive Director?

Response: It is anticipated that the new museum will ultimately have a single Executive Director.

34. **Question:** We anticipate that County General Services will have a project representative assigned to the project; will there also be a designated museum representative (on the Owner's behalf) who will participate in the project from initial programming through building occupancy?

Response: Yes, the museum will have representation on the project from beginning to end.

35. **Question:** Should the architect assume that any exhibit elements from the existing facilities will be relocated and integrated into the new museum? If so, to what extent?

Response: Yes, exhibit elements from existing facilities should be considered for integration and relocation to the new museum. The extent to which this is likely to occur is unknown. It is anticipated that the design team will assist in determining the optimum extent that this should occur for the project.

36. **Question:** Does the County have a MWBE participation goal for the design team?

Response: No, there is not a MWBE participation goal for the design phase of the project. However, firms are encouraged to seek participation as they put their design teams together.

37. **Question:** Proposal format, confirm picture pages are outside of 20 pages limit.

Response: Per section VI. Proposal Submission Requirements, front/back covers, Table of Contents, Tab pages, and photographs are excluded from the page total limits.

38. **Question:** The RFQ states the photographs may be included in addition to the 20 page limit to the response. Is it permissible to include, also as additions, descriptions with photographs? Is it permissible to include information on relevant projects other than the six projects required by the RFQ?

Response: It is permissible to include very brief descriptions with photographs. It is not permissible to include information on relevant projects beyond the six projects requested in the RFQ.

39. **Question:** Section VI.A.3 asks for the Design Team's last 3 museum projects. Can this number be exceeded to show the experience of the entire team?

Response: No. Please provide the last three museum projects as requested.

40. **Question:** Section VI.A.4 asks for 3 relevant projects. Can this number be exceeded to show the experience of the entire team?

Response: No. Please provide three relevant projects as requested.

41. **Question:** Who are the members of the Selection Committee?

Response: The Selection Committee membership is not fully confirmed. The Committee membership is expected to include Museum Board of Directors representation, Museum staff, and Forsyth County staff.

42. **Question:** Will the County entertain a master planning process to precede and/or incorporate Programming in order to develop new museum concepts with Project Goals?

Response: The County does not have a preference for this approach over any other. The County is open to considering the merits of master planning as a design approach.

43. **Question:** As a "Proximity to and familiarity with the Forsyth County Area", what is the percent that category counts in the evaluation criteria?

Response: A specific percentage for this evaluation criterion has not been established at this time.

44. **Question:** Is Forsyth County looking for a complex team with a multitude of specialized consultants (museums display consultant, lighting consultant, etc.), or is the County looking for an approach with just the essential consultants involved (structural, mechanical, etc.) for the RFQ?

Response: Forsyth County is looking for firms to assemble what they believe is the best team to deliver a complete, turn-key facility, including interpretive planning and exhibit design, that satisfies the goals and objectives of the project and submit the team's qualifications in response to the RFQ. The makeup of any given design team is left to the discretion of each proposing firm to decide.

45. **Question:** Is there an overt "stylistic preference" for the project? Is Winston-Salem looking for work that is targeted towards historical work? Does it want to gear submissions towards a modernist minimal approach or is the museum looking for something unique?

Response: No, there is not an overt stylistic preference for the project. It is expected that the design team will assist in determining the optimum approach to provide a project that is pleasing to the community and an excellent complement to the downtown district now and well into the future.

46. **Question:** Would you consider an out-of-state architect for this project if we were to partner with an associate local firm?

Response: Yes.

47. **Question:** How likely is the procurement of the adjacent eastern land parcel of .56 acres?

Response: Discussions regarding procurement of the adjacent 0.56 acre parcel have been very favorable to this point. Though it is not guaranteed, there is a high degree of certainty that the parcel will be obtained and incorporated into the project.

48. **Question:** If the 0.56 acre parcel can be obtained, would it be subject to full incorporation into the Children's Museum/SciWorks project program for potential transformation into a science park with outdoor exhibit elements or would some entry / fore court functions for access to the Liberty Plaza office tower still need to be maintained?

Response: It is anticipated that the majority of the 0.56 acre parcel will be incorporated into the project for museum purposes. As the parcel's best use for the museum is developed, consideration must be given to ensuring appropriate accessibility for the adjacent Liberty Plaza building as well as any other impacted neighboring facilities and properties.

49. **Question:** Are other land parcels to the north being considering for potential incorporation into the site design to expand outdoor programming opportunities?

Response: No, parcels to the north are not being considered for incorporation into any aspect of the museum project.

50. **Question:** We understand that some pre-planning and programming studies have been done to address the merger of two existing educational institutions, each with already developed and established programs on two separate and distinct sites. Please advise as to the extent of these studies and to what degree these studies should be considered as fundamentally confirmed in terms of overall project program intent? Will any or all of the preliminary planning / programming studies completed to date be made available to us for consideration while we are putting our response together for the RFQ?

Response: The degree of pre-planning and programming done to this point does not fundamentally confirm the overall project program intent. However, some key elements

desired for incorporation into the programming include a climbing structure, water play area, planetarium and live animals. Planning/programming studies completed to date will not be available for consideration for the RFQ process.

51. **Question:** The RFQ notes that the design teams shall consider the existing former Sheriff's Office building of approximately 40,200 square feet to be potentially saved in whole or in part and incorporated into the overall project design – which is estimated to be a total of approximately 70,000 gross square feet. Will you provide existing conditions drawings of the former sheriff's office building so we can review plan, section and elevation drawings as pdf. or dwg. formatted documents so our team may consider this as we develop our response to the RFQ?

Response: The County's drawings for the existing former Sheriff's Office building are available through the link below. As noted, the 70,000 square feet is an approximation of the museum's gross area and not necessarily intended to be the final building size. Firms will be challenged to utilize their design creativity to optimize use of space in programming and ultimately determining the overall square footage of the facility.

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B1T9W2pW_1HOajlkMW5RXzUxZGc?usp=sharing

52. **Question:** Can an existing site plan and any existing conditions / architectural drawings be transmitted to interested design teams as digital documents as soon as possible? A plan showing the boundaries of the two parcels currently owned by the County, as well as those of the additional 0.56 acre parcel, would be especially helpful.

Response: Use the link given above to access available drawings for the existing former Sheriff's Office building and site. The County does not have plans for the 0.56 acre parcel to make available.

53. **Question:** Can it be arranged for our design team to visit the proposed site at 120 West Third Street, including the interior and roof of the existing Sheriff's office facility prior to the submission deadline? We also would like to visit the two existing museum facilities as well.

Response: Site visits will not be available for the RFQ response process. However, a site visit opportunity will be made available to short-listed firms.

54. **Question:** Please advise the composition and number of key County staff, museum board members and museum staff that you anticipate comprising the Client side design committee? Also, please clarify the organizational structure of the new museum entity to clarify leadership roles of each institution.

Response: These items will be provided to the successful firm as the project design phase gets underway.

55. **Question:** Where will design presentations and work in progress meetings be conducted?

Response: The location for design presentations and work in progress meetings is to be determined.

56. **Question:** The RFQ notes that the contract for professional design services shall be with the "lead-design-firm". In a situation where two firms are collaborating on design, is your intention for the contract to be with the "Architect of Record"?

Response: In a situation where multiple firms are collaborating on design, the firms shall decide who will be the lead design firm for the team and will ultimately execute a contract with the County. It is preferred for the designated lead design firm to be confirmed and clearly specified in each response to the RFQ.

57. **Question:** The RFQ notes that extensive Life Cycle cost analyses, evaluation of alternative energy options, and the achievement of an overall efficient and sustainable design are to be key

goals for the Project so that design teams should provide the appropriate integrated engineering and sustainable design services. Is the intent for the Project to be LEED Certified and if so, at what level?

Response: Incorporating elements of LEED is of interest for the project however, official LEED certification is not a primary objective. The merits of formal LEED certification can be further discussed with the selected firm during scope of work and fee negotiations.

58. **Question:** The RFQ requires 6 hard copies and a digital copy of the proposal. Can the digital copy be sent via email or do you require a stick drive or CD when the 6 hard copies are delivered?

Response: The digital copy can be emailed or provided on a stick drive along with the six hard copies.

59. **Question:** We understand the County's interest in keeping submittals concise and to the point however, in the past, for projects of this complexity, scale and importance that require large consultant teams, the page limit has been expanded to 30 pages with a 2 page Executive Summary. Would you consider doing the same for this RFQ?

Response: No. Please ensure the response conforms to the Proposal Submission Requirements.

60. **Question:** Has an assessment of the existing building been done?

Response: An assessment of the existing building was done in 2012. This study is available through the link below and found in the 6-26-2012 Study folder.

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B1T9W2pW_1HOajlkMW5RXzUxZGc?usp=sharing

61. **Question:** Are resumes included in the page count?

Response: Yes, resumes are included in the page count.

62. **Question:** Are there structural drawings including foundation plans that are available for the existing building?

Response: The County's drawings for the existing former Sheriff's Office building are available through the link below.

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B1T9W2pW_1HOajlkMW5RXzUxZGc?usp=sharing

63. **Question:** Is there a schedule for the selection of the Construction Manager?

Response: A firm schedule for selection of the Construction Manager has not been established at this time.

64. **Question:** What is the County's position related to either closing or leaving open Third Street north of the project site?

Response: The County does not have a formal position on the closure of Third Street or leaving it open. Rather, the County is open to learning the pros and cons of both approach options for the benefit and betterment of the project and the downtown district.

| Architects | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| ADA | Bobby Patterson | bpatterson@ada-nc.com | | Clemmons, NC 27012 | |
| Adwarchitects | Attn: Phillip Steele | psteele@adwarchitects.com | 101 West Worthington Ave. #270 | Charlotte, NC 28203-4699 | 704-379-1919 |
| ArchStudio7 | Attn: Mili Mulic | mili@archstudio7.com | 301 North Main Street, Suite 1201 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | 336-506-6271 |
| Calloway Johnson | Lisa Lambert | lisa.lambert@cjmw.com | | | |
| Calloway Johnson | Susan Perkins | susan.perkins@cjmw.com | 119 Brookstown Ave, Suite 100 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | p 336.724.1503 |
| Calloway Johnson | Marcelo Menza | marcelo.menza@cjmw.com | 119 Brookstown Ave, Suite 100 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | p 336.724.1503 |
| Calloway Johnson | Thomas D. Calloway | tom.calloway@cjmw.com | | | |
| Clark Patterson Architects | | info@clarkpattersonlee.com | Charlotte, NC | | |
| Clark-Nexsen Architecture and Engineering | | thall@clarknexsen.com | Raleigh, NC | | |
| Clearscapes Architecture | | fbelledin@clearscapes.com | Raleigh, NC | | |
| Corley Redfoot Architects AIA | | kredfoot@corleyredfootarchitects.com | Chapel Hill, NC | | |
| Dewberry | Attn: Skip Notte | snotte@dewberry.com | 6135 Lakeview Road, Suite 150 | Charlotte, NC28269-2618 | 704-509-9918 |
| Dishner Moore Architects | | info@dishnermoore.com | Winston-Salem, NC | | |
| Dishner Moore Architects | | craig@dishnermoore.com | Winston-Salem, NC | | |
| Ersoy Brake Appleyard Arch Pa | Bill Brake | BBrake@ebaarchitects.com | 8 W 3rd St Suite 700 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | (336) 725-1361 |
| Ersoy Brake Appleyard Arch Pa | | eba@ebaarchitects.com | | | |
| Fanning Howey Design | Attn: Dawn Wiford | Dwiford@fhai.com | 5001 Weston Parkway, Suite 201 | Cary, NC 27513 | 919-831-1831 ext. 1611 |
| Fuller Architecture | tlette@fhai.com | John@fullerarchitecture.com | 68 Court Square, Suite 200 | Mocksville, NC 27028 | 336-751-0400 |
| HBM Architects | Peter Bolek | pbolek@HBMArchitects.com | 125 Sunnynoll Ct #200 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | (336) 777-3657 |
| Holzman Moss Bottino Architecture | | info@holzmanmoss.com | | | |
| Lambert Architecture | | mcerrito@lambertai.com | Charlotte, NC | | |
| Little Diversified Architectural Consulting | Charles Todd | CTodd@littleonline.com | Charlotte, NC | | |
| LTL Architects | | office@LTLarchitects.com | 315 Spruce St N #299 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | (336) 725-1400 |
| Metropolis Architecture PLLC | | marty@metropolisnc.com | 315 Spruce St N #299 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | |
| Metropolis Architecture PLLC | | anne@metropolisnc.com | | | |
| Morris Berg | S Moore | smoore@morrisberg.com | 35 Motor Rd | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | (336) 744-8100 |
| Norwood Architecture & Design | Staci Manter | staci@norwoodad.com | | | |
| Norwood Architecture & Design | Jimmy Norwood | <jimmy@norwoodad.com> | Lexington, NC | | |
| Peterson-Gordon Architects | | info@petersongordon.com | Raleigh, NC | | |
| Peterson-Gordon Architects | Peterson Gordon | pgarch@triad.twcbc.com | | | |
| Ratio Architects | | JSIsak@ratioarchitects.com | 135 East Martin St. Suite 101 | Raleigh, NC | 919-821-0805 |
| Ratio Architects, Inc | Dia Holman | dholman@ratiodesign.com | | | |
| Ratio Architects, Inc | Sisak, Jennifer | JSIsak@ratioarchitects.com | 217 west sixth street | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | |
| Steele Group Architects | Matthew Rodda | | | | 336.734.2003 office |
| Steele Group Architects | Bill Steele | Bill Steele <bill.steele@steelegrp.com> | Gastonia, NC | | |
| Stewart-Cooper-Newell Architects | | info@scn-architects.com | Gastonia, NC | | |
| Stewart-Cooper-Newell Architects | Marty Cotton | MCotton@scn-architects.com | | | |
| Stich | | adam.sebastian@stitchdd.com | 601 Trade St NW # 200 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | (336) 723-1067 |
| Stimmel Associates PA | | tjennings@stimmelpa.com | | | |
| Stimmel Associates PA | Kimberly Barb | kbarb@stimmelpa.com | 842 West 4th Street | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | c: 336-406-3551 |
| Teague, Freyaldenhoven & Freyaldenhoven Arch | Attn: Steve Freyaldenhov | sfrey@ffarchitects.com | 300 North Green Street, Suite 285 | Greensboro, NC 27401 | 336-273-0101 |
| The Freelon Group/Architects | | lmeyers@freelon.com | Winston-Salem, NC | | |
| Thomas H. Hughes Architecture | | thughes@thharch.com | 720 Coliseum Dr NW #112 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | (336) 722-4447 |
| Thomas H. Hughes Architecture, P.C. | | thughes@thharch.com | Raleigh, NC | | |
| Vines Architecture | Rob Thomas | rthomas@vinesarc.com | Raleigh, NC | | |
| Vines Architecture | Jeff Schroeder | jschroeder@vinesarc.com | 530 North Trade Street, Suite 301 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | Phone: 336.725.1371 |
| Walter Robbs Callahan & Pierce Architects, PA | Rence Callahan | rencerc@walterrobbs.com | | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | t: 336.725.1371 |
| Walter Robbs Callahan & Pierce Architects, PA | Katie Pepper | katiep@walterrobbs.com | 5455 Bethania Rd | Winston-Salem, NC 27101 | (336) 923-2377 |
| West & Stem Architects | Michael West | m.west@westandstem.com | Winston-Salem, NC | | |

| Requested RFQ | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| HH Architecture | Lauren Stanton | lstanton@hh-arch.com | 520 S. Harrington Street | Raleigh, North Carolina 27601 | 919 828-2301 tel |
| Hands On! Studio | Greg Belew | greg@hostudio.net | | Saint Petersburg, Florida, USA | Office: 727 824-8988 |
| G Y R O S C O P E I N C | Tasha Leverette | tasha@gyroscopeinc.com | 283 Fourth Street, Suite 201 | Oakland, CA 94607 | tele: 510.986.0111 |
| Stroud Pence Structural Engineers | Kim C. Edens | kedens@stroudpence.com | 4904 Professional Ct., Ste 200 | Raleigh, NC 27609 | 919/782-1833 |
| Pei Cobb Freed & Partners | Marc Diamond | mdiamond@pcf-p.com | 88 Pine Street | New York, NY 10005 | 212-872-4000 |
| A-N-X Architects | Darrell Neubert | darrell@a-n-x.com | | | |
| Nomad Studio | Juliet Cutler | juliet.cutler@nomad-studio.net | | | +1 770.238.2665 |
| MUSEUM ARCHITECTS | VernerJohnson | louis@vernerjohnson.com | 45 School Street | Boston, MA 02108 | 617-437-6262 |
| Baumgartner+Uriu | Scott Uriu | scottu@bplusa.com | 834 S. Broadway, Suite 502 | Los Angeles, CA 90014 | P: 213-623 2347 |
| Perkins+Will | Michael Rantilla | michael.rantilla@perkinswill.com | PO Box 14747 | Research Triangle Park, NC 277 | t 919.433.5305 m 919.26 |
| STEVEN HOLL ARCHITECTS | Molly Blieden | molly@stevenholl.com | 450 West 31st Street, 11th floor | New York, NY 10001, USA | t +1 212 629 7262 x14 |
| DUDAPAINÉ ARCHITECTS | Lynn E. Dunn | LDunn@dudapaine.com | | | 919.314.6724 D |
| CLUCKsign | Brad Allen | brad@cluckdesign.com | 1523 Elizabeth Ave Suite 120 | Charlotte, NC 28204 | 505-250-8563 cell |
| BKSK ARCHITECTS LLP | Laura Holwegner | lholwegner@bkskarch.com | 28 W. 25th Street, 4th Fl | New York, NY 10010 | T: 212.807.9600 x3220 |