

ADDENDUM NO. 3
(Issued February 29, 2024)
Request for Qualifications and Proposals
for
Oakland Living Schoolyards Planning Project
and
Oakland Living Schoolyards Implementation Project

The following changes, additions, modifications and corrections hereinafter set forth shall apply to the proposal documents for the project and shall be made a part thereof and subject to all the requirements thereof, as if originally specified and/or shown;

District Note #1: Questions and District responses apply to both RFQ/Ps unless otherwise noted.

Question #1 (re: Implementation Projects):

Has the *Attachment A* been provided? I do not see it in the RFQP, but it is a referenced document within the RFQP.

District Response #1:

Attachments A thru D are provided in Addendum #2.

Question #2 (re: Implementation Projects):

For Section I, do we need to list Current and Contracted Projects for our entire team, including sub-consultants?

District Response #2

Proposing firms has the option of listing projects by sub-consultants. In which case, the projects should identify which ones were performed by the prime consultant and which projects by the sub-consultant.

Question #3 (re: Implementation Projects):

For the outlined Project Schedule, based on our experience we do not think the schedule is achievable. Is there any flexibility in the Project Schedule?

District Response #3

While there may be opportunities to make minor adjustments to the schedule as we move forward, at this time, the District is contractually bound by the term limits of each grant. The target build date of summer 2025 for the implementation grant is planned with the intention of minimizing disruption to the school's operation.

Question #4 (re: Planning Projects):

If we need to provide the 5 Good Faith Effort (and Fingerprinting forms) in Section F, will they be counted against the 15 page limit? That leaves 9-10 pages for our quals, which is very tight. Can we move them to the appendix so they aren't counted? Please advise.

District Response #4:

Yes. The Good Faith Effort forms may be placed in the Appendix. Executed Fingerprinting Notice and Acknowledgement Form may also be in the Appendix.

Question #5a (re: Implementation Projects):

Since the estimated construction budget for the living schoolyards project at each school is \$1.5 million, we assume that this will require that the entire school be included in the accessibility review. Do you anticipate that either Manzanita Elementary School or Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School will require upgrades outside of the living schoolyard area to bring them into compliance with current code? Do you know if either Manzanita Elementary School or Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School have recently had projects that have been through DSA review and included evaluation of the full school? If improvements are identified during the accessibility review, do you know if there will be additional funding available for these upgrades?

District Response #5a:

Both implementation projects will require DSA review and approval. Therefore, accessibility requirements based on the 2022 California Building Code and DSA access compliance criteria. See 2022 CDC Chapter 11B Section 11B-202.4 and DSA Valuation Threshold Update for 2024. Work required for accessibility required for project approvals shall be included in the project budget.

Question #5b (re: Implementation Projects):

Are there any grant requirements for number or type of community meetings? In the proposed schedule the community outreach is anticipated for June 2024. Do both schools have active summer programs, and do you know if the parent associations meet over the summer?

District Response #5b:

Grant requirements do not dictate the number of or type of community meetings. Community engagement will be initiated during the school year and this Addendum is revising the community engagement schedule so as to occur May 2024 – July 2024.

Question #5c (re: Implementation Projects):

Will either site include shade sails or structures?

District Response #5c:

Shade sails and/or structures are among the potential design features which may be included in the scope, subject to review and approval by OUSD.

Question #5d (re: Implementation Projects):

Can you confirm that the construction contract will be awarded ahead of final DSA approval?

District Response #5d:

The construction contract will not be awarded ahead of final DSA approval.

Question #5e (re: Implementation Projects):

Do you anticipate that a new water meter will be needed for irrigation at either school?

District Response #5e:

No, a new water meter is not anticipated due to the new irrigation work.

Question #6a (re: Planning Projects):

Can you clarify what level of design is needed for all projects? On the call, it was noted that 100% construction drawings were anticipated. If 100% plans are needed, we assume the team should include civil and structural plans. Please confirm that these plans will be needed.

District Response #6a:

As a clarification, the District considers the scope for the Planning Projects to only include the Project



Assessment and Conceptual Design Phase (Section 5.3.1 of the District's Standard Agreement).

Question #6b (re: Planning Projects):

Should the scope include accessibility review for the full school to determine potential improvements needed ahead of submitting to DSA in a future phase?

District Response #6b:

A preliminary assessment by the design team shall be performed. Pre-application meeting(s) with DSA shall be considered part of Basic Services (per Section 5.3.1.5 of the District's Standard Agreement).

Question #7a (re: Implementation Projects):

Please provide Attachments A, B, C, and D.

District Response #7a:

See District Response #1.

Question #7b (re: Implementation Projects):

Is DSA review/approval not included in the project?

District Response #7b:

DSA review and approval is required for the Implementation Project as noted in the RFQ/P's Project Objectives and Scope of Work.

Question #8a:

Please confirm the district will provide surveys for all 14 sites of the planning RFQP, and the 2 sites for the implementation RFQP.

District Response #8a:

The District will not be providing new site surveys for the Planning Projects. Surveys from the District's Archives will be provided if available. Per Section 5.2.3 of the District's Standard Agreement, the Consultant shall procure certified surveys for the Implementation Projects. Section 5.2.3 shall be amended to indicate that the costs of the certified surveys shall be borne by the Consultant.

Question #8b:

Please clarify for the implementation project if the consultant is to supervise and manage the contractor directly as the school's CM/representative. The language seems to imply this. (5.7.2, 5.7.3, 5.7.6, 5.7.8)

District Response #8b:

The Consultant will not supervise nor manage the Contractor. The Consultant will not be the District's representative as the Construction Manager. The District will provide a Construction Manager for the Project. Consultant will perform construction administration duties in accordance with Section 5.7 of the District's Standard Agreement. The Consultant's stated duties of observation and interpretation do not imply supervision or management of the Contractor.

Question #8c:

What level of Geotechnical analysis will be required for the 14 sites of the planning RFQP? Do you anticipate any retaining walls or shade structures being constructed?

District Response #8c:

Geotechnical and Geohazard analyses will not be required for the 14 Planning Projects.

Retaining walls and shade structures are among the potential design features which may be included in scope, subject to review and approval by OUSD. Per Section 5.2.4 of the District’s Standard Agreement, the Consultant shall procure geotechnical and geohazard analyses for the Implementation Projects. Section 5.2.3 shall be amended to indicate that the costs of the geotechnical and geohazard analyses shall be borne by the Consultant.

Question #8d:

The link to the Q&A you noted in the RFP brings up a “404-Page Not Found”. Can you let us know where we should check for the Q&A?

District Response #8d:

District Responses to written question are provided as Addenda at the following link:
<https://www.ousd.org/facilities-planning-management-department/opportunities/contract-opportunities/requests-for-proposals>

Question #8e:

The agreement form states any suggested changes be “submitted at least three weeks ahead of the proposal deadline to allow the District time to consider the suggestion and, if a revision is made, issue an addendum to all proposing entities.” The RFP was released Feb 7, but did not release the Addendum #2 with the Agreement until Feb 9. The pre-proposal meeting was Feb 14. This is due Feb 29, so submitting changes 3 weeks in advance is not possible. Is there any flexibility on this?

District Response #8e:

Given the timeline, the Consultant may submit suggested changes in the proposal which the District will forward to its legal counsel for consideration.

Question #8f:

Will any geotechnical or geohazard reports that you have on file be made available?

District Response #8f:

In general, the District does not maintain current geotechnical/geohazard reports for all school sites.

Question #8g:

Do you anticipate any of the sites needing updated geohazard reports?

District Response #8g:

See District Response #8c.

Question #8h:

What types of structures will trigger DSA review?

District Response #8h:

Per 2022 CBC Section 11B-202, additions and alterations to existing building and facilities shall require DSA review and approval which includes but not limited to accessible path of travel requirements.

Question #9a (re: Implementation Projects):

Project Objectives includes soils testing. Is soils testing intended to provide structural analysis, horticultural

analysis or both?

District Response #9a:

In situ testing for pollutants, contaminants and waste characterization will be required. Per Section 5.2.4 of the District's Standard Agreement, the Consultant shall procure an Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Consultant for soil characterization services. Section 5.2.3 shall be amended to indicate that the costs of the ESA Consultant shall be borne by the Consultant.

See District Response #8c for geotechnical and geohazard services.

Question #9b (re: Implementation Projects):

Are overhead structures a consideration for outdoor classroom spaces?

District Response #9b:

Confirmed, overhead structures are among the potential design features which may be included in the scope, subject to review and approval by OUSD.

Question #9c (re: Implementation Projects):

It's typically important to maintain equity and consistency across campuses. As such, will a single team be selected for all project sites?

District Response #9c:

At this time, the District intends to award the two implementation projects to one firm. A final decision will be made once proposals have been submitted and evaluated.

Question #9d (re: Implementation Projects):

Will topographic survey files be provided for each project site or should the team include scope for topographic surveys?

District Response #9d:

See District Response #8a.

Question #10 (Implementation Projects):

Please explain "administrative close out." Does this mean construction administration is not included in the scope of work?

District Response #10:

The term "administrative close out" is not used in the RFQ/P nor in the District's Standard Agreement Specimen. Basic Services shall include project closeout activities delineated in Section 5.7 (Construction Phase) of the District's Standard Agreement which shall include but not limited to complying with the applicable requirements of the DSA Construction Oversight Process.

Question #11 (Implementation Projects):

Are the attachments (Attachments A, B, C, and D) included in the page count?

District Response #11:

Attachments may be placed in an Appendix which would not be counted against the page limit.

Question #12:

Can you provide some clarity around the history of public projects that need to be listed under Part D? Are we supposed to list "start and finish dates, project cost, contractor, owner, and owner contact information" only for projects within the last 3 years, or extended to all projects in the last 5 years?

District Response #12:

Project information shall be provided for "similar" public works projects performed over the last 5 years and "every" public works projects performed over the last 3 years.

Question #13:

For the "Oakland Living Schoolyard Planning Project at 14 District School Sites" does the "Scope of Work [being] limited to the planning phase for the 14 school sites" equate to the 5.3.1 Project Assessment and Conceptual Design Phase in the Agreement for Professional Design and Management Services?

District Response #13:

Yes. The District considers the scope for the Planning Projects to only include the Project Assessment and Conceptual Design Phase (Section 5.3.1 of the District's Standard Agreement).

Question #14:

Is there a scoring matrix for the proposals that can be shared?

District Response #14:

A scoring matrix for the proposals has not been finalized. In the past, the District had generally placed significant emphasis on firm experience, team composition, and proposal compensation.

Question #15:

Will you give any preference to selecting teams that submit for both RFQPs?

District Response #15:

No. Proposals for both RFQ/Ps will be evaluated separately.

Question #16:

Will the inclusion—or lack thereof—of a DVBE on the team be part of the selection process?

District Response #16:

The DVBE requirement is mandated for projects that are state funded. Evaluation will be based on a pass/fail score.

Question #17:

Can you further explain the expectation to work with the teachers and school administrators to design the schoolyards? Is there an expected format or quantity of meetings?

District Response #17:

See District Response #18. The District has no set format for presentations to school sites and the community. The proposal therefore should include examples of past projects and a narrative of how the firm conducted those meetings.

Question #18:

Will OUSD assign a district project coordinator or coordinating team for these contracts? What will their responsibilities be?

District Response #18:

OUSD will have Project Manager(s) and Construction Manager(s) assigned for all project sites. They will coordinate the efforts of the consultant(s) and contractor, and serve as the project liaison with the school site and the community.

Question #19:

Are renovations or new construction of the school buildings connected to objectives with Living Schoolyards projects?

District Response #19:

Planned and future renovations and/or new construction at the school sites are not a consideration at this time and assumed to have no impact on the Living Schoolyard Projects.

Question #20:

Will site surveys be provided for each of the sites, or is the consultant team expected to obtain these as part of their services?

District Response #20:

See District Response #8a.

Question #21:

How is stormwater expected to be addressed?

District Response #21:

For the Implementation Projects, the District will be retaining a SWPPP Consultant.

Question #22:

Do we need to include a CASP (Certified Access Specialist) as part of the team, or will this be provided by the district?

District Response #22:

A CASP team member is not required to be part of the project team nor will one be retained by the District. The District's expectation is the project team will have sufficient experience and knowledge to meet the requirements of DSA Accessibility Plan Check Division to secure project approval.

Question #23:

For the Past Performance Record (E), do you want us to list past or current litigation? Or both?

District Response #23:

Both.

Question #24:

Are the Cover page and the Table of Contents page included in the 15-page limit for Section A-F?

District Response #24:

No. The Cover page and Table of Contents will not be counted against the 15-page limit.

Question #25a (re: DVBE Certification and Worksheet):

If we check "D" on PART II ("Your Enterprise is unable to meet the required participation goals"), does "will complete a Good Faith Effort to obtain DVBE participation and will include the Prime Consultant's Good Faith

Effort Worksheet” mean that the worksheet must be completed at the time of application, or at some point in the future?

District Response #25a:

Per Method of Compliance instructions on page 1 of the DVBE participation form, DVBE participation or good faith effort documentation is required as part of the submitted proposal.

Question #25b (re: DVBE Certification and Worksheet):

Under PART II – ADVERTISEMENTS of the Good Faith Effort Worksheet, does “(1) in a paper that focuses on DVBE and one (1) in a trade paper” mean only a printed paper, or will an online paper suffice?

District Response #25b:

The District will only accept publications in a printed trade paper.

Question #25c (re: DVBE Certification and Worksheet):

Also Under PART II – ADVERTISEMENTS of the Good Faith Effort Worksheet, is their guidance on what is considered a reasonable time for response: “if you cannot advertise 14 days prior, advertise as soon as possible and provide an explanation. (Advertisements must be published in time to allow for a reasonable response).”

District Response #25c:

Confirmed. The referenced advertisement requirements language is correct as stated.

Question #26:

What type of soil testing is required for these projects? Is it a comprehensive testing, or more specific types of testing for a chemicals, organic compounds, pollutants, etc.

District Response #26:

In situ testing for pollutants, contaminants and waste characterization will be required. Also, see District Response #9a.

Question #27:

Due to the tight schedule how many firms could potentially be hired to execute the projects?

District Response #27:

See District Response #9c for the Implementation Projects. The District may elect to retain more than one firm for the Planning Projects depending on the evaluations of the proposals received.

Question #28:

Hard costs are noted as \$1.5 million per campus. Can this be viewed as 1.5 x 14 campuses and have an overall budget of 21M? Will some campuses have a larger budgets and others smaller budgets based on campus size? Also, there are 14 campuses listed with two schools on two of the campuses. For these two campuses, will the whole campus be treated as one project or will there be two projects, one for each school?

District Response #28:

At this stage of the planning process, the \$1.5 million cost per school site should be considered a ROM estimate. Specific conditions and approved scopes will dictate the final budget for each campus. Each campus on the list of 14 shall be treated as one project.

Question #29:

For the Planning Project of 14 School Sites, the Scope of Work is listed as being limited to the “planning phase”. Does that include Assessment and Concept Design through Schematic Design only or all the way through Design Development and Contract Documents Phases as well? The work load is considerably different depending on the answer.

District Response #29:

See District Response #13.

Question #30:

For the Planning Project of 14 School Sites, should we list a fee for each site or a single fee on a per site basis that can then be duplicated based upon how many sites we are awarded?

District Response #30:

Provide a single not-to-exceed fee with the request breakdown (i.e., proposed fee plus 10% contingency)

Question #31:

Does a cost estimator need to be part of the team?

District Response #31:

Section 5.3.1.10 of the District’s Standard Agreement requires the preparation of cost estimate as part of the Basic Scope.

Question #32:

How many resumes per firm?

District Response #32:

Consultant shall submit resumes of key team members, the number of which would vary from firm to firm.

Question #33:

Is the project subject to DVBE requirements or not? Question 5.F.5 is unclear about this.

District Response #33:

See District Response #16.

Question #34:

Do you really want to know who our legal counsel is as requested in 5.C.4 or just if we have been involved in any litigation, arbitration, or mediation as requested in question 5.E.5?

District Response #34:

Both.

Question #35:

Do you really want a list of every single public works project from the last 3 years and all of the start/finish dates, projects costs, contractors, owners, and owner contact information as requested in 5.D or just for “five educational client references” as requested in 5.G?

District Response #35:

See District Response #12.

Question #36:

For the Fingerprinting Notice and Acknowledgement Form, when would we “interact with pupils outside of



Department of Facilities Planning and Management

the immediate supervision and control of the pupil's parent or guardian or a school employee"? Is fingerprinting necessary for this contract?

District Response #36:

This is to cover situations where the Consultant would be on site unaccompanied by District staff.

Question #37:

For the Fingerprinting Notice and Acknowledgement Form, should we only fill out the form on page 43 of the 53 pages of Addendum 2 or do we also need to submit the Attachment B Form for Certification of Lack of Felony Convictions?

District Response #37:

The Fingerprinting Notice and Acknowledgement Form including Attachments A and B shall be completed and submitted.

RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM (AS WELL AS PREVIOUSLY ISSUED ADDENDA) MUST BE ACKNOWLEDGED IN THE PROPOSAL