

ADDENDUM NO. 5
(Issued March 4, 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:

The references needed are only for the prime and the landscape architect, if the LA is not priming? Or do you want them for the full team with all subconsultants?

District Response #1:

References are only needed for the Landscape Architect and the Prime (if the Landscape Architect is not the Prime).

Question #2:

Following up on Question 5a from the first round of questions – will any previous projects that included accessibility review of the entire school or any recent projects be made available to the successful bidding team to continue evaluation of what accessibility upgrades will be required upon DSA review? The successful bidder will need any and all sets of drawings available for each site.

District Response #2:

Yes. The District will provide to the selected team(s), if available, digital copies of any previous projects from the District's archive.

Question #3:

We are assuming that architect, landscape architect, geotechnical and environmental engineer, civil engineer/surveying, structural engineer, and cost estimator are needed for the implementation project. Please advise if any other consultants are needed.

District Response #3:

Consultants mentioned in the above question shall be included in the proposal. Consultants required after the proposals have been submitted shall be considered additional services.

Question #4:

We are assuming that landscape architect, civil engineer/surveying, and cost estimator are needed for the planning project. Please advise if any other consultants are needed.

District Response #4:

See District Response #3.

Question #5:

Can you confirm if soil testing and geotechnical reports will be procured by the consultant for implementation projects? The Q&A #9a implies so but the RFQ-Ps says, “**Procurement by District** of Soil Testing/Underground Utility Locating/Geotechnical Reports: April 2024 - May 2024”.

District Response #5:

Yes. District Response #9a in Addendum #3 was to amend the requirements in the RFQ/P. The District intent is for the Consultant to procure and bear the costs of those services for the Implementation Projects.

Question #6:

While the previous Q&A #8c says “Geotechnical and Geohazard analyses will not be required for the 14 Planning Projects.”, the RFQ-P for planning project under Project Objective says “conduct soil testing, underground utility locating, and complete a geotechnical report”. Should that be corrected or will the District conduct it?

District Response #6:

District Response #8c in Addendum #3 was to amend the Geotechnical/Geohazard requirement in the RFQ/P. The District intent is to have the services procured and bear the costs at the implementation phase.

Question #7:

According to Q&A #9a “the Consultant shall procure an Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Consultant for soil characterization services.” Please explain soil characterization services.

District Response #7:

See District Response #9a and #26. The intent is to identify conditions that would require remediation prior to commencing the Implementation Projects.

Question #8:

According to Q&A #9a and Section 5.2.4, can you summarize what an ESA shall include? We need to know the scope if we shall include an ESA consultant.

District Response #8:

Current conditions are unknown at this time. See District Response #7 for project intent.

Question #9:

Can you summarize who is responsible for the services and costs under Section 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 for implementation projects and planning projects?

District Response #9:

District Responses #8a and #8c in Addendum #3 were to amend the District’s Standard Agreement Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 due to the funding conditions imposed on the District by the Cal Fire Grant Program.

Question #10:

Can you briefly describe the geohazard service?

District Response #10:

Geohazard analyses are typically required to address placement of new structures. The Consultant may indicate this scope as currently unknown in the proposal and noted as a scope of work exclusion.

Question #11 (re: Implementation Projects):

I read in the Addendum #3 that the Consultant is meant to include geotechnical analysis as well as environmental soils testing on their team. The RFQP states on page 3 that the District will procure Soil Testing/Underground Utility Locating/Geotechnical Reports. Can you please confirm that we need to include these services?

District Response #11:

See District Response #9.

Question #12 (re: Implementation Projects):

If we need to include environmental soils testing, as Response to Question #9a in Addendum #3 indicates, to what level of testing is this? Addendum #3 District Response quotes Agreement section 5.2.4 that the Consultant shall procure Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), which I do not see in the Agreement. I see “If required by District, Consultant shall procure chemical, mechanical or other tests required for proper design, tests for hazardous materials and borings or test pits necessary for determining subsoil conditions. The cost of any such tests shall be borne by the District...” If we need to include soils testing for things like trace toxic metals to organic contaminants, including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), microplastics, nanoparticles, per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), petroleum hydrocarbons, and a wide variety of pesticides and herbicides, the cost would be in the range of \$100K. Please clarify what will be needed in this type of soils testing so that we can appropriately include in our proposal if needed.

District Response #12:

See District Response #9.

Question #13 (re: Implementation Projects):

For DVBE, we cannot simply state we have 0% of our basic services performed by DVBE and not include the Good Faith Effort documentation?

District Response #13:

As a project funded by the State of California’s Cal Fire Grant Program, submittal of DVBE documentation is required.

Question #14 (re: Planning Projects):

RE: 6b The question was posed refers to “full school”. Is the response intended to suggest building interiors are to be included, or only exterior spaces but including entrances/exits?

District Response #14:

See District Response #8h in Addendum #3 which references the 2022 California Building Code. Specifically, see 2022 CBC Section of 11B-202.4 which delineates the requirements for accessibility.

Question #15 (re: Planning Projects):

RE: 9a The planning RFP asks for soils testing as well. Please clarify if soils testing for pollutants, contaminant and waste characterization is required, in addition to the ESA. Or is this just for Implementation and none, or only one of these is required for planning.

District Response #15:

See District Response #8c in Addendum #3. See District Response #9 above.

Question #16 (re: Planning Projects):

Is a full ESA actually required for planning, or just someone who is knowledgeable about the ESA requirements/process?

District Response #16:

For the Planning Projects, Environmental Site Assessments (“ESA”) will not be required. The District intent is to have the services procured and bear the costs at the implementation phase.

Question #17 (re: Planning Projects):



Department of Facilities Planning and Management

Please confirm that Ralph J Bunche Continuation High and United for Success Academy Middle School are not included in the 14 school sites. We have site plans for these as part of the RFP package.

District Response #17:

Ralph J Bunche Continuation High and United for Success Academy Middle School are included in the 14 school sites. Due to program relocations and multiple programs on one site, school names have changed. The Ralph J. Bunche Continuation High Program was relocated from its original location to West Oakland Middle School. Unified for Success Academy shares the site with LIFE Academy.

Question #18 (re: Planning Projects):

The project lists for Section D (similar public projects in the last 5 and 3 years) will take up at least 2 pages to include all the project data. Can this list can go in the Appendix? Or can go on an 11x17 page?

District Response #18:

The project lists can be located in the Appendix and noted for its location in the body of the proposal (i.e., note as "see Appendix").

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