

ADDENDUM NO. 6

(Issued July 3, 2024)

Request for Qualifications and Proposals

For Facilities Master Planning Services including Strategic Facilities Optimization

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.

Question #1:

<name of firm hidden> is considering teaming as a subconsultant to respond to the RFQ/P for Facilities Master Planning Services (FMP). We are wondering: if we were to work on this project, are we allowed to work on built projects that come from this planning work?

District Response #1:

The firm selected for the OUSD Facilities Master Plan will not be precluded from performing architectural or other professional services for future OUSD facility projects. For all future facility projects, firms will be selected through an RFQ/P process for each project and applicable services, based on OUSD Board policies and procedures. This response is also posted as [Addendum #5](#) on the OUSD Facilities RFP webpage.

Question #2

It seems the last sentence in the response to Question #16 is unfinished. "This will be part of the ..." What did it intend to say?

District Response #2:

The sentence was intended to state: This will be part of the District's Climate Action and Sustainability Board Policy work.

Question #3

Regarding : " ... the status of the PPAs for solar and the batteries listed on the "Energy Efficiency, Resiliency, and Sustainability Improvements" slides 35-38;... The district has completed seven sites as part of the Solar installation and intends to complete the remaining that are underway. All the pertinent information will be made available as part of the FMP visioning sessions (Part A.2)." Can you tell us if the seven completed sites and/or remaining PPA sites will have been grandfathered into NEM v. 2.0 or are subject to NEM v3.0?

District Response #3:

All sites that are completed are NEM v 2.0. The upcoming sites were approved for NEM v 2.0 and are under construction.

Question #4

Regarding Addendum #5:

"Question #7: And again, if an Alameda County SLEB-certified Prime (or subconsultant) fully meets the "Local.." OUSD requirements, do they still need to submit 3 years of tax returns to OUSD, etc.? –does that certification alone qualify for contributing to the 25% min. now required?

District Response #7: They are considered separate submittals. 360 Total Concept will only review the Local Business Participation Worksheet and verify the Alameda County certification as being valid. "

What is meant by: "They are considered separate submittals."? For example, Do you mean that a certified Alameda County SLEB, if providing at least 25% of the services, would qualify the team for an extra 5 points in selection process scoring; BUT, IF selected, would ALSO later have to provide OUSD with 3 years of first page/tax return documents per your internal OUSD Local business policy? OR not?



District Response #4:

Only the Local Business Participation Worksheet shall be submitted with the proposal. The certifications listed on the worksheet shall be subject to verification by the District’s LBU Compliance Consultant. Alameda County uses the United States Small Business Administration (SBA) revenue standards for small business designations. OUSD will only accept the City of Oakland revenue standards for small business classifications.

Question #5

How will you rank/score professional expertise and firm/team experience qualifications versus the fee proposals? Will lowest bidder likely be selected over more experienced or well qualified teams with commensurately higher fees?

District Response #5:

Selection will be based on the firm providing the District with the “best value.” The scoring rubric will be as follows:

CRITERIA	SCORING
Firm Information (Section 2.3 of RFQ/P)	45 Points (max)
Litigation History (Section 2.4 of RFQ/P)	5 Points (max)
Professional Fees (Section 2.5 of RFQ/P)	35 Points (max)
Additional Data (Section 2.6 of RFQ/P)	10 Points (max)
Local Business Utilization Preference Points (Section 3 of RFQ/P)	5 Points (max)

Question #6

Would OUSD accept a submission for strategic energy and equitable districtwide decarbonization planning services towards meeting the Climate Emergency Action Resolution to serve as advisory to the district in all 3 of its major planning efforts, including equity and strategic funding/finance planning as a supplement to Facilities Master Planning Services?

District Response #6:

The District is currently seeking a proposal for the Facilities Master Plan. Any specific services that may be required in the future will be addressed through additional procurement processes. However, if strategic energy and equitable districtwide decarbonization planning services inform the Facilities Master Plan, the district is open to considering it. This information can be included as Additional Data (Section 2.6 of the RFQ/P).

Question #7

The last FMP is not very specific about classroom square footage adequacy (i.e. >600 S.F.) Does the district have any more accurate inventory of classroom sizes, perhaps with square footages from past master plans or facilities conditions reports that the team can rely upon?

District Response #7:

The room area in square feet is provided in the far right column in the FMP’s room inventory for each site.

Question #8

Does the District have M&O/B&G records of each sites’ mechanical equipment specifications that the team can use, such as name plates, with make/models, dates, etc. and/or end of useful life estimates from last facilities evaluations?

District Response #8:

The District has gathered several data points to inform mechanical systems, including boilers, chillers, air handlers, and HVAC systems. However, the Visioning session will determine the need for any additional data points.

Question #9

RFQ/P page 7 identifies the Facility Needs Assessment as a deliverable. It includes an FCI for major buildings at each site and should address the buildings' seismic safety. We understand that to include site visits, review of available drawings and past reports, and applying engineering expertise and judgment to determine if major buildings' structural seismic safety appears acceptable, improvements needed and/or may require further investigation. It also requires consideration of other alterations that may be planned and determining if they have any seismic safety impact. We understand the goal is to develop a Districtwide index of seismically vulnerable buildings and potential upgrades which can be ROM priced and to determine next steps. However, we interpret the scope in the RFQ/P for FMP to NOT include performing a detailed ASCE-41 seismic evaluation of each major building but rather high level indexing the buildings for further action and consideration in the master planning. Typically, the detailed seismic evaluations would come at a later time. Is our interpretation of the seismic safety scope correct? If not, please clarify what is required for seismic evaluation(s) at this master planning phase.

District Response #9:

For the FMP scope, performing a detailed ASCE-41 seismic evaluation would not be required. Therefore, your assumption is correct on the level of seismic evaluation required for the FMP.

Question #9

The RFP states that all proposers must identify master planning services for K-12 educational facilities provided by firm in the past five (5) years. Due to the impacts from COVID, is it possible to get this timeframe extended to 10 years?

District Response #9:

We understand the impacts of COVID and will accept master planning services provided by the firm in the past ten (10) years.

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