



ALUM ROCK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

2930 Gay Avenue, San José, CA 95127 · Phone: 408-928-6800 · Fax: 408-928-6416 · www.arusd.org

ADDENDUM NO. 2 TO RFQ NO. 2425-Bonds03

PROJECT NO. 1 WORKFORCE HOUSING

1. Below are responses to questions presented in reference to the above RFQ.

Q & A

Q: Please confirm if projects that are over 50% complete are eligible to be included in the project reference section.

A: No. Exhibit A-1 asks for completed projects.

Q: Specifications refer to California's Build It Green Program, are there any additional sustainability goals, such as LEED anticipated for this project?

A: Specific sustainability goals will be included in the RFP. They must meet minimum sustainability standards.

Q: Could you clarify the expected contribution for the Certificate of Participation (COP)?

A: There are no Certificates of Participation assigned to this project. The intent is for the project to be financed with general obligation bonds.

Q: Given that Alum Rock is invoking state laws SB35, AB2295, have there been conversations with City of San Jose about the project with respect to those conditions?

A: Yes. A preliminary project review is in process. Additional information will be provided in the RFP.

Q: Please confirm the project is categorically exempt from CEQA?

A: The intent is to pursue SB 35, where the project would not have to go through the standard CEQA process. Additional information will be provided in the RFP.

Q: Have there been any discussions with the city regarding public right-of-way, infrastructure, or connections to city systems?

A: Yes. Refer to Alum Rock Union School District Housing Feasibility Memorandum by BKF. Additional information will be provided in the RFP.

German Cerda, Superintendent

Board of Trustees: Linda Chavez, President, Andrés Quintero, Vice-President
Minh Pham, Clerk · Corina Herrera-Loera, Member · Minh Nguyen, Member

Q: Will this project require ADA review from the Division of the State Architect (DSA)?

A: No. The authority having jurisdiction is the City of San Jose. (Refer to Appendix D – FAQ, Question No. 14)

Q: Could you confirm where the GC preconstruction service/management fees should be entered on Concept Budget Form A-3?

A: These fees may be allocated to the following budget line items: Entitlement Phase – Other; Design Development/Construction Documents/Permitting Phase – Other.

Q: Can a 1-page project sheet with images be included with the project experience forms A-1 and A-2?

A: An appendix may be added to the response to include this content.

Q: How many printed copies are required?

A: Three printed copies are required. One electronic copy is required as well.

Q: Would the District consider revising the pass/fail criteria to allow for broader qualification of teams that demonstrate significant experience in delivering similar housing projects, even if not all projects were completed under a strict design-build model?

A: Design-build experience is not a pass/fail criteria item. Partial credit would be considered.

Q: Will the District allow design-build teams to include architects with extensive multi-family housing experience, even if they have limited direct design-build project experience?

A: Yes. Refer to Exhibits A-1 and A-2.

Q: Can the District clarify whether projects not delivered through a design-build methodology but completed by the general contractor or architect will be considered if they demonstrate relevant experience in workforce housing or multi-family developments?

A: No. Experience with design-build projects is required.

Q: Would the District consider allowing the evaluation of relevant projects completed by key personnel or staff members proposed for this project, even if those projects were delivered by other entities?

A: No.

Q: The RFQ mentions the opportunity to enhance the existing conceptual design. Would the District consider a scoring incentive for innovative design proposals that improve functionality, sustainability, or cost-efficiency while adhering to the Mediterranean style and project goals?

A: Design proposal terms will be determined during the RFP phase.

Q: Would the School District consider proposals that utilize Low Income Housing Tax Credits and other public sources that leverage the District's existing bond capacity? (Measure E, HCD)

A: No.

Q: If team members individually come with design+build experience, but not yet as a team, is partial credit envisioned or is the scoring more threshold (meaning you either have the experience or do not)?

A: Partial credit would be considered.

Q: Developers often form Limited Partnership entities ahead of applying for funds and entitling the development, would the District accept a narrative description and organization chart of the proposed limited partnership with a commitment to form if selected?

A: The District does not intend to engage with an LLP.

German Cerda, Superintendent

Board of Trustees: Linda Chavez, President, Andrés Quintero, Vice-President
Minh Pham, Clerk · Corina Herrera-Loera, Member · Minh Nguyen, Member

Q: Would the District consider ground leasing the land, at a level acceptable to the Board, which provides the District capitalized revenue up front in exchange for the ground lease which would then be used to apply for the funding?

A: No.

Q: Would there be a preference for teams that propose a use for the currently vacant MACSA building?

A: No. The MACSA building is outside the scope of this project.

Q: Will a portion of the MACSA Youth Center lot be available for construction access (to lessen the impact on the neighbors)?

A: Availability for construction access is yet to be determined.

Q: Q8 of the FAQ in the RFQ is answered with the direction to use the 8" sewer pipe designation in the BKF report. Please clarify if the basis of the conceptual proposal should include the 8" sewer replacement project (~2000+ lineal feet).

A: The conceptual budget should account for upsizing the Lavonne Avenue system from 6-inch pipes to 8-inch pipes.

Q: Does SJ have Capital Improvement plans for upgrading sewer or other infrastructure in the street?

A: Not to our knowledge.

Q: Q8 of the FAQ in the RFQ asks about the whether the sewer ejector option should be the basis of the proposal OR if the 5' site build-up is the basis of the conceptual proposal. The FAQ doesn't appear to answer this question. Please clarify.

A: Assume the project will proceed with the sewer ejector option.

Q: Can you share any information about the timing of the adjacent "Future Affordable Housing" project?

A: Future affordable housing project is not part of this project. Its timing is unknown at the moment.

Q: What is the basis of design for the "community" structure?

A: Basis of design for the Community Room will be determined during the RFP phase.

Q: Has the conceptual design been approved by the School Board?

A: Yes.

Q: Is an all-electric building desired (i.e. no natural gas)?

A: All-electric building option is to be considered. Project is to comply with City of San Jose requirements.

Q: Are the play structures to be supplied and installed by design-builder?

A: Yes.

Q: Have the bridging document conceptual designs and site layout been preliminarily reviewed by SJ Planning?

A: There are no bridging documents. Conceptual site, landscape and floor plans and elevations were submitted to the City of San Jose for a preliminary review.

Q: Has site plan been analyzed for conformance with C3 and Green Building Code?

A: No.

Q: Do respondents need to provide a full list of consultants for the RFQ response, or can the rest of the team (beyond GC, Architect, and MEP subcontractors) be assembled during the RFP phase?

German Cerda, Superintendent

Board of Trustees: Linda Chavez, President, Andrés Quintero, Vice-President
Minh Pham, Clerk · Corina Herrera-Loera, Member · Minh Nguyen, Member

A: Yes. Per the Prequalification Template, “Team members to be identified include, at a minimum, the General Contractor, the Architect, Engineers, and Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing Contractors.”

Q: In statement of qualifications, part II-C, please advise whether “in-house” engineers refers to engineers under direct employment of the design-builder or consulting engineering firms to be hired by the design-builder?

A: It refers to both categories.

Q: For I.C.1. Financial Capacity, please confirm Architecture firms and design consultants are not required to submit financial statements, only General Contractors and MEP subcontractors.

A: Audited financial statements for the past two years must be submitted for the General Contractor and listed subcontractors.

Q: Would the park remain under District property or is a transfer to the City envisioned at a certain point? The conceptual budget may change if interaction with the City’s PRNS department is required.

A: The proposed park area will remain part of the District property.

Q: The RFQ requests specific experience with SB330 and/or AB 2295. That experience is not listed in the evaluation criteria and the 135 points available. Can you confirm how this experience will be taken into consideration?

A: This experience is included within the evaluation criteria that states “Design/Builder’s specific experience with the entitlement process, including applying for and complying with, for multi-family projects, preferably in the City of San Jose”.

Q: Who will be the operator of the workforce housing?

A: The entity responsible for operations is yet to be determined.

Q: The municipal/permit fees are a large component of the conceptual budget. Would the District consider re-formatting Exhibit A-3 and listing municipal/permit fees separately in order for all the DB teams to have a fair evaluation under the project conceptual budget?

A: Respondents are to provide a breakdown of assumed municipal/permitting fees.

Q: Considering the development is on school property, could the School fees be waived?

A: Possibly. For conceptual budget purposes, assume they are not waived.

Q: The RFQ states that we can submit up to 6 resumes – is this total, or each for designer, builder, engineers?

A: Total.

Q: It has been our assumption that the RFQ response is to be based upon the design and planning work that has already been completed by other consultants and provided to the design-build teams. This seems like the correct way to make sure that the initial responses are all responding to the same criteria and the playing field is level. However, at the walk through, we heard that the District “is looking forward to our conceptual plans” (ideas?). We are assuming that further conceptual work would be completed at the RFP stage of the process. Can you please confirm?

A: The District is interested in proposals on how to enhance the existing conceptual design during the RFP phase, not the RFQ phase.

Q: Please confirm that for the safety section you want safety information for the GC only?

A: It is confirmed that the requested safety information is for the General Contractor only.

German Cerda, Superintendent

Board of Trustees: Linda Chavez, President, Andrés Quintero, Vice-President
Minh Pham, Clerk · Corina Herrera-Loera, Member · Minh Nguyen, Member

Please submit a signed copy of this addendum with your RFQ response.

Company Name: _____

Signature: _____

German Cerda, Superintendent

Board of Trustees: Linda Chavez, President, Andrés Quintero, Vice-President
Minh Pham, Clerk · Corina Herrera-Loera, Member · Minh Nguyen, Member