



**Business Services
Contracts Office**

5735 47th Avenue • Sacramento, CA 95824
(916) 643-2464

*Janea Marking, Chief Business Officer
Robert Aldama, Purchasing Manager II*

ADDENDUM NO. 3

Date: April 25, 2025

Issued by: Sacramento City Unified School District

**Project: Project #: 0108-461
New Ethel I. Baker Elementary School**

This addenda shall supersede the original Information, attachments, and specifications regarding **Project No. 0108-461** where it adds to, deletes from, clarifies or otherwise modifies them. All other conditions and any previous addenda shall remain unchanged.

Part A – Bidder Questions

QUESTION #1: Can you please provide CAD files for site plan and underground utilities if available for the Ethel Baker project. We would also like to request a set of PDF drawings of the last project done on the Ethel Baker site.

RESPONSE: See **AD3.01**.

QUESTION #2: Please advise who all will attend the confidential meetings. Also, will those same individuals be the selection/evaluation committee?

RESPONSE: Members of SCUSD Facilities, SCUSD Enrollment, Ethel I. Baker staff, and Kitchell will be present for the confidential meetings. Members from these groups will also be present in the selection committee. However, not all individuals present in the confidential meetings will be the same for selection.

QUESTION #3: Exhibit H - Proposal Bond Form references the CK McClatchy project (Lines 18 and 19). Can we please get a new Proposal Bond Form with the correct project noted.

RESPONSE: See **AD3.02**.

Project No: 0108-461
New Ethel I. Baker Elementary School
ADDENDUM NO. 3

QUESTION #4: Could the District please provide available as-built drawings for the Ethel I. Baker Elementary School campus?

RESPONSE: See **AD3.01**.

QUESTION #5: Are there any existing hazardous materials reports for the site that can be shared with the shortlisted teams?

RESPONSE: No, the District intends on conducting a hazardous materials survey Summer 2025 when students and staff are not present on site.

QUESTION #6: Could the District provide a breakdown of staff at the school, including the number of administrators, counselors, and part-time/full-time instructional and support staff?

RESPONSE:

- 2 Administrators
- 2 Counselors and 2 counseling interns
- 1 School psychologist
- 1 Nurse
- 2 Speech therapists
- 1 OT (Part time)
- 2 Special education teachers
- 3 Instructional aides for special education
- 2 Instructional aides for general education
- 1 Office manager
- 1 Attendance clerk
- 1 Plant manager
- 2 Custodians
- 4 Yard attendants/safety personnel
- 2 PE teachers
- 25 Classroom Teachers
- 3 Reading Coaches
- 1 Instructional Coach

Project No: 0108-461
New Ethel I. Baker Elementary School
ADDENDUM NO. 3

QUESTION #7: Exhibit E – Insurance Requirements of the Progressive Design Build Agreement: Article 4 requires a \$10m project specific policy covering Design-Builder and its entire design team.

Insurance Brokers have confirmed a Project Specific Professional Liability Insurance policy covering the Design Builder and its entire design team is not available in the insurance marketplace. Based on this information, please confirm if Design-Builder can provide the Project Specific Professional Insurance Policy pricing covering the Design-Builder.

RESPONSE: Insurance requirements for the Contractor acting as the Design Build Entity are listed in the **Progressive Design Build Agreement, Exhibit E, Section IV**. Insurance requirements for the design team acting as subcontractors/subconsultants to the Design Build Entity [Contractor] are listed in the **Progressive Design Build Agreement, Exhibit E, Section V**.

QUESTION #8: The Criteria documents reference surveys by WCE and have existing utility information. Can we please receive that information and, if possible, the CAD files?

RESPONSE: See **AD3.01**

QUESTION #9: Is the generator size to be large enough for the full campus or only essentials?

RESPONSE: Criteria are that the switchgear to be generator ready. Design Build Entity to provide automatic transfer switch at new switchgear. Generator sizing for only essentials

QUESTION #10: What is going to be the use of the collaboration rooms? Criteria documents call for 7500 sqft for this space (5 x 1500 sqft).

RESPONSE: Breakout spaces, learning commons, and seating options that allow for collaboration and supporting the LCAP goal of Targeted Supports for Students. Provide connection between learning studios and the commons to empower students to take ownership of their learning. Provide visual connection between learning studios and the commons to support natural surveillance. Provide shared resource spaces that teachers can use to communicate more highly with each other to support learners

QUESTION #11: Is the 1500 sqft Flex space also considered the Head Start program space?

Project No: 0108-461
New Ethel I. Baker Elementary School
ADDENDUM NO. 3

RESPONSE: Head Start is to be housed within the allocated program. The flex space is separate from pre-school space.

QUESTION #12: Is the expectation that the full site 12.31 acres will be developed within the budget provided, or is the district considering partial development?

RESPONSE: Expectation is that the full site is developed within the budget.

QUESTION #13: Considering the volatility in the insurance market, will the District consider excluding Builder's Risk Insurance from the Price Proposal, and deferring Builder's Risk Insurance to time of Contractor's Guaranteed Max Price (GMP) proposal? Most insurance companies will not agree to quote more than 30-60 days in advance of binding a policy (start of construction).

RESPONSE: Builder's Risk Insurance costs will be deferred until the time of GMP when scope and construction costs can be clearly identified. See **AD3.03**.

QUESTION #14: Builders Risk - Section VI Builders Risk/Installation floater Insurance requires the following combination of additional insurance coverages: "In addition there shall be coverage in the amount of twenty percent (20%) of the replacement cost for Extra Expense and Loss of Use and thirty percent (30%) of the replacement cost for Soft Costs coverage." As written the above requirement would add an additional 50% of the contract value to the Total Insured Value of the Contract and such a high additional limit of insurance may not be commercially available or at a commercially reasonable cost. As a cost consideration will the District consider limiting coverage to the combined amount of thirty percent (30%) of the replacement cost for Soft Costs and replacement cost for Extra Expense?

RESPONSE: Builder's Risk Insurance coverage adjustments will be taken into consideration at the time GMP when project scope and construction costs can be clearly identified.

QUESTION #15: In Section 3.5.1.1, it states: "The budgeted construction cost of the Project is \$85,000,000". Later, in Section in 7.1.1, it states: The GMP, including compensation for all design and construction services, is expected to be within the cost range of the Project of \$90,000,000." Please confirm the total budget including design and construction is \$90,000,000 and that the \$5,000,000 difference accounts for design services.

RESPONSE: the construction budget is \$85,000,000. The total budget, including design fees, is \$90,000,000.

Project No: 0108-461
New Ethel I. Baker Elementary School
ADDENDUM NO. 3

QUESTION #16: In Section 3.6. Does "initial approval" include both the first submission and any backcheck resubmittals that might be part of the standard DSA approval process? In the scenario described in Section 3.5.5.3, where value engineering may be required if the GMP exceeds the 100% Construction Document estimate by 10% or more, would any resulting DSA review fees for these value engineering changes be covered by the District or considered as "other DSA fees" that are the Design-Builder's responsibility?

RESPONSE: As noted in Section 3.6.1, the District will pay the initial DSA approval fees and additional fees incurred from District directed changes. All other fees are the responsibility of the Design-Build Entity and will not be reimbursed by the District.

QUESTION #17: While Section 3.5.6 of the RFP mentions meeting "at least on a monthly basis" for constructability and coordination reviews, our experience with successful progressive design-build projects suggests that more frequent collaboration is essential for iterative design development and effective cost management. Is the District and its stakeholders (including end-users, facilities staff, and decision-makers) committed to participating in more frequent design coordination meetings than the monthly minimum stated in the RFP? What is the District's expected timeline for reviewing and providing feedback on design iterations and cost updates when submitted between formal milestone submissions?

RESPONSE: Design meetings will at minimum be bi-weekly, subject to District discretion. Topics of discussion during these meetings will include District review of design iterations and cost estimate updates.

List of Attachments

- AD3.01** – Ethel I. Baker – Existing Conditions Documents (.zip file)
- AD3.02** – Ethel I. Baker – Exhibit H Proposal Bond Form (2 Pages)
- AD3.03** – Ethel I. Baker – DB Price Proposal Form (3 Pages)

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 3

Acknowledgement of this Addendum will be required at time of bid.