



**Business Services
Contracts Office**

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

*Lisa Grant-Dawson, Interim Chief Business Officer
Robert Aldama, Purchasing Manager II*

ADDENDUM NO. 1

Date: April 17, 2026

Issued by: Sacramento City Unified School District

**Project: Project #: 26-052126
2026 Facilities Master Plan**

This addenda shall supersede the original Information, attachments, and specifications regarding Project No. 26-052126 where it adds to, deletes from, clarifies or otherwise modifies them. All other conditions and any previous addenda shall remain unchanged.

Part A – Bidding and Contract Requirements

AD1.01 QUESTIONS

Funding. Will the District provide funding analysis through an existing consultant, or is the selected team expected to include this expertise as part of their proposal?

AD1.01 ANSWER

The selected team is expected to include funding analysis expertise as part of their proposed team. The District will provide available historical bond program data, current financing documents, and any existing analyses to support this work, but the responsibility for synthesizing and presenting a complete financing and funding assessment rests with the selected firm. Teams that intend to engage a subconsultant for any portion of this work should identify that subconsultant in their proposal per the RFP's subcontractor disclosure requirements.

AD1.02 QUESTIONS

Outcomes expected from community engagement: The RFP calls for inclusive and equitable community engagement and notes the need to creatively engage communities that have been historically difficult to engage. Can the District clarify what outcomes it expects from community engagement beyond feedback collection, including how community input will materially influence project prioritization and phasing decisions? How many community workshops/forums does the District anticipate firms to plan for?

AD1.02 ANSWER

Community engagement is a required Base Service component of this scope. The District expects that community input will directly inform the updated equity framework and project

Project No: 26-052126
2026 Facilities Master Plan
ADDENDUM NO. 1

prioritization criteria—not serve merely as a feedback collection exercise. Consistent with the principles established in the 2021 FMP, the District expects engagement to: (1) validate or refine the equity indicators used in the project prioritization methodology; (2) surface school- and neighborhood-level conditions not fully captured by available data; and (3) inform how equity indicators and facility condition data are weighted and balanced in determining project priorities and phasing. The District does not prescribe a fixed number of community workshops or forums, as the RFP invites respondents to propose their approach. However, proposals should reflect a meaningful and substantive engagement plan scaled to a district of SCUSD's size. The District expects engagement to include districtwide public forums, Administrator workgroups, and targeted outreach efforts to historically underrepresented communities that may not attend traditional evening meetings. Respondents are encouraged to propose creative, multilingual, and accessible engagement formats. The proposed number, format, and geographic distribution of community meetings will be evaluated as part of the Technical Approach scoring criterion.

AD1.03 QUESTIONS

FMP Samples / Submittal Format. Can the District confirm whether digital links to sample Facilities Master Plans are acceptable in lieu of hard copy submissions? Additionally, may project sheets include links to representative FMP work as part of the response?

AD1.03 ANSWER

The RFP requires submission of "brief, hard copy samples of deliverables" as item 6 of the Submission Requirements. Proposals must be submitted electronically via PlanetBids (<https://vendors.planetbids.com/portal/61521/portal-home>). In this context, the District will accept digital links to sample FMPs and representative project work within electronically submitted proposals, in lieu of physical hard copies. However, because the District cannot guarantee access to all external links during proposal evaluation, respondents are strongly encouraged to include representative excerpts, images, or summary pages directly within their proposal document. Project sheets may include hyperlinks to hosted samples as supplemental references. The core proposal, including the sample deliverables section, must still be complete and self-contained within the electronic submission.

AD1.04 QUESTIONS

Definition and weighting of equity indicators: How will the District define and operationalize 'equity indicators' in the updated Facilities Master Plan, and how will those indicators be weighted relative to facility condition, age, FCI, and other prioritization criteria?

AD1.04 ANSWER

The 2021 FMP established an equity index using two primary indicators: (1) Neighborhood Opportunity, based on the UC Berkeley Othering & Belonging Institute's opportunity mapping data identifying neighborhoods with High Segregation & Poverty or Low Resources; and (2) LCAP Student Priority Group, reflecting the concentration of priority student populations—including disaggregated students of color, students with disabilities, English learners, foster youth, and homeless youth—as identified in the California School

Project No: 26-052126
2026 Facilities Master Plan
ADDENDUM NO. 1

Dashboard. Project Objective 3 of this RFP directs the updated FMP to continue a focus on equity indicators while increasing focus on project facility condition relative to the 2021 FMP, "as appropriate based on the historic capital investment analysis" required under Objective 1. The specific definition and weighting of equity indicators in the updated model will be developed collaboratively between the District and the selected consultant, informed by the historic capital investment analysis, updated neighborhood and student data, and community and stakeholder input. Respondents should describe in their Technical Approach how they would work with the District to evaluate, define, and operationalize equity indicators and how they would propose to balance them against FCI and other condition-based criteria.

AD1.05 QUESTIONS

Balancing equity and condition focus (Objective 3): Project Objective 3 states that the updated FMP will ‘continue a focus on equity indicators but also increase focus more on project facility condition than the 2021 FMP.’ Can the District clarify the intended decision-making framework for balancing these factors when they point to different project priorities?

AD1.05 ANSWER

Since the adoption of the 2021 FMP, the District has made meaningful and demonstrable progress in directing capital investment toward the communities that have historically been underserved—and that work reflects a commitment the District is proud of and intends to continue. At the same time, the passage of time and the progress already achieved have naturally shifted the landscape: it may be discovered that some schools in more affluent or middle-income parts of the District now present facility conditions that are among the most deteriorated in the portfolio, and those conditions cannot be overlooked simply because the surrounding neighborhood does not meet the threshold of what is defined by equity indicators alone. The District’s intent in Objective 3 is not to retreat from its equity commitments, but to ensure that the updated prioritization framework is sophisticated enough to reflect the full picture of need across all 81+ campuses. The selected firm is expected to develop and present a transparent, data-informed decision-making framework that enables the District to evaluate the full spectrum of facility need alongside equity considerations—one that is responsive to where the District stands today. This framework should include alternative prioritization scenarios, a clear explanation of the methodology, and a process for Board review and approval before finalization. The District will work collaboratively with the selected team to test, refine, and validate the framework throughout the project.

AD1.06 QUESTIONS

Specific conditions included in the equity frame: Beyond historic capital investment analysis, what specific student, school, neighborhood, and community conditions does the District expect consultant teams to consider as part of the equity framework for prioritization (e.g., demographics, historical closures, academic outcomes, neighborhood indicators)?

Project No: 26-052126
2026 Facilities Master Plan
ADDENDUM NO. 1

AD1.06 ANSWER

Consistent with the 2021 FMP approach and the RFP's direction, the District expects equity indicators to include, at minimum: (1) neighborhood opportunity data (e.g., UC Berkeley Opportunity Map or equivalent updated source); (2) LCAP student priority group concentrations per school site; (3) historic capital investment patterns by school and geographic area (Objective 1); and (4) student outcome data disaggregated by LCAP priority populations. Beyond these required elements, respondents are encouraged to propose additional indicators they consider relevant and explain in their Technical Approach how those indicators would be operationalized and weighted. The District will evaluate the rigor and appropriateness of proposed indicator sets as part of the Technical Approach scoring.

AD1.07 QUESTIONS

Alternative prioritization scenarios: Does the District expect consultant teams to present alternative prioritization scenarios—such as scenarios that emphasize facility condition, equity indicators, or blended criteria—to support District and Board decision-making?

AD1.07 ANSWER

Yes. Presenting these scenarios transparently will enable the District to understand the implications of different prioritization frameworks before the final methodology is approved.

AD1.08 QUESTIONS

Role of engagement in shaping criteria vs. reacting to diagrams: Can the District clarify whether community engagement is intended primarily to: (a) inform broad planning priorities, equity-centered decision criteria, and potential tradeoffs across the District, or (b) respond to pre-developed site diagrams and potential physical improvements at individual campuses?

AD1.08 ANSWER

Both purposes are within scope, sequenced intentionally across the project. The District's engagement structure is designed to serve each purpose at the appropriate stage:

REGIONAL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EVENTS —Regional community forums to be held to establish shared values, validating prioritization criteria, and surfacing community-wide priorities before any project rankings are developed. These forums ensure that diverse community voices, including those historically underrepresented in facilities planning, shape the framework that governs all subsequent decisions. Respondents should propose creative, multilingual, and accessible formats to maximize participation across the District's full range of school communities. The District wants to hear how and where those regional community events shall be held to best authentically engage and drive participation across the community, including historically underrepresented communities and members.

FACILITIES LEADERSHIP STEERING COMMITTEE — The Facilities Leadership Steering Committee will engage at key decision points throughout the process to review draft equity frameworks, prioritization criteria, and alternative scenarios before those materials are

Project No: 26-052126
2026 Facilities Master Plan
ADDENDUM NO. 1

brought to the Board. This body bridges the community engagement process and Board decision-making, ensuring analytical rigor and stakeholder perspective are both reflected in the final recommendations.

BOARD OF EDUCATION ENGAGEMENTS — Board of Education engagements at regularly scheduled Board meetings will occur at the start, midpoint, and conclusion of the project.

The Ed Specs add-alternate, if authorized, would involve this deeper site-level work. Respondents should reflect this sequencing in their proposed methodology and schedule.

AD1.09 QUESTIONS

Reconciling community input with FCI/condition rankings: When stakeholder input differs from rankings suggested by facility condition or FCI data, how does the District expect consultant teams to reconcile those differences in the recommended project priority list?

AD1.09 ANSWER

The District does not prescribe a single method for resolving divergences between stakeholder input and quantitative condition rankings. The selected consultant should develop a transparent process for identifying where community input and data point to different priorities and presenting those differences clearly to the Facilities Leadership Steering Committee for reconciliation in partnership with the respondents.

Input from regional forums will be analyzed to surface priorities not fully reflected in the equity or FCI data. The Steering Committee will review reconciliation recommendations before Board consideration.

AD1.10 QUESTIONS

Alignment with and evolution of the 2021 equity index model: The RFP notes that the updated FMP will integrate and update the current equity index model developed in the 2021 FMP. Should consultant teams assume that the 2021 model will remain substantively intact and be updated, or does the District invite recommendations for revising the equity framework itself?

AD1.10 ANSWER

The RFP states that the updated FMP will "integrate and update the current equity index model developed within the 2021 FMP" while also requiring a historic capital investment analysis (Objective 1) and directing a shift in the balance between equity indicators and facility condition (Objective 3). The District interprets this as inviting—and expecting—a substantive evaluation of whether and how the 2021 model should be revised, not simply a data refresh. Respondents should describe in their Technical Approach how they would evaluate the current equity index model, what criteria they would use to assess whether changes are warranted, and how they would engage District staff and the community in validating any proposed modifications. Teams are not required to preserve the 2021 model intact; significant departures should be clearly justified and presented as alternatives for District and Board consideration before adoption.

Project No: 26-052126
2026 Facilities Master Plan
ADDENDUM NO. 1

AD1.11 QUESTIONS

Governance and approval of criteria and rankings: What governance process will the District use to review and approve proposed prioritization criteria, equity indicators, and project rankings during the course of the FMP update (e.g., internal staff working groups, Board study sessions, advisory committees)?

AD1.11 ANSWER

The District's governance process will be structured around two bodies: (1) the Facilities Leadership Steering Committee, which will review and provide direction on draft methodologies, equity frameworks, and prioritization scenarios at key decision points throughout the process; and (2) the Board of Education, which will be engaged at regularly scheduled Board meetings and will provide formal approval of the final product(s).

AD1.12 QUESTIONS

Use of geographic areas for equity analysis and decisions: In connection with Objective 1, how will the District define the geographic areas to be used for analyzing historic capital investments and funding inequities, and will those same geographic definitions guide project prioritization in the updated FMP?

AD1.12 ANSWER

Objective 1 requires the consultant to investigate and report historic capital investments "by areas to be defined" to analyze funding inequities between historically disadvantaged, moderately resourced, and well-resourced neighborhoods. The District has not prescribed specific geographic units for this analysis. The selected consultant is expected to recommend appropriate geographic definitions—such as school attendance boundaries, census tracts, planning zones, or Board trustee areas—in consultation with District staff, based on what best captures historical investment patterns and aligns with available data.

AD1.13 QUESTIONS

FCA ADA requirements: The FCA will include an ASTM standard ADA checklist. Can the District clarify whether it is interested in additional ADA-related services, and if so, which level of effort should be included in the proposal? 1) Base: ASTM Standard ADA Checklist only; 2) Option 1: Base + Title II ADA Survey; and 3) Option 2: Option 1 + Districtwide Transition Plan.

AD1.13 ANSWER

The RFP's FCA scope includes Handicap Accessible (ADA) Requirements as a required data collection element and Deficiency Categorization by Handicap Accessibility (ADA) Requirements. The Base FCA scope therefore includes ASTM Standard ADA Checklist documentation as part of the standard assessment. The District requests that proposing teams provide the Base ASTM ADA Checklist as part of their base fee proposal, and provide separate, clearly itemized pricing for Option 1 (Base + Title II ADA Survey) as add-alternate line items on the Fee Proposal form. A Districtwide Transition Plan is not requested at this time. The District

Project No: 26-052126
2026 Facilities Master Plan
ADDENDUM NO. 1

will evaluate these options and determine which level of service to authorize following consultant selection, based on available funding and program priorities. Firms with relevant Title II ADA expertise should describe those qualifications in their proposal.

AD1.14 QUESTIONS

Energy and carbon-neutral goals: The scope includes outlining current Energy Use Intensity (EUI) metrics and identifying improvements to meet the District's Carbon Neutral Goals. Can the District clarify which level of analysis is intended for this effort? Base: Energy Audit with EUI Benchmarking • Option 1: Base + Electrification Roadmap (including renewables and ECMs) • Option 2: Option 1 + Comprehensive Decarbonization Study (including net zero analysis, renewable feasibility, phased implementation considerations)

AD1.14 ANSWER

Project Objective 6 requires the consultant to "outline current Energy Use Intensity (EUI) metrics for each school site, and possible improvements to each site to meet the District's Carbon Neutral Goals and Guidelines." This scope is included in the Base FMP services. Nothing further is needed currently.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1

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