



**ADDENDUM NO. 3**  
(Issued April 29, 2022)

**Request for Qualifications and Proposals**  
**Melrose Leadership Academy at Maxwell Park Campus and Sherman Campus Project**

The following changes, additions, modifications and corrections hereinafter set forth shall apply to the bid 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 Clarification #1:**

RFQ/P Section G.1.3 (SOQ): Sheets larger than 8-1/2" x 11" will be permitted (for example, fee schedules on 11" x 17" sheets). For hard copy submittals, 11" x 17" sheets shall be folded to fit the 8-1/2" x 11" format.

**District Clarification #2:**

RFQ/P Section B.1 (Project Scope): In assessing classroom capacities, programming for class sizes shall also comply with the California Education Code (EC) Sections 41376 and 41378.

**District Clarification #3:**

RFQ/P Section B.2 (Project Scope): Structural engineering analysis is requested for this phase of services. Scope of Services shall include performing Tier 1 and Tier 2 analyses based on ASCE 41-17 for Risk Category III.

**District Clarification #4:**

RFQ/P Section B.7 (Project Scope): Once scenarios in Section B.6 have been fully developed, the design firm shall assist the District's Community Engagement Team in producing graphic materials and attendance in presentations to the public. Provide fee line item for attendance to two (2) public meetings (minimum).

**District Clarification #5:**

RFQ/P Exhibit A (Form of Agreement for Architectural Services): The services requested shall include Project Assessment and Conceptual Design, and Schematic Design as indicated in Exhibit A Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2.

**District Clarification #6:**

RFQ/P (Project Scope): At this time, the District has not determined the method of project delivery (i.e., Design-Bid-Build or Design-Build). The current requested scope of services may be the basis for a full-service agreement for subsequent project phases or the production of Bridging Documents for a Design-Build Team.

**Question #1:**

Would having a parent of a MLA student in the design team be considered a conflict of interest?



**District Response #1:**

It would not be considered a conflict of interest provided that parent participating as a representative of the school (such as a member of the Project Advisory Committee) had no decision making authority that would affect the economic interest of their design firm.

**Question #2A:**

The page limit is 15 pages for items 2.1-2.5. However, items 2.3.5. asks to provide no more than 20 recent project examples. As each project example takes up one page, this would surpass the 15-page limit. Are we able to put the project example pages in an Appendix?

**District Response #2A:**

Documents placed in the Appendix would not count against the 15-page limit. The narrative requested in 2.3 should direct the reviewer to the Appendix for detailed project examples.

**Question #2B:**

The RFQ does not specifically ask for resumes of our project team – would you like us to include this for our team and consultants? If so, can we place these in the Appendix?

**District Response #2B:**

Similar to District Response #2A, support documents such as detailed resumes could be placed in the Appendix and preferably referenced in the requested narrative.

**Question #3:**

Part 8 of the Project Scope identifies schematic design level material. Please confirm whether this is for both Scenario One and Two or the winning scenario.

**District Response #3:**

For the Fee Proposal, assume Scenario One and Two shall be developed concurrently and to the same level during the Schematic Design Phase.

**Question #4:**

Part 2 of the Project Scope includes structural assessment. Please confirm a structural assessment is to be provided and should be an ASCE 41 Tier 1 analysis.

**District Response #4:**

Structural assessments shall be provided according to ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 and 2 analyses.

**Question #5:**

Is a schematic design level estimate to be provided?

**District Response #5:**

Yes. The estimated statement of project construction cost shall be provided in accordance with Section 5.3.2.4 of the Project's proposed Agreement for Architectural Services (Exhibit A).

**Question #6:**

Is the topographic and utility survey to be completed during the schematic design phase and if so is it to be a part of the scope of work?



**District Response #6:**

The Architect shall procure in accordance with Section 5.2.3 of the proposed Agreement (Exhibit A) the services of a land surveyor and an underground utility locator as part of their scope of work.

**Question #7:**

Please confirm which consultants shall be included in the schematic design package.

**District Response #7:**

The Architect shall retain the services of consultant to complete the Schematic Design Phase in accordance with Sections 5.2 and 6.2.9 of the proposed Agreement (Exhibit A). The exception to the Section 6.2.9 shall be the procurement of a geotechnical and geohazard consultant which shall be by the District.

**Question #8:**

If the LBE certification is other than the City of Oakland (Company XYZ's LBE is with the Port of Oakland), that all (including sub-consultants) must provide tax returns. How many years are required?

**District Response #8:**

OUSD only requires proof of gross revenue when a firm is certified as a SLBE by an agency other than the City of Oakland and that firm wishes to gain credit as a SLBE on an OUSD project. Sub-consultants would only need to provide proof of revenue if they also happen to fall into this category.

**Question #9:**

<Company XYZ> tax returns include XX offices worldwide, no tax returns are available for individual offices. We can provide our Financial statement for 2020. The 2021 tax return is not available yet. Will that suffice?

**District Response #9:**

In the case of <Company XYZ> as indicated in Question #8, they are certified as an LBE by the Port of Oakland. Therefore, they will only be able to receive credit as a LBE on OUSD projects. In this instance, tax verification will not be required.

**Question #10:**

Would you like us to include a section describing our Project Team and any subconsultants? If so, where?

**District Response #10:**

The descriptions should be incorporated into the appropriate sections of the requested narrative (Section 2.3).

**Question #11:**

Could resumes be included in an appendix?

**District Response #11:**

Yes. Documents placed in the Appendix would not count against the 15-page limit.

**Question #12:**

Who will be evaluating the proposals?



**District Response #12:**

Individuals for proposal review committee have not been determined at this time but typically they include staff from the Facilities Department and the Bond Program Management Consultant, and a School Representative.

**Question #13:**

Who will be on the interview panel?

**District Response #13:**

Individuals for interview panel have not been determined at this time but typically they include staff from the Facilities Department and the Bond Program Management Consultant, and a School Representative.

**Question #14:**

Could you share the Selection Criteria and points assigned to each section?

**District Response #14:**

Proposal scoring shall be as follows:

- Section 2.3.1: 15 points
- Section 2.3.2: 15 points
- Section 2.3.3: 10 points
- Section 2.3.4: 10 points
- Section 2.3.5: 20 points
- Section 2.4: 5 points
- Section 2.5: 20 points
- Section 2.6: 5 points
- Section 3: pass/fail

**Question #15:**

Under B. PROJECT SCOPE, items 5 and 7, how many meetings should we anticipate?

“5. Perform a series of meetings with site staff and Facilities Planning & Management Department leadership to understand programmatic needs to support education/curriculum goals.”

“7. Participate in a series of meetings with the site and district leadership which will result in the determination of proceeding with a two site project or the consolidation into one site”

**District Response #15:**

A finite number of meetings cannot be provided since the District expects the Architectural Team to participate in all meetings with District staff required to assist the District during the project definition phases by determining programming needs and producing the requested scenarios. Typically, weekly meetings are needed initially and then evolve into bi-weekly meetings during the latter stages.



**Question #16:**

To ensure consistent pricing, please confirm which consultants shall be included in the assessment. Item 2 of Project scope lists architectural, structure, mechanical, plumbing, electrical/low voltage, civil (access), and roofing. Are there others?

**District Response #16:**

See District Responses #3, #4, #5, #6 and #7.

**Question #17:**

Bridging documents vary considerably. To ensure consistent pricing, please confirm the deliverables the OUSD would like for the SD package. The SD portion of the contract mentions broad categories of deliverables only:

- schematic design documents
- site utilization plans
- schematic design studies
- project description with scale and relationship of components
- estimate
- schedule

As an example are 3D massing/exterior elevations or structural information to be included? See also question 7 on which consultants to include.

**District Response #17:**

See District Responses #3, #4, #5, #6 and #7. At this time, the District does not envision new construction at either school sites but modernization projects at one or both sites. Therefore 3D massing models would not be needed to evaluate the scenarios.

**Question #18:**

Do covers and tabs count within the 15 page limit?

**District Response #18:**

Covers and tabs do not count against the 15-page limit.

**Question #19:**

Are the plans for the selected option to be developed up to Schematic design or through Schematic design?

**District Response #19:**

See District Responses #3, #4, #5, #6 and #7.

**Question #20:**

Is the 15-page limit single-sided pages or double-sided pages?

**District Response #20:**

Page count is based on printed pages (i.e., a single sheet printed on one side counts as one page; a single sheet printed double-sided counts as two pages).



**Question #21:**

Is the Local Business Participation Worksheet included in the page limit?

**District Response #21:**

No. LBU Worksheet should be placed in the Appendix. See RFQ/P Section 1.3 for information included in the 15-page count limit.

**Question #22:**

What is the anticipated duration of work that the District intends the consultant to complete (as a driver for the fee proposal)?

**District Response #22:**

The District has scheduled approval of the agreement with the selected firm for the June 29, 2022 Board of Education meeting. A tentative Notice to Proceed would be issued shortly afterwards. The District anticipates the Feasibility Study and Programming Services/Schematic Design Phase to occur over a six month period and be completed by mid-January 2023.

**Question #23:**

Will the community engagement component be in person or virtual?

**District Response #23:**

The District expects to start, beginning in May 2022, conducting in-person public meetings. Two public meetings have been proposed for this initial phase of work. The Project Advisory Committee (PAC) will meet monthly and will be held virtually.

**Question #24:**

What level of community engagement (other than meetings identified in the "Project Scope") is anticipated for the feasibility, programming, and schematic design phases?

**District Response #24:**

Community engagement will involve meeting on a regular basis with the Project Advisory Committee (who consists of teachers, parents, student leadership, and community/neighborhood members) and the making periodic presentations to the general public (to provide project information and gather comments, and for vetting of final recommendations).

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