ADDENDUM NO. 1  
(Issued July 12, 2021)  

Request for Qualifications and Proposals  
Architect Services for Bridging Documents  
For the  
CCPA at the Havenscourt Campus and McClymonds High School Projects  

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 Modification #1:  
The deadline for submitting proposals shall be extended to July 21, 2021 (2:00 p.m. PST).  

District Modification #2:  
The District is withdrawing the Form of Agreement between the Oakland Unified School District and the Architect attached to the RFQ/P. A revised version shall be issued in a subsequent Addendum.  

Question #1: (questions 1 thru 13 from pre-submittal Zoom meeting chat June 29, 2021)  
Does a Structural Engineer need to be included among the proposed consultants?  

District Response #1:  
Yes. Given what is known based on the 2017 Facilities Condition Assessment Reports, further structural analyses shall be required for both school sites.  

Question #2:  
As this project is two separate schools, should our fee information be separated out into two portions, or combined?  

District Response #2:  
Separate fee proposals are being requested. As indicated in the RFQ/P, the District may elect to select one firm to execute both projects or two firms to execute one project each.  

Question #3:  
It sounds like there is uncertainty around whether this project is to remain a bridging project or be converted to full-service design contract. Would firms participating in the bridging portion of the project be precluded from consideration for the design-build portion of the project?  

District Response #3:  
At this time, the District is seeking architectural services for bridging documents to correlate with Design-Build as the project delivery method. In that case, the firm selected to prepare the bridging documents will be retained by the District to serve in an advisory role for the Design-Builder’s design and construction. However, the District may elect to change the project delivery method to Design-Bid-
Build or Lease-Leaseback at or near the end of the completion of the bridging documents. In this case, the District may elect to offer the Architect a full-service agreement to complete the project.

**Question #4:**
CEQA and entitlement process? Are they running concurrent with the Bridging package?

**District Response #4:**
Until the project scope for each campus has been fully defined, the CEQA and entitlement processes will not commence no sooner than the latter stages of the bridging packages.

**Question #5:**
Has a facility condition survey been conducted for each site? And is that available to us at this time?

**District Response #5:**
The 2017 Facilities Condition Assessment Reports are being made available with the understanding that the reports are now five years old. They can be found at the following links:

For CCPA at Havenscourt Campus:
[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B0oTPiEyONJgTDJhdWV3eHFrY0E?resourcekey=0-zHExuiYBXv5kRgyOnV0v2w](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B0oTPiEyONJgTDJhdWV3eHFrY0E?resourcekey=0-zHExuiYBXv5kRgyOnV0v2w)

For McClymonds High School:
[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B0oTPiEyONJgdy12MG1vQkdSeDQ?resourcekey=0-KgJgICpoZfiLYMeIw.gzBYA](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B0oTPiEyONJgdy12MG1vQkdSeDQ?resourcekey=0-KgJgICpoZfiLYMeIw.gzBYA)

**Question #6:**
Please confirm that email submission is acceptable.

**District Response #6:**
As stated in the RFQ/P, electronic submissions sent via email will be acceptable in lieu of hard copies.

**Question #7:**
Will sample COI be acceptable for Section H?

**District Response #7:**
Sample COIs will be acceptable provided coverages are shown to be current.

**Question #8:**
What's status of your agreement with city re the park property?

**District Response #8:**
At CCPA, the District has a joint use agreement with the City of Oakland limited to its use as a playfield. However, the District may request use of the park for placement of interim housing during the construction period.

**Question #9:**
District standards have been mentioned. Is there anything for us to do with these other than review for inclusion/application?
District Response #9:
As stated in the RFQ/P, Design Consultant shall incorporate into its work and the work of all Sub-
consultants the OUSD Material Standards and Supplemental District Standards. As mentioned in the
pre-submittal meeting, the District standards are being updated and will be issued in a timely manner
for use by the bridging document Architect.

Question #10:
Can other AORs who were not in attendance respond?
District Response #10:
Yes. Attendance at the pre-submittal meeting was non-mandatory.

Question #11:
What is the budget allocated for projects
District Response #11:
The current project budget for CCPA is $35.5 million and for McClymonds High School is $65 million.

Question #12:
What are the project schedule & desired completion dates
District Response #12:
The tentative schedule is to align the kick-off of the Consultant’s planning scope with the beginning of
the Fall semester (September 2021) and complete the bridging documents by the end of February 2022.

Question #13: (questions 1 thru 13 from pre-submittal Zoom meeting chat June 29, 2021)
Will District require hourly rates or full fee proposal
District Response #13:
The District is requesting a full fee proposal for each campus project. However, the basis of selection
will primarily be based on qualifications and experience.

Question #14a:
What is the role of the selected consultant after the project has been awarded to the Design-Builder?
The following statements in Attachment A imply a greater role for the selected consultant than what is
customary for a Bridging Architect on a Design-Build project.
District Response #14a:
The intent shall be where the Architect of the Bridging Documents shall prepare design requirements
(through schematic design) for the Design-Builder followed by overseeing the Design-Builder’s design
and construction in an advisory role. A revised Form of Agreement between the District and the
Architect will be issued in a subsequent Addendum to clarify this issue.

Question #14b:
Attachment A, Agreement for Architectural Services, refers to the selected consultant as the "Architect".
On design-build projects, the official "Architect" is the Architect of Record on the Design-Build team. The
Bridging Architect is a consultant to the Owner.
District Response #14b:
Further refinements in terminology would be made to clarify the District’s intent for the role of Architect of the Bridging Document who would still need to be duly qualified and licensed architect; thus the use of the term “Architect” is appropriate. A revised Form of Agreement between the District and the Architect will be issued in a subsequent Addendum to clarify this issue.

Question #14c:
On item 5.2.5, "... Architect shall be responsible for all submittals required of the Architect by the Division of the State Architect ("DSA")."
The DSA and other agencies having jurisdiction will only review completed design; therefore, the "Architect" in this statement is the Architect of Record on the Design-Build team.
District Response #14c:
A revised Form of Agreement between the District and the Architect will be issued in a subsequent Addendum to clarify this issue.

Question #14d:
"5.5.15 The Architect shall make such regular reports as shall be required by agencies having jurisdiction over the Project and keep the District informed in writing of the progress of the Project." Working with agencies having jurisdiction is the responsibility of the Architect of Record.
District Response #14d: (SKA June 24 2021)
See District Response #14c.

Question #14e:
"5.5.16 The Architect will, consistent with standards of due care, make reasonable professional efforts to exclude hazardous materials from new construction... When construction is properly completed, Architect shall provide such certification as to Hazardous Substances as is required of architects for such projects by the OPSC." The "Architect" responsible for specifying products is the Architect of Record.
District Response #14e:
See District Response #14c.

Question #15:
Section E (Past Performance Record): Would adding a time limit of 5 years be acceptable?
District Response #15:
Yes. That would be acceptable.

Question #16:
Section H (Insurance) – can we include a copy of our Certificate of Insurance instead of providing a letter from our insurance company?
District Response #16:
Yes. See District Response #7.
Question #17:
Are you planning that the consultant will hold community meetings in addition to site committee meetings prior to development of concepts? How many meetings do you anticipate?

District Response #17:
The District is expecting to hold at least four well-noticed public meetings during the design and construction process. At least two of these meetings shall be during the design phase, to ensure opportunities for public input. In past projects of comparable scope, site stakeholder meetings were held bi-monthly during the design phase and monthly during the construction phase.

Question #18:
Would you consider providing a more specific scope so that fees can be evaluated against the same scope line items?

District Response #18:
No. The District is looking to select firm(s) with the qualifications and demonstrated experience for the role of bridging document architect. The District would consider negotiating a final scope and fee after the selection(s) of the team(s).

Question #19:
Would you consider accepting a detailed approach for each site and then negotiating a fee with the team that best meets the District’s needs?

District Response #19:
No. The District would not consider this approach.

Question #20:
Per discussion at the pre-submittal conference on June 29th, we understand the Bridging Documents are to include work through Schematic Design. Please confirm.

District Response #20:
See District Response #14a.

Question #21:
Is there a defined construction cost for each project?

District Response #21:
See District Response #11. Defined construction cost for each project has not been determined at this time.

Question #22:
Can you confirm that the scope of work goes to schematic design?

District Response #22:
See District Response #14a. It is anticipated that scope of work to produce the bridging documents will include the completion of the schematic design.

Question #23:
Will there be one OUSD project manager for both projects, or two project managers (one for each project)?
District Response #23:
At this time, the District plans to assign one Project Manager for each project. Staff assignments for one or two Construction Manager(s) have not been determined.

Question #24:
Are both projects running simultaneously on the same schedule?
District Response #24:
The bridging document phase for both projects is anticipated to run simultaneously.

Question #25:
Could you please define who the District anticipates being invited to the “Community Meetings” – is this the PTA, the neighbors, etc.?
District Response #25:
Community Meetings are meetings where the general public is invited to attend.

Question #26:
Could you please define who the Site Stakeholders are in regards to the “Site Stakeholder Meeting
District Response #26:
Generally, Site Stakeholders consist of the School Principal and/or Vice-Principal and a Project Committee that has in the past included staff, students (Student Site Council (SSC)) and parents (PTA). Also, see District Response #17.

Question #27:
In “Attachment B, Scope of Architectural Services, Scope of Project and Tentative Schedule for CCPA And McClymonds HS,” we see that there is a “Community Meeting” at the end of the design process, but no other identified community engagement tasks or meetings. Is it up to the design team to propose a community process? Should this process conclude by Dec 31st as noted in the RFP, or after winter break, as mentioned in pre-proposal meeting?
District Response #27:
The District has Community Engagement staff who would provide structure and guidance to the process. Also, see District Response #17.

Question #28:
When is the Board Approval of the project delivery method going to occur, prior to the start if the consultant design contract?
District Response #28:
No. See District Response #3.

Question #29:
Is it the intent that the entire “District Scope” as noted in “Attachment B” will be completed before the Consultant is brought on?
District Response #29:
It is anticipated that the Consultant would participate in the District Scope phase.
**Question #30:**
So as to provide an even fee baseline for all submitting teams, can you specify what “Services During Construction” should be provided after the delivery of the Bridging Documents to the D/B Team?

**District Response #30:**
Given the services to be provided during the design-build phase to be advisory and on an as-needed basis, the District would consider negotiating a not-to-exceed fee following team selection(s).

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