ADDENDUM NO. 1  
(Issued June 11, 2021)

Request for Qualifications and Proposals
Architect Services for Design of Various Projects under $5 Million in Construction Cost

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:
Any inquiries regarding the Local Business Policy shall be directed to Philip Lang by email at Plang@Luster.com or by phone at (510) 593-8181. Written questions shall also be copied to OUSD contact persons noted in the RFQ/P.

District Clarification #2:
As indicated in the June 1 Zoom Pre-Submittal Conference, the Facilities Planning and Management Department has transitioned its program and construction program software to COLBI Docs with Account-Ability by Colbi Technologies. It shall be imperative that selected firms become fully acclimated to COLBI Docs to ensure they would be completely proficient through all project phases.

District Correction #1:
Section 5 Statement Format and Content; Subsection H.2: The aggregate amount for Commercial General Liability Insurance shall be Two Million Dollars ($2,000,000).

Question #1:
In Attachment 1 (included in this email), the Bond Projects listed (aside from a couple – projects listed for Hillcrest and Piedmont Elementary Schools) are all above $5 million. Can you please clarify??

District Response #1:
Attachment 1 was provided as an overview of the November 2020 Bond Measure. It is anticipated that projects under $5M will be from District-wide Initiatives. Specific projects have not been identified but may include ADA compliant projects, facilities & technology improvements, health & safety upgrades, energy efficiency & sustainability projects and utilization improvements.

Question #2:
May I assume that if we submit electronically, that one copy will be acceptable and not five?

District Response #2:
One electronic copy of the proposal is acceptable.
Question #3:
I would like to find out which certifying agencies are accepted by the District for LBE, SLBE, and SLRBE. The question is in reference to applying for architectural design work with the District. Who can I contact about this?

District Response #3:
The RFQ/P for Architect Services for Design of Various Projects under $5M in Construction Cost found in OUSD’s website listed the accepted certifying agencies and provided the location of the link to the full policy.

Question #4:
I am emailing to formalize the question I asked in the Pre-Proposal meeting today. In section H.5 under Insurance (Mandatory Requirements) it states a deductible amount not to exceed $7,500. This is much lower than typical and may not be possible to obtain. Our current deductible amount is $75,000 which is much more typical for contracts we see with other Districts. We would like to request that this section be revised to list a deductible amount of $75,000.

District Response #4:
The deductible amount indicated in the RFQ/P for the architect-of-record and sub-consultants’ error and omission insurance shall be revised to an amount not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000.00). This would correspond to the amount indicated in the District’s Agreement for Architectural Services (Attachment A).

Question #5:
I thought of one more question I’d like to ask. Under section I. you ask for a list of our current projects with start and completion dates and explain how we will effectively manage and perform the District’s projects along with those projects. <Firm x> currently has more than 200 active projects. We can provide this data for all of the active projects, but I wanted to just confirm that is what you wanted before we did that. If it is ok with you, we would rather provide a summary of active projects (or maybe top 20 or 50 or some subset of them) and describe how we will manage our active projects and perform on your projects at the same time. This is a challenge that we understand well and a question that we have answered in this way many times on other RFPs.

District Response #5:
The District is seeking a focused response and so detailed narratives of three to five projects should be provided. Providing a list of current projects with brief project information would also demonstrate firm’s experience to handle a range of projects.

Question #6:
How many firms will be in the pool?

District Response #6:
The District has not set a limit on the number of firms to be included in the pool.
Question #7:
How many firms will be invited to propose for each project?

District Response #7:
Typically, the District will be requesting fee proposals for future projects from at least three firms.

Question #8:
If selected for this pool (under $5M) will AOR be precluded for other bond projects/pools (over $5M, D/B)?

District Response #8:
Inclusion in the pre-qualified pool will not preclude those firms from proposing on bond measure projects over $5M.

Question #9:
When would these projects start?

District Response #9:
The District’s Spending Plan for the first group of projects has not been finalized but the expected timeline is August 2021.

Question #10:
Can you distribute the attendance list sooner than the 11th?

District Response #10:
The attendee list has been posted on the District website.

Question #11:
Can you elaborate on the list of potential projects, the list included with the RFQ indicated mostly projects over $5M

District Response #11:
See District Response #1.

Question #12:
Please confirm that the Virtual Pre-Submittal Conference was not mandatory.

District Response #12:
Attendance to the virtual Pre-Submittal Conference was not mandatory.

Question #13:
For Statement and Format section 5, Item B, Mandatory Qualifications, please clarify which individuals this information is required from, ie, just the PIC and Lead Architect?

District Response #13:
Provide licensing information for the Principal-in-Charge. Also, provide licensing information for the Lead Architect if that person will be the signatory of documents submitted to regulatory agencies.
Question #14:
Based on the anticipated scope of work, and relative to SLBE/LBE calculation, will specialty consultants such as Cost Estimating, Acoustical Engineer, Fire Protection or Food Service be required for the project and if so, can they be included in the calculation?

District Response #14:
At this time, the District is seeking firms that could demonstrate the ability to assemble teams that meet the District’s LBE/SLBE requirements and provide basic services limited to the usual and customary civil, landscape architecture, structural, mechanical and electrical engineering services. The District would accept a cost estimator as part of their proposed teaming.

Question #15:
Are there any items that do not count in the 15 page limit, such as insurance or license information?

District Response #15:
The RFQ/P’s statement for format and content (Section 5) indicated that the order and format should be followed. However, respondents may reference full document(s) under requested Sections 5a thru 5k that would then be placed in an Appendix. Documents in the Appendix will not be counted against the 15-page limit).

Question #16:
Section 5.D, “School Facilities Planning and Design Experience” asks that we provide information for “every public works project over the last 3 years, including start and finish dates, project cost, contractor, owner, and owner contact information.” As a firm that does primarily public works projects, this would be a long list, around 50 projects. With the limited page count, does the District wish us to list all of those projects, or may we cull this list down to representative school projects?

District Response #16:
Respondents may condense the list by noting projects by school districts and detailing representative projects.

Question #17:
Section 5.E, “Past Performance Record” asks for reporting on “Involvement in litigation, arbitration or mediation.” Would the District consider putting a time limit, such as 5 years, on this question?

District Response #17:
Reporting any issue(s) that occurred within the last 5 years would be acceptable.

Question #18:
Section 5.H “Insurance” requests “Attach a letter from your insurance company indicating your firm’s ability to provide insurance.” Will a Certificate of Insurance suffice?

District Response #18:
Providing a Certificate of Insurance showing current coverages would be acceptable.
Question #19:
Will the District allow us to propose subconsultants with pending or in progress Oakland Local or Small Business certifications, providing that they are certified by the time of the contract?
District Response #19:
Respondents may include firms that have pending/in progress certifications but must clearly note that status in the proposal.

Question #20:
Due to the nature of an on-call, there are often different subconsultants appropriate for different projects. Would the District allow us to propose multiple subconsultants and then select the appropriate one as jobs are assigned?
District Response #20:
See District Response #1. Also, listing sub-consultants for the proposal would not preclude future teaming adjustments.

Question #21:
Since this is an on-call project, will the District allow for substitution or addition of subconsultants in the future, providing we appropriately conform to the District’s Local Business Utilization Policy?
District Response #21:
See District Responses #1 and #20.

Question #22:
Please define which pages may be left out of the 15 page limit. At a minimum, may we exclude the TOC and the forms under “K. Other Contract Documents”?
District Response #22:
See District Response #15. All requested information in the order and format must be provided in the statement of qualifications. Respondents may organize proposals to include an Appendix in order to adhere to the 15-page limit.

Question #23:
In order to include all 11 sections within the 15-page limit in an organized manner, would the district consider excluding cover pages, tabs/divider pages, cover letter, table of contents, resumes, Local Business Participation Form, and Project Data Sheets from the page limit?
District Response #23:
See District Responses #15 and #22.

Question #24:
Under Section H. Insurance, would the district accept an Insurance Certificate instead of a letter?
District Response #24:
Providing a Certificate of Insurance showing current coverages would be acceptable.
Question #25:
Can I get a recording of the June 1 virtual meeting?

District Response #25:
There was no recording made of the June 1 virtual meeting.

Question #26:
Can the submission date be extended for the number of days late that some of us received the email notification?

District Response #26:
No time extensions are being granted at this time.

Question #27:
Under Item 5, Statement Form & Content, The RFQ for requests “An unbound wet-signed original, five (5) copies and a PDF version on a flash drive of the statement must be provided, with no more than 15 single-sided pages in total length.” Are any SOQ sections (such as cover letter, table of contents, or team resumes) exempt from the 15-page limit, or may they be included in an appendix?

District Response #27:
See District Responses #15 and #22.

Question #28:
Please confirm that electronic submittal is acceptable and no hard copy submittal will be required.

District Response #28:
Electronic submittal is acceptable in lieu of hard copies and flash drive per RFQ/P. Also, see District Response #2.

Question #29:
Article 8, section 8.1 of the sample contract references events “directly or indirectly” arising from the architect’s omission. Would it be possible to revise the language to delete “indirectly”?

District Response #29:
No revisions will be made to the agreement. Also, see Section 4 of RFQ/P.

Question #30:
Article 10, section 10.1 of the sample contract references the deductible amount of less that $10,000. Section H, 5 (page 7) of the RFQ/P references not to exceed deductible of $7,500. These sections are contradicting. In addition, we would like to share that depending on the firm’s size, the insurance deductible may be a lot higher and this does not mean that there is risk for less coverage. In order to minimize the insurance premium for larger project scales, the deductible is higher. We request that this requirement is waived.

District Response #30:
See District Response #4.
Question #31:
Confirm that prime/sub rate sheets, insurance COI/Letter and LBE participation form are NOT included in the page count
District Response #31:
See District Responses #15 and #22.

Question #32:
On page 6 of the RFQ/P under F. Project Team, Item #3 states to “Identify all of your proposed consultants for the Project and provide their qualifications.” As the RFQ/P states on page 4 that our response must be “no more than 15-single sided pages in total length”, could the District please confirm that subconsultants’ key personnel resumes are not required as part of the requested “qualifications”. Or if they are required, will the District accept including resumes in an Appendix that does not count towards the 15-page limit?
District Response #32:
See District Responses #15 and #22.

Question #33:
Regarding section H. Insurance, could the District please confirm that a Sample Certificate of Insurance from our insurance company that indicates the coverage levels identified is acceptable as a “letter”?
District Response #33:
See District Response #18.

Question #34:
Could the District please clarify which sections count towards the 15-single-sided page limit? Are Cover Pages, Table of Contents, Section Dividers, Resumes, and Hourly Billing Rates excluded from the 15-single sided page count?
District Response #34:
See District Responses #15 and #22.

Question #35:
Do we need to complete the “Local Business Participation Worksheet” (page 24 of the RFQ/P PDF) as indicated in Section K? Is it acceptable instead to just list and identify the LBE/SLBE certified firms on our proposed team? It is difficult to complete the form as any percentages will only be estimates since this RFQ/P is not for one specific project and the required scope(s) of work have yet to be defined. Alternatively, we could provide a range of percentages if that is acceptable.
District Response #35:
Yes. See District Responses #14.

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