



City of Alameda

October 17, 2024

Request for Proposals for City Facilities Plan Addendum No. 1

Addendum No. 1 is hereby issued to provide responses to questions submitted by prospective proposers, to clarify and/or modify the above-referenced Request for Proposals (RFP), and to distribute the list of attendees at the optional pre-proposal conference held on October 9, 2024.

A. Questions and Answers

Question 1: If a design team works on this project, would they be precluded from future projects?

Answer 1: *Since the selected design and consulting firms who work on the Facilities Plan will not be allowed to participate in the preparation and development of any future RFPs or other solicitations for architectural services for specific facilities identified in the Facilities Plan, we do not anticipate these firms being precluded from future projects.*

Question 2: Does the City have a budget or budgets in mind for the plan or associated future services? What's the plan for phasing?

Answer 2: *The City is looking for qualified consultants to provide professional fee estimates based on professional experience according to the goals stated in the RFP. If appropriate, proposers can propose a phased scope of work or optional tasks as ways to be budget conscious.*

Question 3: What is the point scale and rating system, and is there a 5-point preference for local firms?

Answer 3: *The evaluation and selection process outlined on pages 7 and 8 of the RFP has been updated as follows for the six criteria outlined in this section:*

1. *Ability of Proposer to Carry Out and Manage the Proposed Project (20%)*
2. *Qualifications (45%)*
3. *Project Understanding and Approach, Scope of Services, Budget and Schedule (20%)*
4. *Willingness to Comply with the Proposed Agreement Terms (10%)*
5. *Local Business (5%)*
6. *Proposed Pricing (Separately evaluated)*

Question 4: Does the City have background drawings, as-builts, etc.

Answer 4: *Some drawings are on file and will be made available upon request to the selected consultant.*

Question 5: Has there been abatement studies? Is there hazardous materials in any of the buildings?

Answer 5: *The Facility Condition Assessment Report for Fire Station 5 identifies that asbestos may be present in the facility with additional analysis needed to determine the extent of mitigation. The facility is*

also rumored to contain lead paint. The status of abatement studies or hazardous materials associated with the other identified facilities is unknown. However, the City does not anticipate such studies are part of this phase of the work.

Question 6: Will any Local, Small Business Certifications be considered for extra points?

Answer 6: See the answer to Question 3.

Question 7: Will the consultant hired for this scope of services be eligible to propose on the architectural services for the future projects as well?

Answer 7: See the answer to Question 1.

Question 8: RFP Section I.C (Project Objectives) includes a table of major facilities with a reference to "electrification" in the Potential Issues column associated with Maintenance Service Center. Can you clarify what is meant by "Electrification"?

Answer 8: The service center needs EV charging infrastructure as the City transitions to an Advanced Clean Fleet, as required by California Air Resources Board. Although emergency response vehicles are exempt from the Advanced Clean Fleet regulations, the City's local policy requires zero emission vehicles, when feasible. Any new fire station will need to consider EV charging infrastructure to support the fire fleet.

Question 9: Regarding the Fire Training Facility, thank you for clarifying that you're currently using a Containerized training system, can you expand on that and what are the requirements for training? FF1, FF2, Hazmat?

Answer 9: The City has an accredited Academy and currently uses a containerized training system. However, the current system is not optimal as the area is constrained and on tidelands. A more robust concrete facility is desired for the future that includes the following attributes:

- 3 to 4 story tower
- Mock house with balloon frame and basement component (basement will be challenging due to water table depending on selected location)
- Live fire burn room
- Gas-fueled interior propane prop
- Confined space prop
- Trench prop
- 2 to 3 classrooms with the ability to be combined into one
- Adequate office space and storage facility for equipment
- Conference room
- Drafting pit
- Roof prop
- Gas-fueled exterior prop
- Workshop (fabrication shop for wood and metal props)
- Vehicle extrication Pad
- USAR Pad
- Vehicle/apparatus storage

Question 10: Is the City expecting fueling stations for the service yards?

Answer 10: The City has fueling stations at its Maintenance Service Center and Fire Stations 1, 3 and 4. Any relocated service center will require fueling stations as will any new fire station.

Question 11: Can the City extend the proposal deadline to two weeks after the answers to questions are posted?

Answer 11: *At this point, the proposal deadline will not be extended.*

Question 12: Is environmental planning part of this master planning effort and, if so, to what level, who prepares and who manages?

Answer 12: *The City of Alameda is evaluating options for future space planning, as well as siting and feasibility analysis associated with certain major facilities needed for City operations. Depending on the City facility, some level of environmental background information may be required for the City to fully understand the opportunities and constraints.*

In terms of environmental review under CEQA, we anticipate the City's Facilities Plan would qualify for exemption from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15262 - Feasibility and Planning Studies. The City will continue to analyze the need for further environmental review during key milestones of the project. CEQA environmental review, if needed, will be managed by the City and prepared by a CEQA consultant under a separate contract.

Question 13: Generally, what is Baker Tilly's role on the project?

Answer 13: *Baker Tilly was engaged to help facilitate the solicitation process.*

Question 14: Specifically, will Baker Tilly continue on the project after the RFP process as a consulting project manager for the City or in some other capacity?

Answer 14: *The City has not contemplated a role for Baker Tilly, if any, following the conclusion of this solicitation process.*

Question 15: Will Baker Tilly prepare a master schedule and a master budget for the master plan?

Answer 15: *See the answer to Question 14.*

Question 16: Will Baker Tilly manage any aspects of the environmental planning services involved in the project (if required)?

Answer 16: *See the answer to Question 14.*

Question 17: Will Baker Tilly be researching funding possibilities?

Answer 17: *See the answer to Question 14.*

Question 18: If the specific tasks mentioned above are relevant to the project but do not fall to Baker Tilly, who on the team would they be assigned to?

Answer 18: *The RFP includes the scope of service expectations for this project. The City is relying on the professional expertise and judgment of proposing consultants to help inform the scope of services for this engagement and/or successor engagements related to the project.*

Question 19: What design consultants do you imagine the teams needing to include to complete the assessment and planning effort? (Structural, mechanical, plumbing, electrical, civil, estimating, environmental, public engagement, other?)

Answer 19: *See the answer to Question 18.*

Question 20: Specifically are teams to include Tier 1 assessments as part of this work for seismic evaluation of existing buildings?

Answer 20: Yes, a Tier 1 Assessment, per ASCE 41-13. The final report should include, at a minimum, a summary of the identified deficiencies with Tier 1 completed checklists as an appendix.

Question 21: Is bond funding the only funding mechanism the City is considering or are you also considering tax measure, grants, and/or other sources? If so, whose responsibility will it be to identify these potential sources of funding and evaluate their viability?

Answer 21: While other revenue generating options could be considered, a potential infrastructure bond is the most probable option under consideration. The responsibility for identifying other potential sources of funding and evaluating their viability rests with the City.

Question 22: What is the anticipated timeline for implementing the initial phases of the master plan?

Answer 22: Following completion of the City Facilities Study, it is anticipated that implementation will occur over a multi-year period. As indicated in the RFP Scope of Services, prospective proposers are expected to develop cost estimates, phasing strategies, and implementation steps for preferred site locations and scenarios, in consultation with City staff.

Question 23: Could the City provide more information on the expected deliverables with each of the tasks noted in the scope of services in the RFP?

Answer 23: The City is relying on qualified professional consultants to identify deliverables based on professional experience with similar engagements.

Question 24: Has the City established a rough fee budget for the scope of services defined in the RFP? If so, please share a range.

Answer 24: See the answer to Question 2.

Question 25: Please tell us more about who the stakeholders are. Specifically, are there members of the public who might be stakeholders or are the stakeholders referenced in the RFP all City employees and agents?

Answer 25: Stakeholders are facility users, neighbors/adjacent uses, as well as potentially the general community. City staff will help identify and notify stakeholders at key points in the process.

Question 26: Who is on the "City Facility Team" mentioned page 5, task 3.C?

Answer 26: The City facility team referenced in task 3.B on page 5 of the RFP will be comprised of key internal stakeholders, primarily including members of the City Manager's Office, Public Works Department, Fire Department, and Finance Department.

Question 27: How are potential new sites identified?

Answer 27: This will be through a collaborative process between the consultant team and City staff.

Question 28: Would the City consider postponing the fee proposal requirement from this initial round?

Answer 28: No.

Question 29: Once a short list of teams is identified based on qualifications, in the next round could those teams be asked to prepare a fee proposal based on a more defined scope of services and deliverables?

Answer 29: The City is not conducting a Request for Qualifications. Qualified proposers are required to submit pricing based on their understanding of the scope of services as written.

Question 30: Are you precluded from working on future projects related to this RFQ if you are on the project team?

Answer 30: See the answer to Question 1.

Question 31: Is there any public outreach/engagement needs?

Answer 31: Public outreach/engagement is covered in Section II of the RFP (Scope of Services).

Question 32: Will there be a single dedicated point of contact from the City/Baker Tilly or is the city expecting to group the sites in multiple packages with different project representatives?

Answer 32: The City will identify a single point of contact for the consultant team.

Question 33: Please clarify the Local Business bonus point. Will having members of the team located within the city limit qualify for the bonus points?

Answer 33: See the answer to Question 3.

Question 34: Re contract language, section 9. Hold Harmless... The language references the California Civil Code 2782.8; however, the part "a" of the language is in conflict with the Civil Code 2782.8. Is the City willing to review the Hold Harmless language so that the language is consistent with the Civil Code 2782.8?

Answer 34: Section 9 (Hold Harmless) of the agreement does not conflict with Civil Code section 2782.8, specifically because Section 9(b) provides an exception from indemnification requirements for design professional liability. No changes to the contract language are contemplated at this time.

Question 35: Please clarify the requirement for the Pollution Prevention Liability Insurance on Contract section 10. B, (6) as design professionals do not perform construction related work. Is this a requirement?

Answer 35: This provision was included as part of the contract template. It is not expected that the City will require pollution prevention insurance for purely design professional work that does not in itself involve physical construction or other physical activity that may result in hazardous materials excavation.

Question 36: What is the name on the Historical Registry that the Fire Station #2 is registered with?

Answer 36: Fire Station #2, located at 635 Pacific Ave, is listed locally on Alameda's Historical Buildings Study List with a "s" notation, indicating the property's eligibility for listing in the California Historical Resources Inventory. A State Department of Parks and Recreation form DPR-523 was prepared in 1980 to document this resource (see attached). Demolition of the building would require a Certificate of Approval by the City's Historical Advisory Board and CEQA environmental review.

Question 37: We would like to understand who runs the Alameda Animal Shelter. Is it the Police, City, or a volunteer run organization? Is it being considered for relocation?

Answer 37: The Alameda Animal Shelter is operated by the Friends of the Alameda Animal Shelter (FAAS), a nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporation. FAAS runs the shelter through a partnership with the City. Future siting needs for the shelter will be considered as part of this study.

B. List of October 9, 2024 Optional Pre-proposal Conference Attendees*

Dong Kim, DIALOG Design	Kim-Van Truong, ELS Architecture & Urban Design	Phil Klinkon, ARCADIS
Eric Price, Lowney Architecture	Byron Wong, RRM Design Group	Leslie Patterson, ZFA Structural Engineers
David Masenten, ELS Architecture & Urban Design	Julie Martinez, The Miller Hull Partnership	Madison Jackson, Siegel and Strain Architects

Krista Beatie, Griffin Structures	Diana Banh, ELS Architecture & Urban Design	Giana Stanco, Merrill Morris Partners Landscape Architecture and Urban Design
Tim Letavish, MW Studios	Michael Green, RA-DA	Jen Colosi, CSW ST2 (Civil Engineering, Surveying, Landscape Architecture)
Andrew Butt, Interactive Resources, INC	Carolina Mindiola, Interactive Resources, INC	Eve Nelson, Principal, mack5
Chris Ford, BRW Architects	Sarah Bonser, ARCADIS	Rania Alomar, RA-DA

****Note: The representatives listed above are those who chose to provide contact information during or following the pre-proposal conference.***

Attachments:

- A. *California Department of Parks and Recreation Historic Resources Inventory, Alameda Fire Station No. 2, 635 Pacific Avenue*