



DALZIEL BUILDING • 250 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA, SUITE 4314 • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612  
Oakland Public Works Department  
Capital Contracts Division

(510) 238-7270  
FAX (510) 238-2346  
TDD (510) 238-3254

**ADDENDUM NO. 01**  
**AND QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**  
**March 28, 2024**

**Subject: RFQ – Multi-Disciplinary Professional Services On-Call 2024**  
**To: All Prospective Proposers**

---

The clarifications, additions and/or deletions contained in this **ADDENDUM** shall be made a part of the bid or proposal solicitation documents (plans, specifications, RFP, RFQ, etc.) for the above-referenced project, and shall be subject to all applicable requirements there-under, as if originally shown and/or specified. The documents are revised as follows:

**IMPORTANT: You must acknowledge this Addendum in your Proposal or Qualifications Transmittal letter or it may be deemed non-responsive.**

1. The following attachments were unintentionally omitted from the RFQ and are attached at the end of this addendum:
  - Consultant Information Sheet
  - Relevant Project Experience Matrix
  - Schedule I Sanctuary City Contracting & Investment
  - Schedule Z Certification of Debarment and Suspension
2. The evaluation criteria table in *Section XIII. Selection Process, A. SOQ Evaluation* (page 53) is being modified as follows:

<u>Max Pts</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
50	<b>EXPERIENCE.</b> Past, recently completed, or on-going projects that will substantiate experience. Demonstrated ability to provide technical assistance for a broad range services. Prior experience and ability to work on projects as outlined in the discipline’s scope of work with City staff, community groups, other stakeholders, and to address the various interests in developing successful transportation and public works projects.

- 20            **QUALIFICATIONS.** Level of experience, professional background, and qualifications of team members and firm/organization comprising the team. Level of technological advancement and/or innovation. Knowledge and experience with regulatory agencies and ability to identify and secure all necessary permits, as applicable to discipline.
- 15            **ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIVENESS.** Availability of staff to respond to task order opportunities and specialized resources, if any. Cohesiveness of the project team. Cost and quality control procedures. Ability to perform on short notice and under time constraints. Capacity and flexibility to meet schedules, including any unexpected work.
- 15            **APPROACH.** Understanding of the nature and extent of the services required. Design and management processes. Ability to develop consensus among stakeholders. Awareness of potential (typical) problems and possible solutions.
- 100           **POSSIBLE POINTS**

3. The Transportation Planning discipline will no longer require a civil engineering license for the SOQ phase. Some task orders may require a civil engineering license, which would be noted in a future Task Order RFP.
4. The address the cover letter should be delivered to is being changed to the City Clerk: 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza # 1st, Oakland, CA 94612.
5. Attendance sheets for each of the Pre-Submittal Meetings are attached at the end of this addendum.
6. Section XII, subsection 7, Billing Rates, "b." was unintentionally deleted, and should read as follows:
  - b. Mark-up on all reimbursable expenses, i.e. sub-consultant fee, printing, production costs, photography, equipment rental, mailing/postage, use of vehicle, software procurement, materials acquisition, etc., shall be individually negotiated and shall be subject to the City's approval, but may not in any case exceed 10%.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

These questions and answers are provided for the convenience of all proposers. Nothing in this Questions and Answers document modifies the bid or proposal solicitation documents (plans, specifications, RFP, RFQ, etc.) for the above-referenced project.

The questions and answers received were organized into sections. If questions were submitted to a specific on-call but were related to all disciplines, they were categorized into the most relevant General Questions section noted below. Duplicative questions were combined. Only questions specific to a discipline's scope of work were included in the discipline-specific sections. The sections below include:

- General Questions: Related to Local Business Program and Prime/Sub-Consultant Requirements
- General Questions: Contracting-Related
- General Questions: Insurance-Related
- General Questions: Submittal Requirements and Tiers
- Transportation Planning and Transportation Engineering On-Calls
- Geotechnical Engineering On-Call
- Construction Management On-Call
- Public Space Management On-Call
- Special Inspection and Materials Testing On-Call

### GENERAL QUESTIONS: Related to Local Business Program and Prime/Sub-Consultant Requirements

Question 1. If we are not a Local/Small Local Business Enterprise (L/SLBE), does it benefit us to partner with L/SLBE's during the Statement of Qualifications phase?

**Answer:** Consultants will not receive L/SLBE points for **subconsultants** during the Statement of Qualifications evaluation phase. Certified L/SLBEs may receive additional points as **prime consultants** during the SOQ phase as noted in the RFQ. Consultants will be required to meet the L/SLBE program requirements during the task order phase.

Question 2. Should a prime respond with their qualifications as an individual firm or respond based on an initial team of subconsultants covering a set of qualifications?

**Answer:** A prime can choose to respond with their qualifications and/or the qualifications of an initial team. The City is not evaluating L/SLBE program compliance during the Statement of Qualifications evaluation phase. Qualifications of a prime and its subconsultants will be further assessed at the Task Order evaluation stage (Schedule E).

Question 3. For the Oakland Resident Workforce Preference Points, is the Workforce percentage shown in Table II based off staff in a firm's Oakland office only or based off the entire number of staff in a firm?

**Answer:** The percentage is based off of the entire workforce of the firm, not just those working in an Oakland office.

Question 4. The RFQ specifies the inclusion of Schedule E-2 Oakland Workforce Verification (if seeking preference points) in submittal. Ninyo & Moore is ready to submit this form should Local and Small Local Business Enterprise (L/SLBE) participation be mandatory. If such participation is mandated, are employees of the County of Alameda eligible for inclusion?

**Answer:** Schedule E-2 is an optional form that L/SLBE certified firms can provide for preference points during the SOQ evaluation phase. Participation is not mandated, and is inclusive of the City of Oakland only, not the entirety of the County. All task orders that are not utilizing the Mandatory Preferred Local Business program are required to meet the L/SLBE program requirements.

Question 5. Could you please clarify whether Local and Small Local Business Enterprise (L/SLBE) participation is required during the SOQ submittal, as page 4 of the RFP states it's not required, but page 49 mentions additional points for L/SLBE participation? Additionally, can you confirm if there's a 50% minimum L/SLBE participation requirement for Task Order Agreements over \$50,000, as stated in section 5b?

**Answer:** L/SLBE participation will not be reviewed at the SOQ phase; it will be reviewed and required at the Task Order phase. However, as noted on Page 49, up to 7.5 additional preference points are available at the SOQ phase for 1) tenure in the City of Oakland for certified L/SLBE firms, and 2) respondents having an existing workforce that includes Oakland residents. L/SLBE participation is required for all Task Order Agreements over \$50,000 that are not utilizing the Mandatory Preferred Small Business Program. The L/SLBE participation requirement is 50%, unless adjusted by an Availability Analysis or waived by City Council action.

Question 6. Please clarify what should be the contents of Section 5 in the proposal (page 49 of 72)? Is it enough for us to qualify if we provide evidence of Oakland residents within our team and evidence of Mentor-Protégé relationship?

**Answer:** Page 49 notes that preference points awarded during the SOQ phase include preference points for 1) tenure in the City of Oakland for certified L/SLBE firms, and 2) respondents having an existing workforce that includes Oakland residents. Preference points for Mentor-Protégé partnership will be assessed at the Task Order evaluation stage.

Question 7. On the Oakland Workforce Verification Form, can you provide a list of possible Job Classifications that we can use to classify our personnel?

**Answer:** There is no list of possible job classifications. Respondents should list the classifications for their workforce.

Question 8. The Oakland Workforce Verification Schedule E-2 requests personally identifiable information about our employees that are Oakland residents. We recognize that this is a voluntary form to complete for Oakland Resident Workforce Preference points, and we would like to receive the points, but we do not want to provide this personally identifiable information about our Oakland resident employees. Under the California Public Records Act, our proposal, including this Schedule E-2, could be disclosed as a public record. Can the City of Oakland provide an alternative option for reporting this information and securing these points that does not require proposers to provide the personally identifiable information of their employees?

**Answer:** This information is required for the City to assess Oakland Resident Workforce preference points. Under the California Public Records Act, not all records are disclosable, including records with personally identifiable information, which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Question 9. I understand the preference for LBEs. Is there a preference or benefit for DBEs or is there is only a local preference?

**Answer:** No. There is no preference for DBEs.

Question 10. For task orders that include work that the prime consultant that is holding the on-call contract would like to pass on to a subconsultant, can the prime add subconsultants to the team at that time, even if those subconsultants are not included in the subconsultant list in the on-call contract? Do these subconsultants have to have their own on-call contracts already to be able to be added to another team?

**Answer:** Prime firms may add subconsultants at the task order phase; subconsultants do not have to have their own on-call contracts.

Question 11. Does the City have list of firms that satisfy the current criteria for the L/SLBE program?

**Answer:** Yes, a list is available on the City's website and can be accessed here: <https://oaklandca.diversitycompliance.com/>.

Question 12. If a Task Order receives less than 3 pre-qualified and less than 3 proposals from SLBEs, will the resulting Task Order proposals need to meet the 50% SLBE? If not, to what extent will SLBE % be taken into account when reviewing proposals?

**Answer:** Yes, there is a 50% minimum L/SLBE participation requirement for all Task Order Agreements over \$50,000, unless adjusted by an Availability Analysis or waived by City Council action.

Question 13. Confirm that non-SLBE firms would not have a chance at Task Orders of \$250,000 or less unless fewer than 3 proposals are submitted by SLBE firms (these are rotated through or solicited from the SLBE firms only).

**Answer:** Pre-qualified non-SLBE firms may have a chance at responding to Task Orders under \$250,000 if the minimum conditions for the Mandatory Preferred Small Local Business Program (MPSLBP) are not met. The City Administrator may solicit proposals from pre-qualified non-SLBEs if at least three (3) proposals are not submitted by SLBE firms – the requirements of the L/SLBE Program will apply.

Question 14. Can proposers who are not certified L/SLBE firms submit as prime for this on-call?

**Answer:** Yes. L/SLBE program compliance will be evaluated at the task order level, not at the RFQ level. All firms will be required to meet the program requirements at the task order level, but the prime does not have to be an L/SLBE certified business to meet those requirements.

Question 15. If there is (for example) a \$500k procurement given to LBE firms to bid on and the firms do not bid, how is the LBE requirement calculated when the procurement is then sent to the non-LBE firms?

**Answer:** All task orders above \$250,000 will go to all firms on the list with sufficient capacity, regardless of the prime consultant's L/SLBE status. All firms will be required to meet the City's L/SLBE program.

Question 16. If a firm has a local presence and office in Oakland, CA, but it is NOT the Corporate Headquarters, does that still comply with the requirements for certification as a Local Business Enterprise (LBE)?

**Answer:** No. At this time, a firm must be headquartered in the City of Oakland to be eligible for LBE certification.

Question 17. Will the City consider the County of Alameda to be eligible as a Local and Small Local Business Enterprise (L/SLBE)?

**Answer:** A firm must be certified as an L/SLBE by the City of Oakland to qualify as a local business enterprise.

Question 18. If a firm is a certified LBE, does that mean it meets the 50% minimum participation requirement on its own? Or does that mean the firm still needs to sub-contract with or find a SLBE to meet the requirement?

**Answer:** The firm still needs to meet the 25% SLBE requirement unless adjusted by an Availability Analysis or waived by City Council action.

Question 19. Can a small business, interested in participating in the upcoming RFQ 271409—RFQ FOR MULTI-DISCIPLINARY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES ON-CALL, 2024 act as both a prime and a subcontractor?

**Answer:** Yes.

Question 20. Please confirm that nothing is required to be submitted for the Local and Small Local Business Enterprise Program section.

**Answer:** Nothing is required.

Question 21. We are in the process of putting together our SOQ for the construction management category. What would happen if we get awarded as a non SLBE company but we acquire the SLBE certification between the awarded time and receiving the first task order. Could we switch to the SLBE company pool?

**Answer:** The resulting On-Call Vendor List (OCVL) from this RFQ has an annual enrollment opportunity to allow SLBE vendors not currently on the OCVL an opportunity to demonstrate their qualifications to be included on the list.

Question 22. Please confirm/clarify which preference points will be given at the SOQ level.

- a. We understand that Preference Points for Prime Consultants Only during this SOQ will be given as follows:
  - i. Max 2.5 Points for L/SLBE Tenure in Oakland for Certified L/SLBE Prime Consultants only
  - ii. Max 5 Points for Existing Workforce that includes Oakland Residents for Any Prime Consultant
- b. However, we understand/assume all other participation preference points will be deferred to future Task Order RFPs as part of a Future Schedule E, and will not be given at this SOQ phase:
  - i. L/SLBE Prime or sub-consultants, non-certified/non-local business preference points, or
  - ii. L/SLBE Prime or sub-consultant certified businesses preference points, or
  - iii. VLSBE Prime or sub-consultant certified businesses preference points, or

iv. Mentor-Protégé Agreement Preference Points

**Answer:** The above is correct

Question 23. Can you please confirm that if we are submitting for the CM On-Call, Schedule E does NOT need to be included in the Statement of Qualifications that will be submitted to the City?

**Answer:** Schedule E is not required with the submittal of the SOQ.

Question 24. Many Small Local Business Enterprise firms do not offer “all of the services” listed in the Construction Management section and therefore would need to include the skills, abilities, personnel, etc. from larger firms as subconsultants. Is it acceptable for a Small Local Business Enterprise firm to submit a Statement of Qualifications for only the short list of specialized services that the small firm can perform? If this is acceptable, will the City establish a separate Task Order by Rotation list for the MPSLBP opportunities, or will there only be one rotation list for all firms and opportunities?

**Answer:** Yes, SLBE firm may submit SOQ for only the short list of specialized services that the small firm can perform. If there are three or more SLBE firms on the list and the task order is less than \$250,000 the City will rotate offering Task Orders to SLBE firms based on Statement of Qualifications ranking, provided that the final selection and award of the task order be contingent on demonstrated competence and qualifications for the types of services to be performed, at fair and reasonable prices to the City. Task orders over \$250,000 will be rotated among all firms as noted in the RFQ.

Question 25. On page 34 of 72, SECTION VIII. Construction Management. The RFQ states “...Qualified consultants should have experience in construction management (CM) and inspection for at least one or more types of projects noted below:...”. On page 35 of 72, the RFQ states “...Firms offering unique or specialized services and resources are encouraged to apply.” On page 37 of 72, the RFQ states “...The selected CM consultant(s) must be prepared to perform **all of the services listed above**....Firms offering unique or specialized services and resources are encouraged to submit qualifications.”

Please provide additional clarifications to the following:

- i. If a Small Local Business Enterprise firm is interested in submitting a Statement of Qualifications for Construction Management with the specific intent to compete for small contracting opportunities within the MPSLBP, must the SOQ include the capabilities to perform “all of the services” listed in the Construction Management section?
- ii. Many Small Local Business Enterprise firms do not offer “all of the services” listed in the Construction Management section and therefore would need to include the skills, abilities, personnel, etc. from larger firms



as subconsultants. Is it acceptable for a Small Local Business Enterprise firm to submit a Statement of Qualifications for only the short list of specialized services that the small firm can perform? If this is acceptable, will the City establish a separate Task Order by Rotation list for the MPSLBP opportunities, or will there only be one rotation list for all firms and opportunities?

**Answer:** Note that all firms on the Construction Management On-Call will be expected to rotate task orders over \$250,000. If there are at least three SLBE's on the list, those firms will rotate task orders under \$250,000 in addition to larger task orders, as noted in the RFQ. SLBE's may sub work to other firms, but it is expected that a significant portion of the awarded Task Order will be performed by an SLBE or Very Small Local Business Enterprise (VSLBE).

Question 26. The RFQ states on page 3 of 72 "There will be only one tier per discipline, however, Certified Small Local Business Enterprise (SLBE's) may qualify for the Mandatory Preferred Small Local Business Program..." Are firms allowed subconsultants on the team to help meet LBE/SLBE target goals and get the additional points?

**Answer:** The Mandatory Preferred Small Local Business Program (MPSLBP) is available to all City of Oakland certified SLBE's who are prime consultants. The program is not based on points, and sub-consultants will not help a non-SLBE firm qualify for the MPSLBP.

Question 27. On page 7 of 72, C. PROJECTS AND TASK ORDERS, Mandatory Preferred Small Local Business Enterprise Program for Task Orders Under \$250,000. The RFQ states "For all Task Orders under \$250,000, the City will utilize the Mandatory Preferred Small Local Business Program (MPSLBP) when there are at least three pre-qualified Small Local Business Enterprises (SLBE) on the On-Call Vendor List (OCVL)."

· Please provide additional clarifications to the MPSLBP when awarded through Requests for Proposal (RFP) process.

i. In the future when responding to the MPSLBP Task Order Request for Proposal and completing Schedule E:

1. What is the default minimum percentage of work that must be completed by the Small Local Business Enterprise Prime Consultant?
2. What is the minimum default percentage of work (in total on Schedule E) that must be completed by Oakland Certified Small Local Business Enterprise firms?
3. What is the minimum default percentage of work (in total on Schedule E) that must be completed by Oakland Certified Local Business Enterprise firms?
4. What is the maximum percentage of work that can be completed by non-local firms?

5. If non-local firms are permitted to be included on Schedule E, can a Prime Consultant on this Discipline On-Call Vendor List (OCVL) perform work as a subconsultant in the MPSLBP?
- ii. In the future when the City issues a MPSLBP Task Order Request for Proposal to three or more pre-qualified Small Local Business Enterprises (SLBE) on the OCVL:
    1. If only one or two firms submit a Proposal, will the City select from the submitted Proposal(s)?
    2. If only one or two firms submit a Proposal, will the City cancel the MPSLBP Task Order Request for Proposal and reissue a Task Order Request for Proposal to the OCVL?
    3. If the City cancels the original MPSLBP solicitation because of few or no responses from SLBE Prime Consultants and re-issues the same Task Order Request for Proposal to the OCVL, will the City lower the required Schedule E SLBE percentages because the City has determined that the SLBE firms on the OCVL are unable/unwilling to participate as a Prime Consultant?
  - iii. Please provide additional clarifications to the MPSLBP when awarded through the Rotation process.
    1. In the future when the City issues a Task Order by Rotation to a SLBE Prime Consultant based on the Statement of Qualifications ranking, the SLBE Prime Consultant will be required to complete a Schedule E.
    2. Is the SLEB Prime Consultant only permitted to use subconsultants that were originally proposed in the submitted SOQ? Or can the SLBE Prime Consultant add subconsultants to the team (specifically if said subconsultants were excluded from the original Statement of Qualifications) in an effort to fulfill the desired services associated with the subject Task Order work.
    3. Is it anticipated that when Task Orders are issued using the Task Order by Rotation process, the Local/Small Local Business Enterprise participation requirements will be 50% Small Local Business Enterprise and 50% non-L/SLBE participation **or** 25% minimum Small Local Business Enterprise and 25% minimum Local Business Enterprise and 50% non-L/SLBE participation? Or will MPSLBP Task Orders by Rotation prohibit the use of all non-L/SLBE firms?

**Answer:**

- i. MPSLBP via RFP:
  1. It is expected that a significant portion of the awarded Task Order will be performed by an SLBE or Very Small Local Business Enterprise (VSLBE).
  2. It is expected that a significant portion of the awarded Task Order will be performed by an SLBE or Very Small Local Business Enterprise (VSLBE).

3. It is expected that a significant portion of the awarded Task Order will be performed by an SLBE or Very Small Local Business Enterprise (VSLBE).
  4. It is expected that a significant portion of the awarded Task Order will be performed by an SLBE or Very Small Local Business Enterprise (VSLBE).
  5. Yes.
- ii. Issuing Task Orders through MPSLBP
    1. No. Three proposals must be received.
    2. Yes, the City will reissue the task order to all consultants with sufficient remaining capacity on the OCVL.
    3. No, the City will follow the L/SLBE program requirements for all task orders.
  - ii. Awarding MSLBP through rotation task orders
    1. A Schedule E is always required for a task order.
    2. Yes, new subconsultants can be added.
    3. It is expected that a significant portion of the awarded Task Order will be performed by an SLBE or Very Small Local Business Enterprise (VSLBE).

Question 28. On page 8 of 72, Non-MPSLBP Task Orders for Public Space Management, Construction Management, and Special Inspection and Materials Testing. Please provide additional clarifications to the following:

- i. In the future when the City issues a Task Order by Rotation to a Prime Consultant based on the Statement of Qualifications ranking, the Prime Consultant will be required to complete Schedule E.
  1. Is the Prime Consultant required to complete a minimum percentage of the Task Order work?
  2. Is the Prime Consultant only permitted to use subconsultants that were originally proposed in the submitted SOQ? Or can the Prime Consultant add subconsultants to the team (specifically if said subconsultants were excluded from the original Statement of Qualifications) in an effort to fulfill the desired services associated with the subject Task Order work.
  3. Is it anticipated that when Task Orders are issued using the Task Order by Rotation process, the default Local/Small Local Business Enterprise participation requirements will be a minimum of 50% Local/Small Local Business Enterprise and a maximum of 50% non-L/SLBE participation?
  4. Is the Prime Consultant permitted to use other Prime Consultants on the OCVL for the subject Discipline? Specifically, Prime Consultants on the OCVL that may be requested to respond to a Non-MPSLBP solicitation may need Local/Small Local Business Enterprise firms to be included on Schedule E, and these same Local/Small Local Business Enterprise firms may also be Prime Consultants within this subject Discipline. Further, it would be

required that if a Prime Consultant on the OCVL decided to be a subconsultant on one or more teams/Proposals for the subject solicitation, that Prime Consultant would be prohibited from submitting a Proposal as a Prime Consultant on this same Request for Proposal.

**Answer:**

1. No.
2. No, new subconsultants can be added.
3. Yes, the L/SLBE program requirements apply to task orders by rotation.
4. Yes, a firm may be a prime or sub-consultant on the same on call vendor list. There will not be any proposals as part of the task order rotations to the second question is not applicable.

**GENERAL QUESTIONS: Contracting-Related**

Question 29. Can a firm be both a prime consultant as well as a subconsultant on another team? Can firms be both sub and prime within a single discipline (e.g., Transportation Engineering) for the SOQ?

**Answer:** Yes, only to determine qualifications. The prime cannot compete in a task order if they are listed as a sub with another prime for the same Task Order.

Question 30. Please clarify: Does the Schedule E-2 need to be in our submittal or are we uploading it as a separate document via the Administration tab in our iSupplier account?

**Answer:** Yes, Schedule E-2 should be submitted with the submittal package.

Question 31. The RFP says that we need to fill out the Consultant Information Sheet and Relevant Project Experience Matrix and include them with our submittal. These documents are not in the RFP. Can you provide the documents, or clarification of what is required in the matrix?

**Answer:** Yes, see the attachments to this addendum.

Question 32. For future competitive task order submittals, can we create teams with one prime and several subconsultants if those subconsultants are firms that originally submitted to the bench as primes?

**Answer:** Yes. A consultant can be on one qualified/On-Call list but when an RFP is requested they must choose either be a prime or a sub, not both on the same RFP.

Question 33. Should consultants complete Schedule Z-A or Z-B or both? Should subconsultants fill out form Z-B and Z-A?

**Answer:** Certification Form A shall be submitted.

Question 34. In Section XII, subsection 7, "Billing Rates," has item "B" been intentionally omitted in this section?

**Answer:** B was unintentionally omitted. It should read:

- b. Mark-up on all reimbursable expenses, i.e. sub-consultant fee, printing, production costs, photography, equipment rental, mailing/postage, use of vehicle, software procurement, materials acquisition, etc., shall be individually negotiated and shall be subject to the City's approval, but may not in any case exceed 10%.

Question 35. What are the net payment terms under this Agreement?

**Answer:** Payment will be made monthly as long the work is done.

Question 36. Will the Contractor's invoices be paid utilizing the City of Oakland Prompt Payment Ordinance?

**Answer:** Oakland's Prompt Payment Ordinance is applicable to this RFQ/RFP

Question 37. The client is requiring A/VII for the A.M. Best Rating - Will the client accept an A.M. Best Rating of A-/X?

**Answer:** Yes, the City will accept an A.M. BEST Rating of A-/X.

Question 38. As stated on page 52 of the RFQ: Billing rates shall be fully burdened and inclusive of all costs, travel mileage, equipment costs, communications, parking fees. Does the City want submitting firms to include labor in its materials costs or to separate labor out from materials as they are accounted for differently by different types of firms.

**Answer:** No, please keep billing rates inclusive and include labor cost to the full billing rate.

Question 39. For the cost proposal, would you like us to use loaded or unloaded rates? What is the fee that the City considers?

**Answer:** The billing rates submitted shall be fully burdened ("loaded") and inclusive of all costs (i.e., base salary, fringe benefits, overhead, travel mileage, equipment costs, indirect cost surcharges, communications, parking fees, roadway tolls, data transmittal, inflation, profit, etc.). There is no provision for a separate fee.

Question 40. Shall billing rates be submitted as a password protected file (if uploading to iSupplier) or be placed in a sealed envelope if submitting by hard copy?

**Answer:** Billing rates should be submitted as an independent file/document and is not necessary to be password protected as other firms will not be able to view them in iSupplier.

Question 41. Section XII item 7.c. (Billing Rates) states increases/adjustments to billing rates may be permitted in accordance with the annual increase stipulated each July 1 by the City's Living Wage Ordinance (Chapter 2.28 of the Oakland Municipal Code). Chapter 2.28 is for minimum wage requirements. The City's projects will be under the prevailing wage requirement. Please confirm that rates can be increased per the General prevailing wage determinations made by the director of industrial relations.

**Answer:** Yes, if prevailing wage applies to the job classification, rate increases will be accommodated.

Question 42. On page 47 of 72, the RFQ states "Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) shall be uploaded into the City's iSupplier online procurement system or may be mailed, or hand-delivered to the Capital Contracts Division, Public Works Department, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 4314, Oakland, CA 94612 prior to the SOQ due date and time." On the same page, the RFQ states "If vendors choose to mail or hand deliver their bid, it is the bidder's responsibility to ensure that it is received by the City Clerk prior to the bid due date and time." The City stated during some of the pre-submittal meetings that the submittals MUST be uploaded to the iSupplier online procurement system.

- i. Please provide clarification on the SOQ submittal requirements to resolve the apparent discrepancies between the above noted RFQ statements.
- ii. Please confirm the address the cover letter should be addressed to. Are all SOQs to be addressed to the project manager through the Capital Contracts Division OPW even if some project managers are in the Department of Transportation?
- iii. Please confirm that iSupplier will accommodate multiple submittals (Quotes) from each firm. It currently appears iSupplier is only set up to accommodate one submission (Quote) from each firm. Please explain how firms are to upload multiple SOQs (one for each Discipline) through the iSupplier portal.
- iv. Will the City accommodate test confirmations that "test" submissions to iSupplier is working properly?

**Answer:**

- i. SOQs may be submitted online, mailed, or hand-delivered.
- ii. The address the cover letter should be delivered to is being changed to the City Clerk, 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza # 1st, Oakland, CA 94612.

- iii. If submitting multiple SOQs, firms should submit all files at the same time. iSupplier will accommodate multiple attachments under one RFQ.
- iv. Yes, the City has tested submitting multiple attachments to this RFQ and it is functioning.

Question 43. If the Contractor holds the capacity as a design professional, can the 10% retention requirement be waived since this is not standard in the industry?

**Answer:** In general retention is not withheld from consultants under professional services agreements with the City.

### **GENERAL QUESTIONS: Insurance-Related**

Question 44. Will Sexual/Abuse Insurance will be required for this project? If it is, will it be a cost reimbursable item since it isn't a standard policy that consultants keep?

**Answer:** Subject insurance will be vetted during contracting process and reimbursement may be discussed during request for proposal. As stated in Schedule Q, section a. the required insurance coverage is at the Contractor's own cost and expense.

Question 45. If [a Community Based Organization/Non-Profit] works primarily through volunteers and subcontractors, do we need to submit a formal letter to waive certain schedule requirements such as workers compensation?

**Answer:** Any vendor, regardless of legal status or size, that does business with the City of Oakland must meet the Worker's Compensation insurance requirement if they have at least one employee. Owners and Partners are not considered employees by California State Labor Law.

Question 46. Will the City accept \$1M aggregate / \$1M per occurrence for the Cyber Liability Insurance?

**Answer:** If Cyber Liability Insurance is required for a SOW, the Schedule Q details the minimum coverage limits acceptable. The SOW will determine if a higher coverage limit is required for Cyber Liability Insurance.

### **GENERAL QUESTIONS: Submittal Requirements and Tiers**

Question 47. If subconsultants are included on our team, would the City like to see their firm info represented under sections 2, 3, or 4 under SECTION XII. Submittal Requirements? If not, how would you like to see their qualifications presented?

**Answer:** Identifying subconsultants are not required during the submittal of SOQ. Firms may voluntarily list subconsultant participation and involvement under Section XII.3, Project Personnel, but will not be evaluated during the selection process. Primes will also not be limited or restricted to the subconsultant team(s) identified during the SOQ.

Question 48. If we place sub consultants on our team, of the information required to be submitted for the prime, will the same information be required for the prime to include regarding its sub consultants? If not, which parts of the information will the prime need to include in the Statement of Qualifications regarding its sub consultants?

**Answer:** It is incumbent upon each firm to assemble a team as needed that would best provide the scope of services as specified in Section VIII.B of the Request for Qualifications. The presentation of each leading firm and its sub-consultant(s) will be at the discretion of the leading firm and will be evaluated accordingly per Section XIII.A of the Request for Qualifications.

Question 49. Under section 3. Project Personnel, item a. requests “Provide an organizational chart of the firm” should the organizational chart show the entire consultant firm or just the team members assigned to our SOQ?

**Answer:** The organizational chart should identify the relevant and key team members assigned to the SOQ.

Question 50. The requirement for resumes is not mentioned. Would you like to see these included as an appendix and will this contribute to the scoring or are you only looking for bios of key personnel to be included in Section 3 of our submission?

**Answer:** Resumes are not necessary with the submittal of SOQ but may be considered during Request for Proposal for specific scope of services. Resumes or summary qualifications of the principal-in-charge and project manager(s) would be acceptable in Section XII.3, Project Personnel, to include brief descriptions of relevant experience in the project areas and services requested.

Question 51. We currently do not see any mention of the inclusion of staff resumes other than providing information for the lead technical staff in the Project Personnel section which the suggest limit is three pages. Would the City possibly accept resumes for staff to be included as an appendix that would be excluded from the page count? Or does the City only want to see limited information for the key staff at this time, with more specific info on team members quals and resumes provided with RFP responses that eventually come out of this on-call list?

**Answer:** Resume is not necessary with the submittal of SOQ but may be considered during Request for Proposal for specific scope of services. However, a



few resumes would be acceptable in Section XII.3, Project Personnel, with the SOQ for lead consulting firm.

Question 52. If resumes are required, does the City also require resumes for subconsultants/subcontractors?

**Answer:** See response to Questions (46 and 48) regarding resume requirements.

Question 53. Can the City expand the suggested page limit for Section 7. Billing Rates?

**Answer:** Loaded-rate fee schedule to be submitted as an independent file/document from the Statement of Qualifications for consideration.

Question 54. Can respondents include 11x17 pages? If so, will 11x17 pages count as 1 page or 2 pages?

**Answer:** Yes, 11x17 is counted as a single page when used for large charts or figures.

Question 55. What is meant by “recently completed” projects? Can respondents include projects that are currently underway or in progress or projects that are substantially completed?

**Answer:** “Recently completed” projects are defined as projects for which firm has performed similar scope of services as defined in the RFQ within the last 5 years. Respondents may include projects that are currently underway, in progress, or substantially completed. However, relevant completed projects will carry more weight during evaluation.

Question 56. The RFQ has suggested page limits. Has the City established a mandatory page limit for the entire SOQ?

**Answer:** There is no mandatory page limit for the entire SOQ.

Question 57. Are there any question-and-answer documents, as well as an attendance list, from the pre-proposal meeting held on March 12th, available for distribution?

**Answer:** Yes. This addendum provides that information.

Question 58. It took some time within the past week for me to gain approval and then access to the City's iSupplier portal and the RFQ. I was wondering if the City would consider extending the due date/deadline so that those, like myself, who have experienced a delay to enter the site can have additional time to work on our team's SOQ's?

**Answer:** The City is not extending the deadline at this time.

Question 59. Question: Are “tiers” defined as prime or subconsultants, or as different ‘levels’ of work to be done, or as different disciplines? ‘Tiers’ are mentioned on pages 3, 59, and 71.

**Answer:** There are no tiers for any of the disciplines.

### **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING ON-CALLS**

Question 60. Could you expand on what is expected for CEQA/NEPA tasks, specifically for discipline 8. Transportation Planning?

**Answer:** Typical CEQA/NEPA tasks include the preparation of CEQA Letters of Exemption, filing of CEQA Notice of Exemption with the State Clearinghouse, and preparation/filing of NEPA Categorical Exclusion paperwork for projects receiving Federal Funding.

Question 61. Approximately how many firms/teams does the City anticipate seating for the Transportation Engineering and Transportation Planning disciplines?

**Answer:** Past on-call lists carried up to 10 firms. There is no set limit on number of firms per on-call.

Question 62. We noticed that the Transportation Planning Bench requires a Civil Engineering license. Typically planning projects do not require engineering design work. Can this be waived, or be expanded to include Traffic Engineering registration?

**Answer:** Yes, the requirement for the Civil Engineering license will be waived at this Statement of Qualifications evaluation phase. Some task orders may require a civil engineering license, which would be noted in a future Task Order RFP.

### **GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING ON-CALL**

Question 63. The RFQ for Geotechnical Engineering Services mentions scope items that suggests that having land survey and structural engineering capabilities on the geotechnical team would be beneficial. Would having a survey subconsultant and a structural engineering subconsultant on our team be acceptable to the City?

**Answer:** Yes. Proposing firms are encouraged to build teams with subconsultants.

Question 64. We have performed slope works under separate task orders on a bench contract for a local agency in the Bay Area. Would it be acceptable for us to include these in one project description for a bench contract?

**Answer:** Yes.

### **CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT ON-CALL**

Question 65. The RFQ specified “Civil Engineering or Architectural firm, licensed to practice in the State of California, as desired qualification. Will the City please include (add) licensed General Contracting firms to this RFQ statement?

**Answer:** Firms with a General Contracting license would be acceptable qualifications. However, personnel with technical background, including engineering license to practice in California, may be considered during Request for Proposal for specific scope of services.

Question 66. The Civil Engineering section of the RFQ (section 10, pp. 10-13) also includes construction management scope. Is #3 ‘construction management’ (page 12 within the Civil Engineering section) intended to be placed within the Construction Management section of the RFQ?

**Answer:** No, the typical project services in the Civil Engineering section of the RFQ intends to include Construction Management services. These construction services may be necessary to support civil engineering design projects in the design, delivery, and implementation of capital improvements during the construction phase.

Question 67. Can you tell us the types of projects that the CM On-Call has supported during this current contracting period?

**Answer:** Types of projects are listed in Section VIII.A of the Request for Qualifications.

Question 68. If a Small Local Business Enterprise firm is interested in submitting a Statement of Qualifications for Construction Management with the specific intent to compete for small contracting opportunities within the MPSLBP, must the SOQ include the capabilities to perform “all of the services” listed in the Construction Management section?

**Answer:** Capabilities to perform “all of the services” is not necessary as part of the SOQ submittal. However, the expertise and experience of each firm will be considered at the Request for Proposal for desired scope of services.

Question 69. Under “B, Scope of Services” of the Construction Management section of the RFQ (section 8), is it the City’s preference that we propose only on the services that we offer as a firm, or does the City prefer that the CM have an all-inclusive team and therefore include sub consultants who will offer some of the specialty services noted in those bullet points?

**Answer:** Firms may propose qualifications for all or some of the desired scope of services, including any sub-consultants that may offer specialty services.

### **PUBLIC SPACE MANAGEMENT ON-CALL**

Question 70. Will the City of Oakland be issuing a Task Order for EACH assignment? Or is it a Task Order for a GROUP of assignments?

**Answer:** For the Public Space Management (plan review, permit intake and construction inspections) On-Call, projects will likely be grouped into a single task order.

### **SPECIAL INSPECTION AND MATERIALS TESTING ON-CALL**

Question 71. Section X subsection B ‘Scope of Services’ under Soils has the following:

- a. Verify materials below footing are adequate to achieve the design bearing capacity.
- b. Verify excavations are extended to proper depth and have reached proper material.
- c. Prior to placement of controlled fill, observe subgrade and verify that the site has been prepared properly.

The above are geotechnical inspection scope and the responsibility of the geotechnical engineer of record. Please confirm it will be covered by the geotechnical engineer under Section VI of the RFQ and excluded from the scope of special inspections.

**Answer:** The above are geotechnical inspection scope and the responsibility of the geotechnical engineer of record. Please confirm it will be covered by the geotechnical engineer under Section VI of the RFQ and excluded from the scope of special inspections.

Question 72. The RFQ states on page 41 of 72 “The selected primary firms shall have a MATERIAL TESTING LABORATORY certified with Caltrans TL0113. Firms that do not submit required certifications with the Statement of Qualification shall be disqualified.” If the prime consultant is not a Caltrans certified material testing laboratory, can this required certification be satisfied through a subconsultant who does have the required certification?

**Answer:** Yes, subconsultant may satisfy this requirement. However, only the subconsultant meeting this requirement may perform special inspection and material testing.

Sincerely,

Nicole Ferrara  
nferrara@oaklandca.gov  
(510) 238 4720

## Addendum Attachments for #1: Forms Unintentionally Omitted from RFQ

The following attachments were unintentionally omitted from the RFQ and are attached here:

- Consultant Information Sheet
- Relevant Project Experience Matrix
- Schedule I     Sanctuary City Contracting & Investment
- Schedule Z     Certification of Debarment and Suspension

# CONSULTANT INFORMATION FORM

Consultant's Business Name: \_\_\_\_\_

- CORPORATION       PARTNERSHIP       SOLE PROPRIETOR       JOINT VENTURE  
 NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION

BUSINESS ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

*(Provide full street address even if P.O. Box used)*

TELEPHONE NO: \_\_\_\_\_

FAX NO: \_\_\_\_\_

CONSULTANT'S NAME SIGNING THE CONTRACT: \_\_\_\_\_

EMAIL ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CELL PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

**CHECK ALL THAT APPLIES (Provide copies of State of California licensure and certifications with the SOQ. Make an additional copy of this sheet if there is insufficient space):**

- Licensed Architect and/or Engineer in the State of California  
    ○ License Type, License No. and Expiration Date \_\_\_\_\_

- PMP Certification Number and Expiration Date Issued by PMI \_\_\_\_\_

- Other Project Management Certifications: \_\_\_\_\_

- 501(c)3 Non-Profit Organization

OAKLAND BUSINESS LICENSE NO: \_\_\_\_\_

**INDICATE FOR WHICH CATEGORY YOU ARE SUBMITTING (please select one; one form is required for each statement of qualifications submitted; each discipline requires separate statements of qualifications):**

- Civil Engineering: \$10,000,000  
 Transportation Engineering – TCP & ITS: \$5,000,000  
 Public Space Management: \$5,000,000  
 Engineering Services for Paving: \$3,500,000  
 Geotechnical Engineering Services: \$2,500,000  
 Land Surveying: \$2,000,000  
 Construction Management: \$2,000,000  
 Transportation Planning: \$1,500,000  
 Special Inspection and Material Testing Services: \$1,000,000  
 Community Based Organization (CBO) and Non-Profit Services: \$750,000

# RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE MATRIX

Firm Name:						
Project Name	Type of Project (Park/Open Space, Facility, Storm Infrastructure Streetscape, Transportation Structures, Paving, Complete Streets Program, Planning)	Contract Award Date	Date Completed (or Indicate In- Progress)	Total Consultant Fees	Location (Project Address)	Describe Services Provided
<b>Example:</b> Oakland Recreation Center Renovation and Expansion Project	Infrastructure	12/2/2015	12/1/2017	\$1.2M	Oakland, CA	*Budget, Scope and Schedule Management from Planning Thru Design Phase





Schedule I

“Sanctuary City Contracting and Investment Ordinance”

United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement (HHS/ORR) Prohibition.

This Schedule must be submitted with all proposals or bids by all contractors/Consultants and their sub-contractors/subconsultants, and all vendors seeking to do business with the City of Oakland. Compliance must be established prior to full contract execution.

I, (name) \_\_\_\_\_, the undersigned, \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ (Position/Title)

(Business Entity) - hereinafter referred to as Business Entity and duly authorized to attest on behalf of the business Entity), declare the following:

- 1. Neither this Business Entity nor any of its subsidiaries, affiliates or agents are under contract with the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Customs and Border Protection (CBP), or the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement (HHS/ORR) to provide services or goods for data collection or immigration detention facilities. The term “data collection” includes the collection of information (such as personal information about consumers) for another purpose from that which it is ultimately used, datamining in large data bases for trends and information, threat-modeling to identify probable attackers to computer systems, predictive risk analysis to predict future events, and similar services. Additionally, this business entity does not anticipate a contract with ICE, CBP, or HHS/ORR for such work for the duration of a contract/contracts with the City of Oakland.
2. The appropriate individuals of authority are cognizant of their responsibility to notify the City’s Project Manager and invoice reviewer or the City Administrator’s Office, Chief Privacy Officer if any of this Business Entity’s subsidiaries, affiliates, or agents are under contract with ICE, CBP, or HHS/ORR for the purposes listed above.
3. To maintain compliance, upon review and approval of invoices, the contractors/vendors hereby agree to submit a declaration on company stationery attached to each invoice that the company remains in compliance with the ICE, CBP, and HHS/ORR Prohibition and will not seek or secure a contract with ICE, CBP, or HHS/ORR.
4. Upon close out or completion of deliverables and prior to issuance of final payment (while honoring the Prompt Payment Ordinance), this business entity agrees to submit a statement attached to the final invoice, under penalty of perjury, declaring full compliance with the ICE, CBP, and HHS/ORR Prohibition. I understand that an invoice is not declared fully complete and accepted unless and until the declaration of compliance is accepted.
5. If this business entity fails to disclose a contract with ICE, CBP, or HHS/ORR to provide services for data collection or immigration detention facilities, the relevant persons may be guilty of a misdemeanor and up to a \$1,000 fine. Additionally, the City Administrator may to the extent permissible by law, remedy any such violations and may use all legal measures available to rescind, terminate, or void contracts in violation.
6. I declare under penalty of perjury that the above will not, have not, and do not plan to contract with ICE, CBP, or HHS/ORR to provide services or goods for data collection or immigration detention facilities.



**PLEASE COMPLETE AND SIGN**

I declare that I understand Ordinance #13540 C.MS. Based on my understanding the above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

or

I declare that I understand Ordinance # 13540 C.MS. Based on my understanding all or a portion of the above is not true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Printed Name and Signature of Business Owner)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Business Entity)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Street Address, City, State, and Zip Code )

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Parent Company) (If applicable)

Contacts:

Office Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Cell Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ email: \_\_\_\_\_

**For Office Use Only:**

Approved/Denied/Waived

(signed) \_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SCHEDULE I DB/DM 2019



# Schedule Z

## Certification of Debarment and Suspension

Under the requirements of OMB Circular A-133 Supplement, part 3, Section 1, the City is required to obtain certifications that contractors and sub-grantees receiving awards exceeding \$100,000 have not been suspended or debarred from participating in federally funded procurement activities.

1. The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief that its principals:
  - a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal debarment or agency.
  - b) Have not within a 3 year period preceding this proposal, been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction under a public transaction or contract.
  - c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal State or local) with commission of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and
  - d) Have not within a 3-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State or local) terminated for cause or default.
2. Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

By signing and submitting this form the prospective primary participant's authorized representative hereby obligates the proposer(s) to the above stated conditions.

_____		_____	
Company Name		Signature of Authorized Representative	
_____		_____	
Address		Type or Print Name	
_____	_____	_____	_____
Area Code	Phone	Date	Type or Print Title

### **Instructions for Certification A**

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective primary participant is providing the certification set out below.
2. The inability of a person to provide the certification required below will not necessarily result in denial of participation in this covered transaction. The prospective participant shall submit an explanation of why it cannot provide the certification set out below. The certification or explanation will be considered in connection with the department or agency's determination whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the primary participant to furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this transaction.
3. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when the department or agency determined to enter into this transaction. If it is later determined that the prospective primary participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause of default.
4. The prospective primary participant shall provide immediate written notice to the department/agency to whom this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective primary participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
5. The prospective primary participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency entering into this transaction.
6. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," "person," "primary" covered transaction," "principal," "proposal" and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of rules implementing Executive Order 12549: 49CFR Part 76. You may contact the person to which this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
7. The prospective primary participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will included the clause titled" Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion – Lower Tier Covered Transaction," provided by the department or agency entering into this covered transaction, without modification, to all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
8. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines this eligibility of its principals.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph (6) of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause of default.

# Addendum Attachments for #5: Attendance Sheets from Pre-Submittal Meetings

## **Attendance sheets are in the following order:**

- (1) Civil Engineering
- (2) Transportation Engineering – Traffic Capital Project (TCP)  
and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
- (3) Public Space Management
- (4) Engineering Services for Paving
- (5) Geotechnical Engineering Services
- (6) Land Surveying
- (7) Construction Management
- (8) Transportation Planning
- (9) Special Inspection and Material Testing Services
- (10) Community Based Organization (CBO) and Non-Profit Services





## Civil Engineering Pre-Bid Attendance

Mahvash Harms, Biggs Cardosa Assoc. mharms@biggscardosa.com, 408-8398878-Structural Engineering, CM and Inspection

Guadalupe Bumatay, Marketing Manager, Sandis, [gbumatay@sandis.net](mailto:gbumatay@sandis.net), 510-301-7911

Craig Hensley, Sr. Marketing Coordinator, Wood Rodgers, [chensley@woodrodgers.com](mailto:chensley@woodrodgers.com)

Katie Naster, Marketing Manager, JMA Civil, [knaster@jmacivil.com](mailto:knaster@jmacivil.com), 916-894-8215

Anthony Richardson

Emma Svensson, Marketing at Langan [esvensson@langan.com](mailto:esvensson@langan.com)

Haley Palmer - Proposal Coordinator (Wood Rodgers, Inc.), [hpalmer@woodrodgers.com](mailto:hpalmer@woodrodgers.com)

Abigail Bokman, Marketing Manager Alta Planning + Design, [abigailbokman@altago.com](mailto:abigailbokman@altago.com)

Margot Yapp, Principal, NCE, [myapp@ncenet.com](mailto:myapp@ncenet.com)

Shakeel Jogia, Principal Engineer, Terraphase Engineering, [sjogia@terraphase.com](mailto:sjogia@terraphase.com)

Christine Idiculla, GHD Inc., [mariechristine.idiculla@ghd.com](mailto:mariechristine.idiculla@ghd.com)

Mahvash Harms, Senior Principal, Biggs Cardosa Assoc. mharms@biggscardosa.com, 408-839-8878-Structural Engineering, CM and Inspection

Sasan Daneshvar, Project Manager, Parsons, [sasan.daneshvar@parsons.com](mailto:sasan.daneshvar@parsons.com)

Leanne Mason, Senior Marketing Coordinator, [Kittelsohn & Associates, Inc.](http://Kittelsohn & Associates, Inc.), 714.468.1997, [lmason@kittelsohn.com](mailto:lmason@kittelsohn.com)

Jaggi Bhandal, BKF Engineers, [jbhandal@bkf.com](mailto:jbhandal@bkf.com), 925-396-7700

Melissa Logue, Transportation Director/Env. Planner; ESA, [mlogue@esassoc.com](mailto:mlogue@esassoc.com), 916-995-7223

Anthony Richardson, Biggs Cardosa Assoc, Arichardson@biggscardosa.com, 415-939-9292, Associate

Jacob Wood, Associate Principal, Arup, [jacob.wood@arup.com](mailto:jacob.wood@arup.com), 415-697-5614

Nicholas Pilgrim, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc, nicholas.pilgrim@acumentransit.com, 510-530-3029



Allen Wong, VSCE, Inc. (SLBE) PM, CM, Public Outreach: [awong@vsceinc.com](mailto:awong@vsceinc.com); 510-500-4451

Jesus Vargas, VSCE - President, [jvargas@vsceinc.com](mailto:jvargas@vsceinc.com); 510-835-5001

Robert Wong, Aliquot. [rwong@aliquot.com](mailto:rwong@aliquot.com) 925-476-2330

Steven Robinson, Senior Associate, Wood Rodgers, Inc, [srobinson@woodrodgers.com](mailto:srobinson@woodrodgers.com)

Sara Rauwolf, Toole Design, [srauwolf@tooledesign.com](mailto:srauwolf@tooledesign.com), 510.298.0740 x610

Michele DiFrancia, Parsons, [michele.difrancia@parsons.com](mailto:michele.difrancia@parsons.com), 510-282-5216

Matt Salveson, Wood Rodgers, [msalveson@woodrodgers.com](mailto:msalveson@woodrodgers.com)

## Questions

1. [1:21 PM] Mahvash Harms: Hi. BCA is a structural engineering firm who has done many projects with the City of Oakland. How do we participate in this on call contract? Structural Eng. is not listed as one of the disciplines but is in the scope of work.
2. [1:30 PM] Mahvash Harms: Is there Federal funds for this project with DBE requirements?





# **Transportation Engineering ITS Pre-Bid Teams Attendance**

- **Abigal Bokamn, Alta**
- **Leanne Mason, Kittelson**
- **Megan Eby, Toole Design**
- **Carleton Wong, ARUP**
- **Ethan Angold, Ardurra**
- **Cheung Wong, BKF**
- **Susie Hufstader, Fehr & Peers**
- **Rodolfo Anchi,**
- **Robert Pilgrim, Acumen**
- **Atul Patel, W-Trans**
- **Chi-Hsin Shao, CHS**
- **Joe Paull, Sandis**
- **Elbert Chang, Kimley Horn**
- **Jennifer Harmon, Diablo**
- **Larry Yee, Ardurra**
- **Abigal Bokamn, Alta**
- **Leanne Mason, Kittelson**
- **Megan Eby, Toole Design**
- **Carleton Wong, ARUP**
- **Ethan Angold, Ardurra**
- **Cheung Wong, BKF**
- **Rodolfo Onchi, BKF**
- **Susie Hufstader, Fehr & Peers**
- **Robert Pilgrim, Acumen**
- **Atul Patel, W-Trans**
- **Chi-Hsin Shao, CHS**
- **Joe Paull, Sandis**
- **Elbert Chang, Kimley Horn**
- **Jennifer Harmon, Diablo**
- **Larry Yee, Ardurra**



# Public Space Management Pre-Bid

Maurice Kaufman, West Coast Code Consultants [mauricek@wc-3.com](mailto:mauricek@wc-3.com) 925-548-2648

Katie Rowan, Marketing Manager, [katier@wc-3.com](mailto:katier@wc-3.com)

[Robert Pilgrim, P.E., Operations & Program Manager](#), Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc., 7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 200, Oakland, CA 94621, Tel: 510.530.3029 Ext. 105

Trevor Akright, Marketing Coordinator, [TAkright@4leafinc.com](mailto:TAkright@4leafinc.com), 925-344-1383

Christy Manzeck, Development Services Coordinator, [cmanzeck@4leafinc.com](mailto:cmanzeck@4leafinc.com), 4LEAF, Inc. 925.462.5959





## Engineering for Paving - Pre-bid Teams Attendance

Marcelo Cosentino, BKF Engineers (LBE)

Jun Im | Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Larry Yee, Ardurra, [lyee@ardurra.com](mailto:lyee@ardurra.com), 949-368-4159

Sara Rauwolf, Toole Design, [srauwolf@tooledesign.com](mailto:srauwolf@tooledesign.com), 510.298.0740 x610

Robert Pilgrim, P.E., Operations & Program Manager, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc., 7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 200, Oakland, CA 94621, Tel: 510.530.3029 Ext. 105

Jun Im | Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. | [jun.im@kimley-horn.com](mailto:jun.im@kimley-horn.com) | 714.248.6933

Marcelo Cosentino, BKF Engineers, 2100 Franklin Street, Suite 4C, Oakland, CA 94612, Office: 510.899.7300, Mobile:408.406.4036, [mcosentino@bkf.com](mailto:mcosentino@bkf.com)

## Questions/Comments

1. [1:57 PM] Sara Rauwolf: The RFQ mentions on Page 58 that “a firm may not submit a proposal as a prime consultant or contractor if they are being listed as a sub-consultant or subcontractor on another proposal or bid for the same solicitation.” Is that true for the SOQ for each discipline, or just for individual projects that result from that discipline’s on-call?
2. [2:01 PM] Sara Rauwolf: if it's helpful to reword - Can firms be both sub and prime within a single discipline (e.g., Transportation Engineering) for the SOQ?



**Geotechnical Engineering On-Call Pre-Proposal Meeting Attendance:**

Annie Gutierrez, Langan, [agutierrez@langan.com](mailto:agutierrez@langan.com)

Nik Sokol, Arup, [nik.sokol@arup.com](mailto:nik.sokol@arup.com)

Teri Ozuna, Twining, Inc. [Tozuna@twininginc.com](mailto:Tozuna@twininginc.com)

Emma Svensson, Langan, [esvensson@langan.com](mailto:esvensson@langan.com)

Eric Sekulski, Arup, [eric.sekulski@arup.com](mailto:eric.sekulski@arup.com)

Vince Geronimo, Geronimo Engineering, [Vince@geronimoengineering.com](mailto:Vince@geronimoengineering.com)

Elmon Toraman, Arup [elmon.toraman@arup.com](mailto:elmon.toraman@arup.com)

# Land Surveying Pre-Bid Meeting

Annie Gutierrez, Langan, [agutierrez@langan.com](mailto:agutierrez@langan.com)

Craig Hensley - Senior Marketing Coordinator with Wood Rodgers, Inc., [chensley@woodrodgers.com](mailto:chensley@woodrodgers.com)

Emma Svensson, Langan [esvensson@langan.com](mailto:esvensson@langan.com)

Emily Brandes, BKF Engineers, Senior Marketing Coordinator, [ebrandes@bkf.com](mailto:ebrandes@bkf.com)

Davis Thresh(BKF) 408-640-0911 Cell- [dthresh@bkf.com](mailto:dthresh@bkf.com)

Guadalupe Bumatay, Marketing Manager, Sandis, [gbumatay@sandis.net](mailto:gbumatay@sandis.net), 510-301-7911

Haley Palmer - Proposal Coordinator (Wood Rodgers, Inc.), [hpalmer@woodrodgers.com](mailto:hpalmer@woodrodgers.com)


Maurice Kaufman, West Coast Code Consultants, [mauricek@wc-3.com](mailto:mauricek@wc-3.com)

Dennis Barber, PLS, Wood Rodgers Principal Surveyor [dbarber@woodrodgers.com](mailto:dbarber@woodrodgers.com) 916-440-8070

Robert Wong, Aliquot. [rwong@aliquot.com](mailto:rwong@aliquot.com), 925-476-2330

ALL Attendees were online – NO Firm attended in person.

## ATTENDANCE ROSTER

<b>RFQ Description:</b>	<b>RFQ for Multi-Disciplinary Professional Services On-Call, 2024 (Construction Management)</b>	 <b>CITY OF OAKLAND</b> Bureau of Design & Construction - Construction Management Division 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 4344 Oakland, CA 94612-2032		
<b>Subject of Meeting:</b>	Pre-Submittal Conference			
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>Tuesday, March 12, 2024</b>			
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	250 FHO Plz, Broadway Conf Rm (4th Flr)			
	Name	Company	Telephone	Email Address
1	Paul Tran	City of Oakland	510.238.6493	<a href="mailto:ptran2@oaklandca.gov">ptran2@oaklandca.gov</a>
2	Vivian Inman	City of Oakland		<a href="mailto:vinman@oaklandca.gov">vinman@oaklandca.gov</a>
3	Nocoasha Henry	City of Oakland		<a href="mailto:nhenry@oaklandca.gov">nhenry@oaklandca.gov</a>
4	Joseph Tanios	City of Oakland		<a href="mailto:jtanos@oaklandca.gov">jtanos@oaklandca.gov</a>
5	Jane Rozga	GHD		<a href="mailto:Jane.Rozga@ghd.com">Jane.Rozga@ghd.com</a>
6	Brian Juarez	VSCE, Inc.		<a href="mailto:info@vsceinc.com">info@vsceinc.com</a>
7	Shereen Hayes	C2PM		<a href="mailto:Shereen@c2pm.com">Shereen@c2pm.com</a>
8	Jesus Vargas	VSCE, Inc.		<a href="mailto:jvargas@vsceinc.com">jvargas@vsceinc.com</a>
9	Ajay Singh	Dabri, Inc.		<a href="mailto:ajay@dabri.com">ajay@dabri.com</a>
10	Nicholas Pilgrim	Acumen Building Enterprise		<a href="mailto:nicholas.pilgrim@acumentransit.com">nicholas.pilgrim@acumentransit.com</a>
11	Eve Nelson	mack5		<a href="mailto:enelson@mack5.com">enelson@mack5.com</a>
12	Serge Sinevod	Parsons		<a href="mailto:serge.sinevod@parsons.com">serge.sinevod@parsons.com</a>
13	Ismael Pugeda	Conсор PMCM, Inc		<a href="mailto:Ismael.Pugeda@consorpmcm.com">Ismael.Pugeda@consorpmcm.com</a>
14	Ron Oen	Biggs Cardosa Associates		<a href="mailto:roen@biggscardosa.com">roen@biggscardosa.com</a>

	Name	Company	Telephone	Email Address
15	Jazlyn Carvajal	Webcor		<a href="mailto:jazlyn.carvajal@webcor.com">jazlyn.carvajal@webcor.com</a>
16	Ali Altaha	C2PM		<a href="mailto:ali.altaha@c2pm.com">ali.altaha@c2pm.com</a>
17	Mayank Patel	Consort PMCM		<a href="mailto:mayank.patel@consorpmcm.com">mayank.patel@consorpmcm.com</a>
18	Rodrigo Macaraeg	Consort PMCM		<a href="mailto:rodrigo.macaraeg@consorpmcm.com">rodrigo.macaraeg@consorpmcm.com</a>
19	Gus Gregory	Haley & Aldrich		<a href="mailto:ggregory@haleyaldrich.com">ggregory@haleyaldrich.com</a>
20	Darcy Taylor	Ghirardelli Associates, Inc.		<a href="mailto:dtaylor@ghirardelliassoc.com">dtaylor@ghirardelliassoc.com</a>
21	Erin Hanigan	Anchor		<a href="mailto:erin@teamanchor.com">erin@teamanchor.com</a>
22	Garrett Gritz	Diablo Engineering Group		<a href="mailto:garrett@diabloengineeringgroup.com">garrett@diabloengineeringgroup.com</a>
23	Azad Mahsa	Azad		<a href="mailto:mahsa@azadeng.com">mahsa@azadeng.com</a>
24	Tajarrod Arman	Azad		<a href="mailto:arman@azadeng.com">arman@azadeng.com</a>
25	Allen Wong	VSCE, Inc.		<a href="mailto:awong@vsceinc.com">awong@vsceinc.com</a>
26	Tanakorn Techajorgchareon	Biggs Cardosa Associates		<a href="mailto:ttechajo@biggscardosa.com">ttechajo@biggscardosa.com</a>







## Transportation Planning Pre-Bid Teams Meeting Attendance:

Abigail Bokman, Alta Planning + Design; [abigailbokman@altago.com](mailto:abigailbokman@altago.com)

Colin Burgett, GHD, [colin.burgett@ghd.com](mailto:colin.burgett@ghd.com), 415.296.2053

[nabaz.saieed@ghd.com](mailto:nabaz.saieed@ghd.com), (209) 751-7588

Allen Wong, VSCE, 510-500-4451, [awong@vsceinc.com](mailto:awong@vsceinc.com) Oakland SLBE

Mark Spencer, W-Trans, [m Spencer@w-trans.com](mailto:m Spencer@w-trans.com), (510) 444-2600

Ellie Fiore, Toole Design Group [efiore@tooledesign.com](mailto:efiore@tooledesign.com)

Leanne Mason, Senior Marketing Coordinator, [Kittelson & Associates, Inc.](mailto:lmason@kittelson.com), [lmason@kittelson.com](mailto:lmason@kittelson.com), 714.468.1997

Beth Altshuler Muñoz, Principal, [beth@bamplanning.com](mailto:beth@bamplanning.com), 415-516-2715

Vikrant Sood, Principal, [vikrant@bamplanning.com](mailto:vikrant@bamplanning.com), 510-703-5615

Ena Kassem, Marketing Coordinator, BKF Engineers, 925.396.7767 [ekassem@bkf.com](mailto:ekassem@bkf.com)

Julie Polak, Associate, Sam Schwartz, [julie.polak@samschwartz.com](mailto:julie.polak@samschwartz.com), 646-801-3948

Nicholas Pilgrim, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc, [nicholas.pilgrim@acumentransit.com](mailto:nicholas.pilgrim@acumentransit.com)

Jesus Vargas, VSCE, [jvargas@vsceinc.com](mailto:jvargas@vsceinc.com), 510-835-5001

Carleton Wong, Arup, [carleton.wong@arup.com](mailto:carleton.wong@arup.com), +1 415-659-4965

Karina Schneider, Fehr & Peers, [k.schneider@fehrandpeers.com](mailto:k.schneider@fehrandpeers.com), 510-851-7711

Allen Chen, Parsons, [allen.chen@parsons.com](mailto:allen.chen@parsons.com), 510-418-3801

Kate White, Restorative Communities, Arup, [kate.white@arup.com](mailto:kate.white@arup.com) 415/652-9516

Sara Rauwolf, Toole Design, [srauwolf@tooledesign.com](mailto:srauwolf@tooledesign.com) 510.298.0740 x610

Takeshi Nakamura, Arup, [Takeshi.Nakamura@arup.com](mailto:Takeshi.Nakamura@arup.com), +1-415-659-4945

Eleanor Leshner, Leshner Planning, [eleanor@leshnerplanning.com](mailto:eleanor@leshnerplanning.com), 415-684-8988

Vince Geronimo | [Vince@geronimoengineering.com](mailto:Vince@geronimoengineering.com) | VSLBE

Larry Yee, Ardurra, [lyee@ardurra.com](mailto:lyee@ardurra.com), 949-368-4159

Jennifer Kamangar, GHD Inc., [jennifer.kamangar@ghd.com](mailto:jennifer.kamangar@ghd.com), 949-648-5203

Ethan Angold, Ardurra, [eangold@ardurra.com](mailto:eangold@ardurra.com), 949-368-4168

Amir Abdollahi, BKF Engineers, [amira@bkf.com](mailto:amira@bkf.com), 925-396-7731

Veronica Cummings, Kearns & West, [vcummings@kearnswest.com](mailto:vcummings@kearnswest.com), 415-963-4208





Materials Testing & Special Inspection Pre-bid Teams Attendance

Teri Ozuna -Twining, Inc., Tozuna@twininginc.com

Mohammed Faiyaz, mohammed@appmateng.com

Jay Lorenzo, ISI Inspection Services, Inc., jlorenzo@inspectionsservices.net

Ron Oen, Biggs Cardosa Associates, roen@biggscardosa.com

Joseph Tanios City of Oakland Jtanios@oakalndca.com

Wezlon Myles City of Oakland Wmyles@oaklandca.gov

Paul Tran City of Oakland Ptran@oaklandca.gov

## CBO/Non-profit Pre-Bid Meeting Attendance

ONLINE ONLY; no firm showed up in person

Jill Holloway, Bike East Bay, [jill@bikeeastbay.org](mailto:jill@bikeeastbay.org)

Chris Hwang, Walk Oakland Bike Oakland. [info@wobo.org](mailto:info@wobo.org)

Anh Bui, Spokeland, [phuonganh9196@gmail.com](mailto:phuonganh9196@gmail.com)

Veronica Cummings, Kearns & West, [vcummings@kearnswest.com](mailto:vcummings@kearnswest.com), 415-963-4208

Cari Zinter, Spokeland [cz@spokeland.org](mailto:cz@spokeland.org)

Roxanne Caldera, East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation, [rcaldera@ebaldc.org](mailto:rcaldera@ebaldc.org)

Aitan Mizrahi. Uptown Downtown Community Benefit Districts. [aitan@downtownoakland.org](mailto:aitan@downtownoakland.org)

Chris Salam from Spokeland, Board Member, [Csalam@spokeland.org](mailto:Csalam@spokeland.org)

## QUESTIONS (in the Chat)

1. Chris Hwang (WOBO): How long are SLBE certifications good for?