



Addendum No. 1 to
**RFP 2526-02 PRECONSTRUCTION AND LEASE-LEASEBACK SERVICES FOR PROPOSED
CARMEL DEL MAR SCHOOL MODERNIZATION AND ASHLEY FALLS SCHOOL MODERNIZATION**

Addendum Dated: October 22, 2025
Original RFP Issued Date: October 1, 2025

All clarifications, updates and questions received are posted below with corresponding answers.

The following timeline update is provided:

Page 3:

Interviews, if required Nov. 24~~19~~, 2025*

*** Estimated deadlines subject to revision at the District's discretion.**

Q1: Are drawings available for the projects?

**A: No. Carmel Del Mar - Nearing completion of Design Development (DDs). The Architect is DLR.
No. Ashley Falls - Design Development drawings are now being composed. The Architect is HMC.**

Q2: For Attachment 2, Fee Proposal: Does the District have specific general conditions line items they are looking for, or do you have a template you'd prefer all proposers to follow?

A: No. The District does not have a specific template or line item that all proposers must follow for the General Conditions fee breakdown on Attachment 2, Fee Proposal. However, providing a detailed breakdown is mandatory and directly impacts the evaluation score. The Fee Proposal instructions explicitly require you to "provide as backup for the general conditions a line-item listing of the proposed monthly general conditions and the corresponding monthly cost that you propose using for any/each Proposed Project".

Q3: What is the current status of design for both schools?

**A: Carmel Del Mar: Nearing completion of Design Development (DDs). The Architect is DLR.
Ashley Falls: Design Development drawings are now being composed. The Architect is HMC.**

Q4: What is the anticipated DSA submission deadline for both schools?

**A: Carmel Del Mar: Early to mid-January 2026.
Ashley Falls: Early April 2026.**

Q5: Please provide the current set of plans for both schools.

A: Not available. Design Development drawings are being created.

Q6: Part 11.1.2 of the Construction Services Agreement states, “the Master Construction Schedule shall be developed using Primavera P6 format.” May the prime contractor use a scheduling software other than Primavera P6 if it can still meet the critical path and illustration requirements?

A: The District confirms that while it works with the Primavera P6 format, proposers may submit their scheduling data in an equivalent program ("or equal").

The acceptance of any proposed equivalent scheduling program remains at the District's sole discretion and is contingent upon the demonstration that the proposed scheduling program performs and fully fulfills the same requirements as the Primavera P6 format.

Q7: Attachment 1 - Firm Questionnaire, Section A - General Information, Questions 11-14: Is there a word count or limit to the amount of text for these questions?

A: While a word limit isn't stated, the proposal must still comply with other general submission requirements:

- **Completeness: Proposals should be "completed in all respects as required by the instructions herein."**
- **Rejection Risk: A proposal may be rejected if it is conditional or incomplete, or if it contains alterations of form or significant irregularities of any kind as determined solely by the District.**
- **Required Format: You must submit one original, four (4) hard copies, and a digital copy (on a thumb drive) of your proposal.**
- **Use of Attachments: For questions in Attachment 1, you may use additional sheets if necessary, as noted in the introductory text for the questionnaire.**

Q8: Attachment 1 - Firm Questionnaire, Section A - General Information, Question 12: Please clarify which “parameters described above” are referring to.

A: Attachment 1 - Firm Questionnaire, Section A - General Information, Question 12 refers to the requirements for listing relevant experience and past performance projects found in Section IX.D.3 of the Request for Proposals (RFP).

This section explicitly mandates the parameters for the projects you are required to "Identify" and submit in your proposal:

- **Project Type: Preconstruction and lease-leaseback services.**
- **Location: Performed in California.**
- **Timeframe: Performed in the past five (5) years.**
- **In addition to listing preconstruction and lease-leaseback projects performed in California over the past five years that are of the approximate size of the individual proposed projects (Carmel Del Mar: \$10,000,000.00; Ashley Falls: \$13,500,000.00), the District requests that proposers also include projects of the approximate combined size (approximately \$23,500,000.00).**

Q9: The RFP details the required contents for the proposal but does not appear to specify any page limitations for the overall response or for individual sections. Can the District please confirm if there are any page limits that responding firms must adhere to?

A: Since the Request for Proposals (RFP) does not specify any page limits for the overall submission or individual sections, proposers should prioritize clarity and completeness.

Q10: if a proposer is interested in proposing for both Carmel Del Mar and Ashley Falls projects, is the District expecting to receive one proposal submittal for each project or one proposal addressing both projects?

A: If the proposer is proposing on both projects, each project should be clearly broken out from the other. There should then be a combined proposal for both projects to demonstrate the benefits of integrating them with your firm.

Q11: Fee Proposal Clarification: Attachment 2 (Fee Proposal) shows a 14-month duration for Ashley Falls Elementary School (section 4.f.), however the background description of this project states 18 months. Please confirm that the Ashley Falls fee duration should be 14 or 18 months?

A: 18 months is the correct duration.

Q12: DSA Submission Status: Is there an anticipated date for DSA submission for both Carmel Del Mar and Ashley Falls?

A: Carmel Del Mar: Early to mid-January 2026.

Ashley Falls: Early April 2026.

Q13: HVAC Modification Scope Clarifications: For both Carmel Del Mar and Ashley Falls, do the HVAC upgrades include unit replacement? If so, what is the district standard for the units?

A: Yes. The HVAC unit replacement for both Carmel Del Mar and Ashley Falls.

The District's standard units are Carrier.

Q14: Ashley Falls Interim Housing Requirements: Does Ashley Falls have existing classrooms that will be used for interim housing?

A: Yes. To minimize disruption and ensure student safety, construction will be phased such that students remain housed in the existing buildings throughout the construction period. The planning for work performed during the school year must prioritize phasing to accommodate all students on the current site, while summer breaks should be maximized for any major construction activities. Ultimately, the goal is to execute the work with minimal disruption to the school sites and ongoing educational programs.

Q15: Is a preliminary construction schedule required to be submitted with the proposal? If so, does the District prefer a single schedule showing the timelines for both projects, or two separate preliminary schedules?

A: Yes. Both projects need to be shown in their respective timelines. If the proposer is submitting for both projects. The schedule should show how the two sites will overlap to coordinate the two consecutive timelines.

Q16: Section IX.D.6 requires firms to provide EMR verification for the past five years, and the "Safety" category is worth 10 points in the evaluation. To ensure we fully understand the District's evaluation process, could you please clarify the following:

a. Is there a maximum EMR threshold (e.g., an average EMR of 1.25 or higher over the last five years) that would automatically disqualify a firm from consideration?

b. If there is no disqualifying threshold, could the District explain how a firm's EMR will be factored into the 10-point score for the "Safety" category? For example, will a sliding scale be used, or will the EMR be considered holistically along with the other safety information requested?

A:

- a. The RFP document confirms that the submission of your EMR verification for the past five years is a factor in the scoring, but is not a mandatory pass/fail requirement for initial consideration.
- **Mandatory Pass/Fail:** The list of *Mandatory Requirements* (Section IX.D.1) does not include any specific EMR threshold that would automatically disqualify your firm. Failure to meet the actual pass/fail criteria (Submitting your EMR score) is what disqualifies a firm.
 - **Scoring Factor:** Your EMR is one component of the "Safety" evaluation category, which is worth 10 points in the overall assessment. The proposal review committee will evaluate this section.
- b. The District confirms that there is no maximum EMR threshold that automatically disqualifies a firm. The Safety category is worth 10 points, and since proposals are reviewed by a Proposal Evaluation Committee composed of professionals from different disciplines (at least three members), the District cannot disclose a specific formula or sliding scale for scoring. Instead, the committee will conduct a holistic evaluation of the entire submission within this category, assessing your EMR, safety plan narrative, accident statistics, and documentation of required safety programs (IIPP and Cal/OSHA compliance) to determine your final score out of 10 points.

Q17: Could the District please clarify if proposers are permitted to include supporting images, graphics, or charts within the narrative sections? Or, should all responses remain strictly text-based?

A: The goal is to enhance readability and persuasiveness, not detract from it. Since the District did not explicitly forbid visual elements, and they often aid in technical explanations (such as methodology or safety), they are permitted, provided they are included in the proposal's required hard copies and digital format.

Q18: Could the District please clarify how the evaluation process will ensure a fair "best value" comparison between a firm proposing on a single project and a firm proposing on both projects? Specifically, how will the Price score for a single-project proposal be weighed against a dual-project proposal that may offer overall economies of scale?

A: The District's evaluation is designed to achieve the "best value" combination of price and qualifications. While the District has a strong preference and intention to award both projects to a single contractor to maximize economies of scale, it expressly reserves the right to award the Proposed Projects to different contractors if it determines a different approach represents the best value outcome. The decision to award one or both projects depends entirely on the Proposal Evaluation Committee's final determination of the best value score for the District.

Q19: Can the district provide the number of classrooms/learning studios to be modernized at each school?

A: The precise number of classrooms/learning studios to be modernized cannot be stated because this detail is subject to the Preconstruction Work phase of the Lease-Leaseback contract. The final scope is not yet fixed.

The selected Contractor's responsibilities are to perform Cost Estimates, Value Engineering, and Constructability Reviews against the available budget: Carmel Del Mar: \$10,000,000.00, and Ashley Falls: \$13,500,000.00.

Q20: We noticed some water intrusion in the Carmel Del Mar library ceiling during the job walk. Has the district performed any site investigations for either school? Will the prime contractor be responsible for specific site investigations while the architect is in their design-development phase?

A: Yes, along with the architects for each project, some site inspections have been completed. The information will be shared with the awarded LLB Contractor.
No. Not during the DD phase.

Q21: The RFP mentions “include modernizations such as roofing/HVAC.” Does this roofing scope encompass the entire school site, or just selective roof areas?

A: The roofing scope is just in the selected areas.

Q22: Will the prime contractor be responsible for providing temporary learning spaces while classrooms are under construction?

A: No. The District will use existing spaces on the campus. The awarded contractor may assist with unforeseen issues if needed.

Q23: Will the prime contractor be responsible for moving and storing the library books or providing a temporary space while the library is under construction?

A: No. The District will move and store the books on-site.

Q24: To maintain consistency among proposers’ fees, please specify the number of design meetings and planning/programming sessions to be considered in our proposal.

A: Carmel Del Mar School: 10 meetings.

Ashley Falls School: 10 meetings.

Combined Projects: 20 meetings.

Q25: Will this go out to bid again once the LLB contractor is awarded?

A: No. The awarded Lease-Leaseback (LLB) contractor will be responsible for managing the competitive bidding process for subcontractors and working directly with the District to establish the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP).

Q26: With two different designers (one for each school), will the BIM advisor process be the same between projects? What is the expected level of participation from the contractor in the BIM process? What software platform will be utilized?

A: The RFP requires the firm to state whether your firm has building information modeling capability and mention your use of BIM on prior lease-leaseback projects. The RFP does not require the Contractor to perform BIM Modeling itself.

Q27: For BIM, is the expectation that the contractor execute virtual modeling for all key building systems, perform independent clash detection, all handle all related coordination, inclusive of development of an execution plan? What LOD is required for the project? What are the architect and engineering teams responsible for in terms of virtual modeling and high-level clash detection handled as part of their current services? Will the architect and engineering teams provide REVIT, CAD, and other design files to the contractor for use and baseline modeling?

A: The RFP requires the firm to state whether your firm has building information modeling capability and mention your use of BIM on prior lease-leaseback projects. The RFP does not require the Contractor to perform BIM Modeling itself.

Q28: The RFP states Carmel Del Mar construction services timeline is 14 months and Ashley Falls is estimated for 18 months. Attachment 2 – Fee Proposal indicates 14 months for Carmel Del Mar and 14 months for Ashley Falls. Please confirm construction services timelines.

A: The official, estimated construction service timelines are confirmed as:

- Carmel Del Mar School Modernization: 14 months
- Ashley Falls School Modernization: 18 months

When reviewing proposals, the Proposal Evaluation Committee will closely examine each firm's approach to maximizing the overlapping opportunities and efficiently planning the phasing process across both projects to minimize disruption and maximize construction efficiency.

Q29: Is the intent to run preconstruction services for the projects concurrently, or are there separate preconstruction services timelines? Please provide anticipated preconstruction services timelines.

A: The District intends to run the preconstruction services timelines for both the Carmel Del Mar School Modernization Project and the Ashley Falls School Modernization Project concurrently. However, this is contingent on both projects being awarded to a single Contractor.

Q30: Is the District requesting (1) team for each project, or is the intent to roll project teams from Carmel Del Mar to Ashley Falls?

A: The District requires Proposers to submit proposals outlining the team structure for two scenarios:

1. A distinct project team for each Proposed Project (Carmel Del Mar School Modernization and Ashley Falls School Modernization).
2. A combined project team option that would handle both projects sequentially or concurrently, specifically demonstrating how key personnel (such as the best job superintendents) would "roll" from the Carmel Del Mar project to the Ashley Falls project, is proposed.

The District needs this team information to enable the Proposal Evaluation Committee to conduct a complete "best value" comparison. Specifically, the proposed team structure, whether separate or combined, will directly determine if awarding both projects to one firm provides superior value and economies of scale, making it the best overall option for the District, or if splitting the work is preferable.