



**STATE OF HAWAII  
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS  
560 NORTH NIMITZ HIGHWAY, SUITE 200  
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96817**

April 8, 2016

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. LPM 2016-02  
MASTER PLAN FOR KŪKANILOKO**

**Addendum No. 2  
Response to Questions**

- 1. Q: Will Professional Insurance be required (for Liability Insurance)?**  
A: Yes.
- 2. Q: Will the THREE (3) phases be binding?**  
A: The THREE (3) phases are connected however, Phase I should be "emphasized" in the proposal. OHA would like the three phases to be completed/led by the same entity. Hence successful bidders will show capacity and a plan, informed cost estimate, and time range for all phases.
- 3. Q: How shall the permitting section be addressed? Shall we associate costs for each permit?**  
A: The bidder shall list anticipated permits and permitting processes. As the actual processes and permits will depend on Phase 1, anticipated responsibilities, rates, and estimated (range) timeframes associated with permitting and the permitting process specific to this project shall be communicated. The bidders approach to the permitting section shall also be communicated as it specifically relates to working with OHA, a quasi-State entity.
- 4. Q: What is the current public situation on the development of Kūkaniloko? What is the public's perception of the plan?**  
A: The full presentation of OHA's Conceptual Direction for Kūkaniloko was made to OHA's Board of Trustees and was broadcasted publically via "live-stream".

Additionally the same presentation was given to the Hawaiian Civic Club of Wahiawa.

5. **Q: Will there be a larger community approval from Phase I to Phase II?**  
A: Since the planning process is participatory and intended to enable collective impact, community input is expected in Phase 1. Phase 2 and 3 shall include public engagement as needed. It is important for OHA that our beneficiaries support what is to be done at Kūkaniloko but final approval of any work will be given by OHA.
6. **Q: Will there be a televised presentation to make large communities aware of the Plan to gain support?**  
A: Any presentation given to OHA's Board of Trustees will be live streamed unless it is decided that the presentation shall be given in executive session.
7. **Q: Who will be responsible to contact the military if required?**  
A: OHA will work with the winning bidder to contact any government agencies.  
1) Depending on what the contact is for, OHA may at its discretion  
a. Suggest contacts  
b. Initiate contact  
c. Facilitate meeting  
d. Ask vendor to make contact in affiliation with OHA's Kūkaniloko Master Planning project.
8. **Q: There appears to be THREE (3) priorities with this effort, schedule, process, and product. Which one of these three is considered the most important?**  
A: They all are important; however the schedule would be the driving factor at this point.
9. **Q: For the agricultural model, are we looking for all native Hawaiian plants?**  
A: Not necessarily, various species should be considered, and needs to take OHA's bills in to consideration.  
1) Small farm bill (ACT 031 – please see attached)  
2) Native Plant Landscaping bill (ACT 233 – please see attached)
10. **Q: We understand that the budgets for Phase II and Phase III are not yet determined. Can you inform us as to what the budget is for Phase I? Knowing the budget will help the consultant teams scope the number and depth of site investigation, public engagement efforts, and evaluation tools.**  
A: \$360,000.00 is currently budgeted for Phase I.

11. **Q: Does OHA have a desired minimum number of public meetings in mind?**  
A: To be determined in discussions with the winning bidder, though preliminary discussions have brought up:
- 1) Monthly or bi-monthly Working Group Meetings (co-facilitated by OHA)
  - 2) Monthly or bi-monthly Cultural Working Group Meetings (co-facilitated by OHA)
  - 3) Bidders should recommend the total number of public meetings that they think would suffice with an associated budget and justification for each meeting. There may be at least 1 set of kick off meetings, a mid-point set of meetings, and a final set of meetings.
    - a. Meetings/Presentations as requested by OHA to the OHA Board of Trustees;
    - b. Meetings/Presentations with the Hawaiian Civic Club of Wahiawa
    - c. Others as required by OHA.
  - 4) Included with the bidders' recommendation, bidders should create a line item of the rates that will be charged per each type of meeting. Any additional meetings required by OHA can be negotiated with the winning bidder and will utilize the rate information provided should the number of meetings exceed the originally proposed number of meetings as indicated by the winning bidders proposal.
12. **Q: Beyond permits enumerated in Section 3.2, does OHA want to endeavor to take on any additional implementation tasks such as business planning?**  
A: Potentially, that will depend on what is planned; and the governance/management construct that OHA decides to utilize. At the end of the day business modeling, planning, and acumen will be essential to sustainably and regeneratively bring the project to life considering the intentions that are driving the Project.
13. **Q: Besides the Environmental Site Assessment, what other site investigations have been completed that OHA can share with the consultant teams?**  
A: Aside from the Phase 1 EA and all other attachments and exhibits provided, there are a few documents in draft form or being developed (Traditional Cultural Property Report, Preservation Plan; Water, Soil, and Ag report) that will be shared with the winning bidder as they are finalized/evolve. Other documents will be shared with the winning bidder.
14. **Q: With respect to Collective Impact, does OHA intend to be the "backbone organization" to the process?**  
A: Depending on how the process develops, OHA may or may not need to be the backbone organization, but will do so if required to efficiently further the progress of this project.
15. **Q: If, through developing the common agenda using the Collective Impact approach, the primary themes or other fundamental assumptions for Kūkaniloko diverge from those anticipated by OHA, is there management support to the Collective Impact process to re-assess assumptions and deliverables?**  
A: The conceptual direction has been approved for further development by the OHA Board of Trustees. OHA's Land and Property Management Program will work with the

successful bidder to address any diverging concepts. OHA will make any decisions necessary relative to the assumptions and deliverables throughout the process.

16. **Q: Pursuant to the Collective Impact approach and the interest of nation building, is OHA willing/prepared to partner with other Hawaiian agencies and trusts in developing land uses and programs relevant to their respective missions? (i.e. DHHL, QLLC, KS, Alu Like, Queen's Medical Center)**
- A: Should ideas of merit present themselves in alignment with OHA's strategic direction and mission, OHA, at its discretion, may consider appropriate partnerships.
17. **Q: What is the primary envisioned water source? Are existing agricultural water allowances in place and can they be continued with the range of uses envisioned by OHA? Are wells also envisioned to provide all potable water and fire protection needs for this development, or will a connection to the BWS system or a private water system be considered for redundancy?**
- A: 1) As stated in the solicitation, the water study is currently being conducted. The winning bidder will be privy to the evolution and results of the study.  
2) There are no current water allowances in place that we are aware of.  
3) Wells were previously considered, however due to installation and operating/maintenance costs, and the available apportionment of the areas sustainable yield, this option is not currently being pursued.  
4) Connection to the BWS system for pertinent uses as well as private water systems should be considered. More information will be available as the Water, Soil and Agriculture Report evolves.
18. **Q: Is there an estimated range for the total project budget AND/OR anticipated budget breakdown range for each of the Phases?**
- A: \$360,000.00 is currently budgeted for Phase I.
19. **Q: As there many variables that could dictate what the programmatic EA/EIS would need to cover and as it's not clear what entitlements are necessary at this time to implement the MP program, is it sufficient to assume a range of estimated fees for Phases 2 and 3?**
- A: Yes, and please consider the following:  
1) The bidder shall list anticipated permits and permitting processes. As the actual processes and permits will depend on Phase 1, anticipated responsibilities, rates, and estimated (range) timeframes associated with permitting and the permitting process specific to this project shall be communicated. The bidders approach to the permitting section shall also be communicated as it specifically relates to working with OHA, a quasi-State entity.

20. **Q: Other than the studies cited in the RFP, have there been any other studies already conducted for the 511-acre parcel, including but not limited to archaeological reconnaissance survey, biological inventory, infrastructure assessment, agricultural market demand?**
- A: 1) There is a draft of a Traditional Cultural Property report that is in the process of final review, the final copy will be provided to the winning bidder when it is completed. The winning bidder will also be apprised of its progress and be able to review the document in draft form at an appropriate time after being selected.
- 2) There is a preservation plan and a Water, Soil and Agricultural report that are in the process of being completed and shall be incorporated into the Master Planning process as stated in the solicitation.
- 3) No formal biological inventory, infrastructure assessment, or agricultural market demand that OHA would like to share at this time.
21. **Q: Is there an anticipated range of revenue production capability that Trustee and/or Executive Leadership would want to see these parcels achieve?**
- A: No range has been set at this time, however we do know that revenue generation will need to be balanced with cultural and natural resource management, programmatic uses, and other related returns as insinuated by exhibit A.
22. **Q: Due to Covenants and Restrictions, is it still accurate that OHA is only allowed to put 30.66 acres of impervious surface on the 511 acre?**
- A: That is what OHA understands at this time.
23. **Q: Beyond Trustee meetings as a means of public dissemination and website presentation of the project, how much concerted effort has gone into community dialogue to date on presenting the conceptual direction? Is there a summary of any dialogue or meetings available?**
- A: At this time aside from the trustee's meeting, there has only been one other presentation to the Hawaiian Civic Club of Wahiawa. There is no summary of past dialogue or meetings.
24. **Q: Authority of the Working Group on page 21 is not disclosed (in comparison to the Kupuna Cultural Council/Advisory Committee on page 23) – has the authority been defined?**
- A: It has not; this is something we would like to discuss with the winning bidder in association with OHA staff.

25. **Q: We understand that the OHA Community Engagement group will take the lead on developing the Working Group and Kupuna Cultural Council/Advisory Committee – is there any preliminary thought as to how often either group would convene (monthly, quarterly) – and confirm the assumption that the selected Vendor would attend and participate in all meetings.**
- A: OHA will take the lead of forming the group. Preliminarily, we anticipate monthly or bi-monthly meetings depending on the demand and collaboration between OHA and the winning bidder.
26. **Q: RFP states that broader community engagement shall be considered by the OHA as determined necessary – should we make an assumption on a select number of meetings to be held island wide on O’ahu and/or pae ‘āina wide?**
- A: 1) Bidders should recommend the total number of public meetings that they think would suffice with an associated budget and justification for each meeting. There may be at least 1 set of kick off meetings, a mid-point set of meetings, and a final set of meetings.
- a. Meetings/Presentations as requested by OHA to the OHA Board of Trustees;
  - b. Meetings/Presentations with the Hawaiian Civic Club of Wahiawa
  - c. Others as required by OHA.
- 2) Included with the bidders’ recommendation, bidders should create a line item of the rates that will be charged per each type of meeting. Any additional meetings required by OHA can be negotiated with the winning bidder and will utilize the rate information provided should the number of meetings exceed the originally proposed number of meetings as indicated by the winning bidders proposal.
27. **Q: Regarding Proposal Requirements on 4.13-B – it states that Certificate of Vendor Compliance is required for all firms of the Offeror’s team but states nothing regarding COGS for all firms and references Section 2.1 for further detail. However, Section 2.1 (C)(Certificate of Vendor Compliance) details the successful Offeror(s) provides COGS. Please clarify if only the Offeror or all firms of team must provide COGS.**
- A: All firms of the Offeror’s team designates if the Offeror’s team is comprised of two or more companies that formed one group. Therefore only the Offeror must provide the requirements and not the subcontractors/subconsultants.
28. **Q: Regarding Proposal Requirements- other team members are small business, sole proprietors- would the provision of Income Tax Return or some other financial record suffice as financial statement for such entities?**
- A: All firms of the Offeror’s team designates if the Offeror’s team is comprised of two or more companies that formed one group. Therefore only the Offeror must provide the requirements and not the subcontractors/subconsultants.

29. **Q: How many iterations of the Master Plan (site plan and cost estimates) should be assumed to be developed during the iterative process?**

- A: 1) Show line item for Primary Iteration  
2) Alternative 1  
3) Alternative 2

This shall be discussed further with the winning bidder and will be subject to available funds.

30. **Q: Would the selection of the Offeror and/or its team disqualify any associated member of the team to potentially serve on the WG or KCCAC?**

A: Any individual working on behalf of the Offeror or its team would be disqualified from serving on the WG or KCCAC. As the WG and KCCAC are to serve an advisory role to the selected vendor, it would be a conflict of interest for an individual working for the vendor to also be advising the vendor, in a sense advising themselves. Select representatives of the Master Planning team are expected to attend the meetings, and will have no decision making authority.

31. **Q: On page 37 of the RFP item 8 asks for the most recent financial statements of all firms in the Offeror's team. Are we allowed for to put available upon request for the subconsultants of our subconsultants?**

A: All firms of the Offeror's team designates if the Offeror's team is comprised of two or more companies that formed one group. Therefore only the Offeror must provide the requirements and not the subcontractors/subconsultants.

32. **Q: Is this RFP open to just preferred/prequalified vendors of OHA or to all?**

A: The RFP is open to all.