



RFP: Restoring Dakota Culture & Landscape at Owámniyomi

Questions & Answers

UPDATED FEBRUARY 21, 2024

What does the RFP mean by “Tribal Engagement”? How will the Consultant Team engage with Tribes?

Owámniyomni Okhódayapi has convened a Tribal Working Group comprising representatives of the four Mni Sota Dakota Nations to guide this work. The Consultant Team will attend Tribal Working Group meetings and may be asked to participate in visits to Tribal Council meetings, or contribute to Owámniyomni Okhódayapi’s preparation for Tribal engagement events such as wacipis (or powwows).

The RFP also mentions a need for Phase III archaeological mitigation services. How does that fit into the Tribal engagement portion of the project, and what is the current status of the archaeological survey?

It is anticipated that Phase III mitigation planning will be necessary because a small US Army Lock control station will be demolished in order to achieve the restoration of Indigenous landscape, and the building is more than 50 years old. Completed Phase I and Phase II studies will be provided to the Consultant Team. Those studies identify the Upper Lock as a historically significant complex, and the mill ruins and water works as historic resources. Owámniyomni Okhódayapi has also completed a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) study for this site, identifying the river, its upstream creek, the Falls, the islands, and other features as significant. The TCP is included in the RFP exhibits. The project must comply with all federal guidance (NEPA, NHPA).

Can the Teaming Directory be released to Directory participants earlier than February 21st? Teams may already be formed by then.

Yes. Owámníyomni Okhódayapi has considered this request and decided that the Teaming Directory can be shared earlier than the planned release date of February 21. The Teaming Directory will not be posted publicly; only those who are participants in the Directory will receive this information. The initial distribution will take place via email on Wednesday, January 31, and will be repeated every Wednesday thereafter through February 21, to include email releases on January 31, February 7, February 14, and February 21.

Can you share more about the role of Mni Sota Dakota knowledge keepers, and how OO will evaluate cultural competency on each Consultant Team?

Owámníyomni Okhódayapi is actively inviting Mni Sota Dakota knowledge keepers to be centered in the programming, design, and restoration at Owámníyomni as consulting advisors, engaged by and embedded in a contracted Consultant Team. This team member will play an essential role at the center of their Team, providing guidance and ensuring that their team hears, understands, and prioritizes Dakota voices and knowledge in shaping the direction of the project. Teams' approach to this role should reflect Owámníyomni Okhódayapi's mission, and should honor our commitment to be guided by the Dakota Nations in this work. Teams that understand the value of knowledge keepers, and ensure their presence at a leadership and decision-making level, will be attractive to the Selection Committee. We have encouraged all types of knowledge keepers to consider this opportunity, including elders, artists, language speakers, or those with knowledge of medicines, Indigenous land management, and water rights.

Is there an in-person option for attendance at the Pre-proposal Conference on February 15th?

There is no in-person meeting option for the pre-proposal conference.

If teams are interested in exploring the site in person during the proposal process, would it be possible to meet with Owámníyomni Okhódayapi staff or leadership as part of that visit?

Teams are welcome to experience the public areas of the site in person. However, no in-person site visits with staff and leadership are currently planned. We ask that Teams utilize the information about the site that has been made available on Owámníyomni Okhódayapi's website, in the text of the RFP, and in the supplemental references that have been linked in Exhibit A, during the pre-proposal stage. Specific questions about site conditions or site elements are welcome, and can be submitted and promptly answered through the Q&A

process. In addition, we will have a navigable 3d view of the site open in Google Maps at the pre-proposal conference to facilitate answering site related questions.

The cover sheet of the RFP indicates a due date at 3/22, however within the RFP on p4, 3/15 is cited as the due date and on p6, again cited as 3/22 . Please confirm the intended submission date is 3/22.

The correct submission date is March 22, 2024. The erroneous date on page 4 of the RFP has been corrected in the RFP PDF.

I am concerned that the Dakota knowledge keepers will be “rolled over” and exploited by big firms, who may just approach this as “checking the box” but not really adjust their way of working. How will that be avoided?

Owámniyomni Okhódayapi’s primary mission is to restore Dakota presence and indigenous landscape at Owámniyomni. Knowledge keepers will be the only members of each team who can bring authenticity, trust, and relationships to the process. The Selection Committee will be looking for an approach demonstrating an understanding of that. Additionally, our process design will underscore this intention. We view Dakota knowledge keepers as part of a three-way network of communication and concept development, which looks like this:



Are there specific goals or requirements for Small & Underutilized Businesses?

No.

Are we to acknowledge receipt of any addenda, and if so, in what manner?

If any addenda are published, they will be publicly available on the procurement page. We do not require you to acknowledge receipt of any addenda. All materials necessary for teams to prepare a proposal will be provided on the procurement page.

How will Knowledge Keepers be paid?

If not serving as the Prime themselves (as part of a firm), Mni Sota Dakota Knowledge Keepers on the Consultant Team will be invoicing, and being paid by, the Prime contractor as either an independent contractor or an organizational subcontractor.

Do the City and Park Board have a role in the consensus-based decision making process?

The consensus-based decision making process includes OO's Programming & Partnership Advisory Group, the Tribal Working Group with representatives of Dakota Nations, and Dakota Knowledge Keepers with their Consultant Teams. It creates a collective forum to advance the Dakota-led cultural and environmental restoration of Owámniyomni. Engagement with the City of Minneapolis and the Park Board is taking place in a different forum, and is more focused on the technical and government relations aspects of conveyance, project implementation, and coordination with the Park Board on its abutting project, Water Works Phase 2. The City and Park Board are parties to a Memorandum of Understanding with Owámniyomni Okhódayapi, and are active participants in the overall effort. The MOU Partners convene monthly, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers joins the Partners meeting bimonthly.

Is the Teaming Directory available online?

The Teaming Directory is not available online. It is issued via email ONLY to Directory participants, to the email address provided in their Directory profile.

What are the intended touchpoints or cadence with consensus-based decision making groups?

The Programming & Partnership Advisory Group and the Tribal Working Group will each be meeting monthly.

Will the Pre-Proposal Conference slide presentation be distributed?

Yes, the Pre-Proposal Conference slide presentation is posted on the procurement tab of OO's website.

Does the vision for this project include some treatment or removal of the lock chamber wall?

The Upper Lock will continue to be owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and there are no plans to remove the lock walls as a part of this project. However, the two small structures on the landward side of the Lock (the control station and the "bathroom building") are anticipated to be demolished in favor of landscape restoration. Regarding the larger infrastructures, it's notable that the disposition of all three Locks on the Upper Mississippi is currently being studied by the St. Paul District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. [You can learn more about their work here.](#)

Does the work included in this RFP anticipate full design or just planning and partial design?

The RFP seeks services to complete full design, through construction and bid readiness. Please also note that we are not starting from scratch. More than a year of robust community engagement, generation of project values and early design ideas, and Native Partnership Council outcomes, can be reviewed in OO's First Season takeaways. Community Conversation videos, Native Partnership Council graphic recordings, and the First Season report [can be found on the website](#). Design and programming guidance will be provided at OO's kickoff meeting with the selected Consultant Team.

There is a note to provide an option for continued Construction Administration. How should this be submitted? Lump sum?

We recommend that you include Construction Administration as part of your fee proposal, but treat it as the basis for a future contract extension, priced separately. There will be a pause between the completion of design and bid preparation, and construction. We anticipate construction in 2027.

Is assistance with fundraising part of the desired scope?

Fundraising is not part of the desired scope. OO already has a fundraising team actively engaged.

Are the separate fundraising consultants focused on private and philanthropic sources, or additional sources of funding?

OO's fundraising includes private, philanthropic, foundation, and public sources of funds.

What is the status of the NHPA Programmatic Agreement?

The Programmatic Agreement is circulating for signature.

Will the National Park Service be included as a stakeholder in this process, given the project's location in the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area?

The National Park Service has been a welcome stakeholder in this process for many years, along with Mississippi Park Connection (its nonprofit partner) and the National Parks Conservation Association.

The following questions came in after the Pre-Proposal Conference, and have been organized thematically, since many touch on the same themes.

QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO RFP EXHIBITS & DIRECTIVES

Exhibit E: We could not open the second set of bulleted Resource Links (Alta Survey, etc.), please restore the links or provide the URL addresses.

Here are the relevant links:

- <https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Suggested-Timeline.pdf>
- https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/RFP_ALTA-Survey-Lock-and-Dam-Mpls-7-2021-signed.pdf
- https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Easements_Color-coded-map.pdf

- <https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Zoning-and-Land-Use-Details-for-the-Site.pdf>
- https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Traditional-Cultural-Property-Study_DRAFT.pdf
- <https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Section-408-Process-Guide.pdf>
- <https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Section-408-EA-Template.pdf>
- <https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Section-106-Submittal-Guidelines.pdf>

Section V: Is there a maximum allowable file size for the proposal submission if submitted directly by email? If submitted by proponent provided document link/sharefile site?

We have not set a maximum size for submissions as a criteria. However, if submitting a file greater than 10 MB via email, please send via document link. For the benefit and convenience of its Selection Committee, OO encourages optimized PDFs, preferably under 50 MB. Files larger than 50 MB will not be rejected on that basis alone, however. We advise respondents to remember that Selection Committee members may not have powerful design computers at their disposal, and that as a result, reasonable file size is preferred.

Is there a specific format and required level of detail for the Fee proposal?

We prefer to see the fee proposal organized by Task, in a Gantt chart depicting progress and burn rate over time, ideally by month. This question is also answered in Questions Pertaining to Scope & Fee.

Noting that insurance coverage is listed as Evaluation Criteria M, should evidence of insurance coverage be included in the proposal? If so, what format should this be in?

For the proposal stage, a statement that the Prime possesses, or will possess, the necessary insurance will suffice. At the interview stage, a Certificate of Insurance (from the Prime Consultant only) will be required.

QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO CONTEXT

Section 3, page 3, last paragraph: What is the status of and schedule for the Water Works Park Phase 2 project? Are there plans of the approved design?

The Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board (MPRB) adopted plans for Water Works Park Phase 1 and 2 several years ago, and implemented Water Works Park Phase 1. You can learn more

about it on the Minneapolis Parks Foundation (MPRB's nonprofit partner) website, [here](#). Water Works Park Phase 2 directly abuts OO's project site, and MPRB and OO have agreed to coordinate on the two projects through design and construction. It is possible, but not confirmed, that MPRB may revisit the plan for Water Works Phase 2 based on the shared goal for the entire Central Riverfront to be designed and constructed as one coordinated place. The Consultant Team will be a participant in that coordination. MPRB is an important partner agency. MPRB and the Minneapolis Parks Foundation are actively raising funds to implement Water Works Phase 2, and our shared intent is for these projects to be progressing in parallel.

How and when will this project respond/acknowledge any changes stemming from the potential disposition of other locks in the upper Mississippi? These actions would affect hydrology and river stage, and impact site characteristics and accessibility.

OO regularly communicates with stakeholder organizations and the USACE Project Manager regarding the disposition study for the Lower Lock and Lock 1. We agree that the decisions made in that process present important context for our project and the River. The Consultant Team will need to be fully apprised of that ongoing process over the next two years as our plans develop.

QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO FUNDING SOURCES

Section I, Invitation, paragraph 3: Regarding this statement: "*Design will also be consistent with state grant funding parameters, and will be feasible to build and operate.*" What are the "state grant funding parameters"?

The work will be funded in part by state grants: one with Environment and Natural Resource Trust Fund dollars from the Legislative-Citizen Commission on Natural Resources (LCCMR), whose mission is "to protect and enhance Minnesota's environment and natural resources," and one with Clean Land & Water Legacy dollars from the Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council (LSOHC), whose mission is "to restore, protect, and enhance Minnesota's wetlands, prairies, forests, and habitat for fish, game and wildlife." Eligible uses of the state funds secured are outlined in both the appropriating language and the approved work plans for both grants, and this information will be provided to the Consultant Team. These grants do not cover 100% of all needs. Other sources of funding are also secured.

Can you clarify what amount of funding has been secured for phase 1?

First, a correction: there is ideally just one phase, not multiple. This misunderstanding may be due to an error in the slide deck shown at the pre-proposal conference that suggested the shoreline tract would be a "future phase." That is not our current plan.

OO has fully secured funds to undertake the scoped design and engineering work.

OO has partially raised project construction funds, and will continue efforts to achieve its goal through a comprehensive campaign. The campaign committee has been formed and the effort is currently ramping up.

QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

Exhibit A, Scope of Work, General: Has a construction budget been established, and can you share it? Does the amount include costs beyond the base construction budget, such as additional funds for contingency, softs costs, general conditions, etc.?

OO completed a preliminary cost estimate based on early design ideas depicted in the First Season Report (linked in Exhibit E). That preliminary estimate, and the discussions it has generated since the completion of the first season, has generated the following insights:

- Restoring indigenous land and bringing water back to life in and around the site are OO's most important objectives. The estimated cost to undertake that restoration work is fully considered in our budget projection.
- A multi-story enclosed building may not be a good fit for the site, since there are so few acres available, and the core mission is restoration. However, seasonal or temporary structures may be appealing and appropriate based on what programs emerge as priorities. The estimated cost of the building as depicted in the First Season report is not fully included in our budget projection.
- Major modifications to the Lock walls that were explored in the first season, such as numerous bridging structures, will be extremely cost (and process) prohibitive. Our current budget projection includes an assumption of targeted enhancements only.
- Variables such as how Spirit Island becomes present and known, and whether or how guidewalls and jetties are engaged, will need to be evaluated for cost, and cost responsibility, in the process to come.

With these assumptions understood, we are budgeting for a construction cost of approximately \$25 million.

What is the anticipated construction budget? What are the funds that have already been raised for the project anticipated to be used for?

The anticipated construction budget is \$25 million. Funds already raised will be used for this professional services contract, as well as for other pre-development activities including program development, conveyance costs, project management, and other necessities. Some funds already raised are restricted and will be held in reserve for their eligible use: capital improvement.

Is there an estimated target construction budget on which consultants should base a design fee?

Yes, our target budget is \$25 million.

QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO PROJECT SCHEDULE

Is there an error in the length of the CD phase? 2 months? [UPDATED ANSWER]

This question has come up from several respondents and deserves a more detailed response. The answer has been updated from the prior posted Q&A:

It's not a typo, but as represented in the RFP it is also not providing the full picture. The project schedule currently includes the following assumptions:

- A 2-month push from 65% and 95% design (this is what is reflected in Exhibit A),
- A 6-week review period for USACE *followed by time for the design team to respond to USACE comments* (and then a final backcheck by USACE),
- An additional 3 months for bid preparation,
- Followed by 2 months for the bid process.

The full construction document set will be completed in coordination with the GC.

- Once the GC is onboard, there is 1 more month planned to reach 100% design.

OO accepts that respondents may wish to propose an alternative approach. OO will consider proposed adjustments to this approximately 10 month period, including modestly extending it overall. Consultant Teams may also consider adjusting the allotment of time given to each Taks in the overall timeline.

The overall schedule is designed to ensure that OO secures the full approvals necessary from USACE for all Section 408 modifications by the end of 2025. This is necessary to advance fee title conveyance, a critical path milestone. Although OO will achieve initial control through a long term lease, securing fee title timely is important to both public and private funders.. OO does not wish to extend the process further than absolutely necessary..OO will consider recommended adjustments that are mindful of the constraints described.

Section VII: Is the schedule provided tied to any funding or regulatory requirements? Can we suggest alternate timelines without penalty in the evaluation?

OO is open to modest adjustments to the overall timeline and the pace of each phase, and is open to considering modest adjustments that are sensitive to the following factors.

USACE has advised OO that Section 408 compliance must be completed prior to the Congressionally-directed fee title conveyance of the land, a critical path milestone. Section 408 modifications present engineering and design issues that OO feels must be solved in an integrated way with the full restoration design. This places the design on a faster schedule than we might otherwise pursue. OO is open to modest modifications of the timeline.

Additionally, OO requires time to mobilize, with all necessary components in hand, for the public phase of its comprehensive campaign, and for day-one programming and operations readiness..

Exhibit A, Tasks 2, 3, 4: Is the 6-week USACE review period included within the given timeline of each Task or is it simultaneous with the ongoing work? Can the design team begin work on the subsequent Tasks during this review period?

This is a question for the USACE project manager during Discovery. Our assumption is that aspects of work not specifically impactful to federal compliance criteria could continue to progress during the 6 weeks, but that engineering or design features that the Corps is reviewing for compliance with Section 408 will pause, lest those changes require their own additional 6 week review period.

Exhibit A, Task 4 95% Design: Is the schedule length of 2 months correct or is that a typo? Perhaps it should be 12 months? Two months is an aggressive schedule for reaching 95% design, can this phase timeline be expanded?

See the answer to the first question under this section, "Questions Pertaining to Project Schedule."

Exhibit A, Task 5, Construction Documents (with GC): Please expand on the scope of this task.

Task 4 anticipates a role for the Consultant Team in bid prep and bid review. Task 5 then anticipates coordination between the Consultant Team and the GC on the push to 100% design. We leave it to Consultant Teams to propose a preferred approach to the desired coordination.

Is it possible to adjust the timing and length of the phases of concept, SD, DD, CD within the larger time frame provided in the RFP (2024-2027)?

It's possible to adjust the timing and length of the individual phases, but be advised that it is OO's goal is to secure USACE approvals for Section 408 modifications by the end of 2025, and that these modifications must be designed in an integrated fashion with the rest of the project. OO is open to modest adjustments to the schedule, as described in more detail in the answer to the first question answered under this section, "Questions Pertaining to Project Schedule."

Can you please elaborate on how the project timeline is influenced by the Army Corp of Engineers' timeline and other Federal timelines?

The Section 408 process is linked to a critical milestone: fee title conveyance. OO wishes to undertake engineering design for modifications under Section 408 in an integrated manner with overall design, therefore pegging these processes to one another.

In the pre-proposal meeting it was mentioned that the schedule outlined in the RFP is driven by specific external deadlines from other agencies etc. Can you share more details about the parameters driving the schedule?

Answered in the previous question.

QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO SCOPE & FEE

How does the previous conceptual work fit into this design scope? Should the proposing consultants assume that the ideas from the earlier process are the starting point for engagement and design work?

The early design phase was just that: early design ideas. Early design ideas are not the starting point for the current process, although there are many valuable principles and lessons learned that will inform it.

Section IV: Is the fee a lump sum amount or another fee structure?

A lump sum contract is a reasonable assumption, but all contracting decisions will be made through OO's Finance Committee.

Section IV, Paragraph 2b: Should the payment schedule information be provided by Task (phase), month, or other?

We prefer to see the fee proposal organized by Task, in a Gantt chart depicting progress and burn rate over time, ideally by month.

Should consultants assume that OO will be the contracting agent for all construction work? Are there known parameters around procurement requirements related to funding, such as following City of Minneapolis procurement rules etc? Are B3 Guidelines a known, or possible, project requirement?

OO will be the contracting agent. Because the project will include public sources of funds, procurement must follow all applicable laws and regulations.

Exhibit A, Scope of Work, General: Will the proponent be involved in either producing documents for fund raising or attending fundraising meetings or events?

We do anticipate that project renderings will be a scoped design deliverable, and that those renderings will support OO's comprehensive campaign. At this time, we don't anticipate requiring attendance at fundraising meetings and events, but OO is not opposed to it.

Exhibit A, Scope of Work, Task 1, 1.3: Are the documents listed below available? We are not seeking these documents now, only assessing what existing condition work would be needed.

1. Land Survey of all natural and built features, utilities, etc. [May be part of Alta Survey that we could not open]
2. Geotechnical report
3. Latest structural inspection report by the USACE or others
4. Drawings for existing structures including:
 - a. Buildings to remain
 - b. Bike Bridge
 - c. Lock Walls
 - d. Canal Walls

The answers are as follows:

1. Yes, the ALTA survey is linked in Exhibit E, and linked here:
https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/RFP_ALTA-Survey-Lock-and-Dam-Mpls-7-2021-signed.pdf

2. USACE has a geotechnical report on file, but it may need to be updated. There have been some site borings done.
3. USACE has reports that can be requested as part of Discovery.
4. On the availability of drawings for existing structures:
 - a. Our current assumption is that no buildings on the conveyed land are to remain.
 - b. Assuming you are referring to the Stone Arch Bridge, this would be a request to MNDOT, its owner. As an aside, MNDOT is currently actively sharing its staging plans for a 2-year bridge repair and restoration project.
 - c. Yes.
 - d. Assuming you mean the mill race channel in abutting Mill Ruins Park, we do have drawings that include those features, and anticipate more detailed drawings may exist and could be procured through a request to the Park Board during Discovery, or possibly the Minnesota Historical Society.

Exhibit A, Scope of Work, General: Will an Owner's Representative or Construction Manager be hired by the client at any stage in the process? If so, has this entity been selected?

No Owner's Representative or Contract Manager is currently in place or selected. The core team for pre-development activities including conveyance, planning, and partnership agreements, includes OO's Project Advisor (also your Contract Manager), General Counsel, Tribal law consultant, and OO leadership.

Exhibit A, Task 2.2.3, 3.2.2, 4.2.3: What cost estimate classification/level will be required at each design phase? Will the client be hiring its own independent cost estimator to verify and reconcile the design team's estimate? Was a cost estimate or an order of magnitude cost prepared for the First Season concept design and, if so, can you share the cost?

OO has already completed what we would consider a feasibility study cost estimate, possibly equivalent to Class 4, during early design. We would anticipate the cost estimates produced at 35%, 65%, and 95% to be equivalent to an updated feasibility estimate (Class 4-5), a design estimate (Class 3-4), and a bid estimate ((Class 2-3) respectively. We prefer that the Consultant Team procure and manage estimators. OO may, at its discretion, hire an independent cost estimator to verify the bid estimate. The early design cost estimate completed as part of early design was useful for level-setting, and led to current assumptions. However, sharing the initial cost estimate in full would be misleading as factors have changed. Our current assumed project budget is \$25 million.

Exhibit A, Task 4, 95% Design, 4.2.2: Should we assume that Bidding and Negotiation will be part of this scope? For example, does it include: Assistance with preparing the bid (info only, not management)? Perform a review of bids received? Value engineering if needed? Incorporation of Addenda issued during bidding and then submission of “100% Construction Documents” (documents released for construction)? Other tasks?

The Consultant Team should include bid preparation and bid review in its scope.

The RFP anticipates that after the General Contractor is selected and is under contract, the Consultant Team will coordinate with the GC on the push to 100% construction documents, and will provide Construction Administration services.

Exhibit A, Task 5, Construction Documents (with GC), last paragraph: Are proponents to submit a non-binding fee for construction administration and if so, can it be a range? Can more information be given about construction contract type and management (construction management vs/ general contractor), length of schedule, construction cost, etc.)

Yes, OO is requesting that Task 5 be included in the fee proposal, but be separate in anticipation that the work would be contracted later, in coordination with the GC contract.

Has a recent survey of the site, including all public and private utilities, been completed? If not, when can the design team expect to have that information?

OO has completed an ALTA survey of the site, which is linked in Exhibit E of the RFP. For your convenience, here are the relevant links:

- https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/RFP_ALTA-Survey-Lock-and-Dam-Mpls-7-2021-signed.pdf
- https://owamniyomni.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Easements_Color-coded-map.pdf

Has a geotechnical survey been completed? If not, when can the design team expect to have that information?

The Army Corps has a geotechnical survey on file that was completed some years ago. It can be provided.

What potential modifications are predicting a no-net rise evaluation?

This is simply stating a known parameter. Any final alternatives evaluated in the EA will need to comply with the no-net rise regulations for Minnesota.

Should consultants assume that the entire 5.2 acre project area would be bid and constructed in one phase?

Yes, that is OO's current intent.

Is there additional site information such as soil testing or other explorations that the consultants should assume need to be part of their scope?

It is our understanding that USACE has a geotechnical report, and that minimal borings were done.