

April 26, 2018

Addendum #01 Responses to RFSOQ Questions Architectural and Engineering Services for the County of San Mateo South San Francisco Campus Project

To All Respondents,

Please carefully review the responses below and incorporate the information as directed into your RFSOQ Submittal that is due to the San Mateo County Project Development Unit on **May 11, 2018 at 2:30pm**. Respondents submitting proposals that do not reflect the information provided below may be deemed non-responsive and not accepted by the County.

ANSWERS TO RESPONDENTS' QUESTIONS

Question#01– Scope: In addition to the health clinic, the scoping study includes a mixed-use office building, a parking structure, renovation, and sitework. Are any of these additional projects within the scope of this RFP?

Response – **The Scoping Study and Masterplan documents were provided for reference only on site concept and design component options. Exact scope will be developed with Architect during design. For the purpose of this RFSOQ, the site shall be based on the red outlined area only as shown in "Option 6" on page 28 of the "North County Courthouse Masterplan". See also Section 3.02.**

Question#02– Experience: The RFQ calls for projects exceeding \$30 million each. We have experience that is extremely relevant and local to the bay area that falls at \$20 million construction cost. Would the County consider revising the requirement from \$30 million construction cost to \$20 million?

Response – **The \$30M construction budget for projects shall remain as stated in RFSOQ Section 6.04**

Question#03– Experience: Can our application highlight project experience of a key team member prior to working with the submitting firm?

Response – **Project experience prior to working with the submitting firm may be included. However, the firm(s) that the team member(s) worked with shall be clearly noted in presenting the project experience.**



Question#04- RFSOQ item 4.02 asks for projects with budgets up-to \$30M each and RFSOQ item 6.04 asks for projects exceeding \$30M. Please clarify.

Response – RFSOQ Section 4.02 is amended as below:
4.02 Respondents to this Request for Statements of Qualifications (RFSOQ) should have a minimum of ten (10) years of experience in designing civic buildings, Federally Qualified Health Center buildings that may be subject to OSHPD 3 status, office buildings or similar facilities in urban settings. Respondents shall also have successfully designed and completed at least five (5) civic buildings, FQHC buildings, office buildings or similar facilities of comparable scope to this Project within the last ten (10) years with construction budgets at a minimum of \$30 million dollars each, preferably at least two (2) of them being local Bay Area projects.

Question#05- Schedule dates identified in RFSOQ section 11.02, including the RFI deadline, differ from the RFSOQ Part 13 Schedule. Please clarify.

Response – Follow Part 13 – Anticipated Schedule of Events For RFSOQ Process. Dates noted in Section 11.02 shall be amended to match with Part 13.

Question#06- Part 6.03.C Design Team Background requests respondents to identify “all sub-consultants with whom they would be willing to work.” Please confirm the request is to provide a complete list of proposed sub-consultants and consulting disciplines necessary to complete the work, and not a list of multiple sub-consultants for each discipline.

Response – Provide names of proposed sub-consultants for the key roles listed in Section 6.03 Respondents prefer to work with. It is up to the Respondents to decide how many sub-consultants to list for each key role or discipline.

Question#07- Option 6 proposes to renovate the existing Probation and Revenue Collection Building. Please confirm that renovation scope of work is not to be included in this RFSOQ and subsequent RFP. Please also confirm that the relocation of the existing IT facility in the Probation and Revenue Collection Building is not included in scope of work for this RFSOQ and subsequent RFP.

Response – See response to #1 above.

Question#08- Option 6 phasing includes the demolition of the North County Jail Building and construction of a temporary surface parking lot. Please confirm that demolition and parking work is not included in the scope of work for the RFSOQ and subsequent RFP.

Response – See response to #1 above.

Question#09- Part 5.01.A lists a range of 32,000 – 45,000 gross square feet of total program area. Please explain the reason for range since the upper bound is not supported by the preliminary program area of the 21 February 2017 Scoping Study, Alternate Scheme 2.

Response – Please propose based on the upper range for the purpose of this RFSOQ. See also response to #1 above.

Question#10- Are there any physical security criteria for this project?

Response – Yes, the requirement will be typical of buildings of similar scope to this Project such as security cameras, card keys.

Question#11- Please confirm low-voltage technology design will be done as design-bid-build.

Response – Low-voltage technology shall be included in the Architect's design scope.

Question#12- Are there any additional details pertaining to the AV scope (e.g. areas that should or should not be included in scope, will AV equipment will be provided by the Owner)?

Response – See responses to #1 & 11 above.

Question#13- Based on the Schedule related to Option 6, no time has been given for the EIR process. Please provide clarification on status of the traffic study and other agreements that need to proceed to have the clinic entitled for the proposed site.

Response – Respondents shall propose and incorporate appropriate timeline to allow for CEQA. Project Schedule will be updated collaboratively with Architect upon project commencement.

Question#14- Will this FQHC be licensed by CDPH and report to OSHPD?

Response – This clinic will be operated under the jurisdiction of CDPH and will be required to pass the requisite licensing inspection prior to occupancy; all licensing components must be included in scope of work. This Project will be OSHPD 3 (which is an Outpatient Clinic, not for overnight care facility.)

Question#15- PAGE 8 - Per item 6.03 – C - it says, "List any other consultants not listed that you anticipate having a role on this project. The inclusion of sub-consultant's resumes is not required unless they hold key roles as listed in the requirement" - Please confirm "the requirement" is referring to the "Project Architectural Team" as shown on pg 7, section 6.03-A – items #1-6

Response – "Key roles as listed in the requirement" refers to the 9 key roles listed right above the said paragraph in Section 6.03.

Question#16- PAGE 10 – Per item 7.01 – Please confirm if qualifications must be 50 pages single-sided, or may we submit 25 double-sided pages?

Response – No. Submit per Section 7.01.

Question#17- PAGE 11 – Please confirm if we are to submit with our qualifications, the "Letter of Compliance" referred to in Section 8.01-C

Response – Yes.

Question#18- PAGE 13 – Per item 11.02 – please confirm dates of submittal of Questions and when Responses will be posted to County website, as these dates differ from the "Anticipated Schedule" shown on page 15

Response – See response to #5 above.

Question#19- In the RFSOQ there are two conflicting requirements (see below). Could you please clarify if relevant project experience should be below or above \$30 million dollars?

4.02 Respondents to this Request for Statements of Qualifications (RFSOQ) should have a minimum of ten (10) years of experience in designing civic buildings, Federally Qualified Health Center buildings that may be subject to OSHPD 3 status, office buildings or similar facilities in urban settings. Respondents shall also have successfully designed and completed at least five (5) civic buildings, FQHC buildings, office buildings or similar facilities of comparable scope to this Project within the last ten (10) years with construction budgets up to \$30 million dollars each, preferably at least two (2) of them being local Bay Area projects.

6.04 Civic/Office Building Experience: The County seeks information concerning the experience of your Firm, and your proposed team, with relevant experience in designing for the construction of civic buildings, Federally Qualified Health Clinics (this project may be subject to OSHPD 3 requirements), office buildings or similar facilities comparable in scope to this Project. List relevant projects completed by your firm in the last ten (10) years, including at least five (5) civic buildings, FQHC buildings, office buildings or similar facilities designed, completed, or under construction by your firm with construction budgets exceeding \$30 million dollars each, preferably at least two (2) of them being Bay Area local completed Federally Qualified Health Centers and medical office building projects that best represent a similar scope, program and complexity to this Project planned by the County.

Response – See response to #4 above.

Question#20- The RFSOQ states that the project is targeted for zero net energy design and LEED certification. Can you share what level of LEED certification?

Response – The Project shall be at a minimum LEED Certified per County of San Mateo Municipal Green Building Policy.

Question#21- In section 5.02 - Scope of Services item B of the RFSOQ refers to an addendum "Health System Requirements". We did not find this Addendum. Could you please provide this Addendum?

Response – It referred to the addendum to the Scoping Study that was not part of the project requirement and was not included in the RFSOQ.

Question#22- Clarification of seemingly conflicting statements: On page 4 section 4.02 you require experience with budgets "up to \$30 million dollars each" and on page 8 section 6.04 you require experience "exceeding \$30 Million dollars each". Please clarify which requirement we should comply with.

Response – See response to #4 above.

Question#23- Clarification regarding section 6.08 Financial Information: We are a privately owned corporation, and, therefore, do not release detailed financial statements. In lieu of such information, we annually submit financial information to Dun and Bradstreet. We will provide our Dun and Bradstreet identifying number in our submission. Will this be deemed acceptable for compliance with requirement 6.08-A? We will be able to provide the requested information for 6.08 sections B & C.

Response – Provide Financial Information as required in Section 6.08. Respondents may submit such documents under seal and mark as "Confidential".

END OF DOCUMENT