Addendum #01
A/E Services for the Cordilleras Mental Health Facility
Response to RFSOQ Questions

To All Respondents,

Please carefully review the responses below and incorporate the information as directed into your submittal of qualifications due to the San Mateo County Project Development Unit on August 18, 2017. Respondents submitting qualifications that do not reflect the information provided below may be deemed non-responsive and not receive a Request for Proposal.

RFSOQ Addenda

Item #1 – Last Paragraph of Section 3.02 of the RFQ shall be modified and shall read as follows:

3.02 The study recommended replacing the 49-bed SH with a 37-bed SH in a separate building from the MHRCs on the same campus. This building would also house space for medical care, a community room, dining facility and other community resources.

Item #2 – Section 5.02C of the RFQ shall be modified and shall read as follows:
5.02C The Basic Services will also include normal architectural services; performance and coordination of structural, mechanical (including plumbing); electrical; physical and electronic security systems and civil engineering services; landscape architecture services; roofing consultant services; and any other services included in the Agreement as part of Basic Services.

Item #3 - Section 8.01C of the RFQ shall be modified and shall read as follows:

8.01C Respondents shall assure compliance with section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 by including a statement of compliance in their Cover Letter. Respondents shall be prepared to submit a self-evaluation and compliance plan to County upon request within one (1) year of the execution of any agreement that may result from this submittal.

Item #4 - Section 11.01 of the RFQ shall be modified and shall read as follows:

11.01 The SOQ should be clear and concise to enable management-oriented personnel to make a thorough evaluation and arrive at a sound determination as to whether the SOQ meets the County’s requirements. To this end, each SOQ should be as specific, detailed and complete as to clearly and fully demonstrate that the Respondent has a thorough understanding of and has demonstrated knowledge of the requirements to perform the work (or applicable portion thereof). The SOQ must be verified under oath by the Respondent and each of its members. Respondent shall include the following in the Cover Letter “I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that all information submitted under this RFQ is true and correct.”

ANSWERS TO RESPONDENTS QUESTIONS

1. Question: Under 5.02 C. on page 5, it indicates that geotechnical services would be part of the basic services that the AE team should provide. How does that scope differ from the Owner’s Geotech scope?

Response: Please see revised Section 5.02C, in item #2 of the addenda. The Geotechnical Engineer will be directly under County contract. The Architect is not required to have a Geotechnical Consultant on their team.
2. Question: Interface Engineering worked on the bridging documents, are we precluded from teaming on the project.

   **Response:** The only firm precluded from teaming on this RFQ is HGA Architects, per Section 6.03C on Page 7. Interface Engineering can team on this RFQ.


   **Response:** The Feasibility Study is correct. Please see revised Section 3.02 in item # 1 of the addenda. We will attempt to accommodate 57 beds if possible, during the Design Phase.

4. Question: RFSOQ 5.01.A Scope of Project notes a goal for energy performance at least 10% above the 2016 California Energy Code and indicates that LEED Certification is preferred but not mandated. Feasibility Study, Part 6 program, P .22 notes requirement from California Title 24 and San Mateo County Sustainable Guidelines to achieve Zero Net Energy (ZNE). In addition, Feasibility Study, Part 7 Conceptual Design Recommendation, PP 83-85 discusses the desire for a photovoltaic system. Please advise.

   **Response:** The County has revised the sustainability requirements. LEED Certification and ZNE are not being targeted for this project. The only requirement mandated, is 10% better than current Energy Code as per Section 5.01A. The County is very interested in energy efficiency for its buildings. Solar Panels along with other efficiency measures will definitely be considered during the Design Phase.

5. Question: Please advise if the County will retain an EIR consultant directly and, if so, what the scope of responsibilities of that consultant will be.

   **Response:** The County will retain an Environmental Consultant to further develop on the Biological Constraints Analysis (Appendix F of Feasibility Report) and to assist the Design Team with permitting and regulatory compliance.

6. Question: Please confirm that the experience requirement for projects in environmentally sensitive location per RFSOQ 6.04 and 4.02 can be met by consultants to the prime Architect, including firms providing engineering services or specialty consulting services as part of the project.

   **Response:** Yes, experience requirements noted in Section 4.02 and 6.10 (please note section number) can be met by consultants to the Prime Architect.

7. Question: RFSOQ 6.05 contains experience requirement for San Mateo County. Please confirm that experience requirement for work within San Mateo County per RFSOQ 6.05 can be met by
consultants to the prime Architect, including firms providing engineering services or specialty consulting services as part of the project.

**Response:** Yes, experience requirements noted in Section 6.05 (San Mateo County Experience) can be met by consultants to the Prime Architect. Please note that this is not a mandatory requirement.

8. Question: Feasibility Study, Part 1 Executive Summary, P.4, notes phased approach to development, where 36 consumers will be relocated to places off site during construction. Please confirm the number of consumers that need to be accommodated on site during construction.

**Response:** No consumers will be relocated off-site during construction. We will work with the Contractor to incorporate safety and noise abatement measures to ensure the safety and well-being of all on-site residents during construction.

9. Question: What is the County’s construction cost budget for the project?

**Response:** Pages 3 & 4 of the executive summary in the Feasibility Study provide an estimated cost. Part 8 of the Feasibility Study includes an extensive Financial Analysis of the project. The final target construction cost will be confirmed during RFP.

10. Question: What is the required date for completion of the project?

**Response:** The complete project schedule (Design & Construction) will be developed once we have the CM/GC on board. The County’s target design phase is 1 year and 2 years for construction.

11. Question: In the Request for Statements of Qualifications there is discussion related to the need for additional geotechnical engineering services. In Section 5.02 Scope of Services geotechnical services are listed under Basic Services, but in other locations in the document geotechnical services are not mentioned with other services to be subcontracted. Can you verify if geotechnical services for design will be procured through subcontracted services as part of the architectural contract or contracted separately?

**Response:** Please see response to Question #1 above.

12. Question: Page 10, Section 8.01, Item C: Indicates respondents shall assure compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act by submitting a signed letter of compliance. Is this signed letter of compliance required as part of the SOQ submittal? If so, does it count toward the 50-page limit?
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Response: Yes, there is a form that has to be signed. It is a part of the RFP and has to be signed and submitted as part of the RFP response. For the RFSOQ submission, please address and affirm compliance in your cover letter. See item #2 in addenda above.

13. Page 12, Section 11.01: Indicates the SOQ must be verified under oath by the respondent and each of its members. Is this verification under oath required as part of the SOQ submittal? If so, does the County have a form of verification available for respondents to utilize? Do these forms count toward the 50-page limit?

Response: There is no form of verification required to be signed and submitted as part of the SOQ submittal. Please see item #4 in addenda above. The signed cover letter submitted as part of the SOQ needs to include the line “I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that all information submitted under this RFQ is true and correct.”

14. Is the project currently tracking within your desired budget?

Response: Please see response to Question #9.

15. Will HGA be involved in selection process and/or the project? If so, to what degree?

Response: No, HGA will not be involved in the selection process or the Project.

16. Will the County be issuing bridging documents at the RFP stage or at the beginning of the project for implementation? If so, will there be opportunity to revisit the architectural design of the project?

Response: Bridging Documents will be made available along with the RFP, but the County sees this as a fresh start. So, the design will definitely be revisited.

17. Will the County be carrying the cost for the additional geotechnical study or should team include a geotechnical consultant?

Response: Please see response to Question #1 above.

18. How many copies of the financial document package do you require?
Response: Please provide 10 copies and 1 electronic copy, as per Section 2.01 of the RFQ.

19. Does the county have an arborist on board or shall respondents include that in their scope?
Response: The County does not have an arborist on board at this time, but the County will bring the arborist on board at a later stage in Design.

END OF DOCUMENT

Please Note: There will be a walkthrough of the Project Site on Monday July 24, 2017 at 10am. Further details about the walkthrough will be posted on the PDU website.