



Board of Harbor Commissioners

Virginia Chang Kiraly, President
Nancy Reyring, Vice President
Tom Mattusch, Treasurer
Edmundo Larenas, Commissioner
William Zemke, Secretary

James B. Pruett, General Manager
Trisha Ortiz, District Counsel

Addendum #2 (Q3 Clarification) San Mateo County Harbor Admin Bldg D&E, RFP 2019-07

Questions, Clarifications, Requests for Modifications

Q1: In addition to an electronic searchable PDF, does the District require a Word doc copy of the Proposal for electronic submission via email?

A1: No, PDF's of both the proposal and cost form are sufficient. Separate electronic versions in PDF form of both the proposal and cost form will be accepted due to COVID-19 challenges with actual printing. PDF's can be e-mailed to jmoren@smharbor.com prior to submission deadline or, if file is too large, an e-mail with link so the docs can be downloaded is fine. I will immediately confirm receipt. If you do not receive a receipt confirmation please call me at (650)228-8683.

Q2a: In the conference you stated that we do not need to provide a fixed fee for construction phase services, and instead can provide hourly rates, with an intent to negotiate the fee for this phase after award of contract when construction duration has been established. Please confirm that on the Cost Proposal Form fees only need to be provided for tasks "a: Design, Engineering, Public Outreach", "b: Permitting" & "d: Project Funding Assistance", and that task "c: Bid Support/Construction Management" can refer to a separate hourly rate sheet.

Q2b: If hourly is accepted, we would suggest requesting an assumed fee based on assumed timeline regardless to have a basis of comparison. Otherwise, you may receive hourly fees with no basis of time for each individual at a given hourly rate.

A2a/b: To ensure there is equity, proposers will assume a 6 month construction duration for task "c". Cost form will reflect above.

Q3: In the conference you stated that a geotechnical report, topo & utility survey, and CEQA report be provided by the consultant. All three of these services are typically excluded from architecture and engineering contracts and provided by the owner. In particular, having the CEQA consultant under the Architect raises potential conflict of interest issues. Please confirm if these services can be excluded from the proposal, and if not which ones must be provided.

A3: SMCHD is a small Special District which manages marine facilities. District staff do not have the expertise required to professionally compete and submit above, as we are marina operators. The District does not publish additional RFP's for each of above for professional assistance in their completion. The RFP requires the winning firm, based on project specifics, to determine all reports/permits necessary, CEQA, EIR, etc... and work as District consultant, complete and submit all necessary on behalf of the District. The District will review and execute

prior to submission authorization. The firm creating plans/tech specs is most familiar with project detail and District has never had an issue with this being considered a conflict of interest. If proposing firm does not have in-house capability, proposal should reflect a sub-consultant for this task.

Q3 (follow-up clarification): We received Addendum #2 today and have the following question: As a follow up to Answer #3 in Addendum #2 - it is not clear what the district already has "in hand" with respect to entitlements. Does the district have a Negative Declaration (or Mitigated Neg Dec.) or an Exemption from an Environmental Impact Report as a requirement of CEQA? If not, is it the District's intent to simultaneously award a single contract for 'entitlements' and 'design and engineering services'?

A3 (follow-up clarification): The District has yet to develop even a conceptual plan for Board consideration, thus this RFP. Therefore, sufficient progress has not been made to apply for any permitting or entitlements. None in-hand at present. As stated in the RFP Scope of Services and addenda, responding firms should include determining applicable permits, CEQA/EIR requirements when enough detail has been developed and appropriate to do so. Successful RFP respondent will be responsible, based on project detail, for determining if a Neg Dec, Mit Neg Dec and EIR Exemption would be applicable, then prepare and apply for all that is determined necessary for construction IFB. Our desire is to hire an experienced firm that has worked through like projects and is familiar with necessary permitting/entitlements to construct an office building to meet our District's needs. If the proposing firm does not have necessary in-house experience with permitting/entitlements, a sub-consultant should be brought on with fees included in the RFP cost form. The District will not be issuing a separate RFP for permitting/entitlement needs.

Q4: We have received several proposals from Grant/Fundraising subconsultants, and the cost of work is variable and directly correlated to the number and complexity of grants being applied for. Since at this time it is unclear how many, if any, applicable grants will be available to the district for this project, we recommend the fixed fee and scope be to "*Identify, and present for District consideration, all available Federal and/or State grant funding opportunities and subsidized loan opportunities*" as outlined in the scope of services, while the fees for individual grant *applications* be negotiated on an as needed basis after award of contract. Please confirm this approach is acceptable.

A4: Confirmed, above approach is acceptable to the District. Fees for individual grant applications, if any are identified, will be negotiated on an as needed basis after award of contract. The District also already has in place a contract with a professional grant writing firm, who will be assisting, their participation will be considered in the negotiated grant identification/submission fees for winning firm.

Q5a: Is funding in place for design services for the duration of this project as identified in the RFP?

Q5b: Is any funding in place for the construction of the project? Is there an estimated budget at this time?

A5a/b: Yes, the District has ample financial reserves to fund the entire project as approved by our Board. There are many unknown variables related to this project. The District has no dollar

cap. The Architectural D&E cost will be determined through this competitive RFP process and the actual construction of Board approved plans will be determined through the competitive IFB process. RFP winning Architectural D&E firm will provide an engineer's estimate for the preferred plan for District's use when deciding upon awarding IFB contractor. Lowest cost qualified construction contractor submitting pursuant to the IFB process will be selected consistent with Public Contract Code. RFP winning Architectural D&E firm will prepare IFB package docs using provided District boilerplate template. District will advertise the construction IFB in local publications, on website, Plan Rooms, etc...RFP winning Architectural D&E firm will assist in ensuring the construction IFB reaches as many qualified contractors as possible.

Q6: Page 40 of the RFP states that the proposer must *present to the Board a final design alternative recommendation*. Is extensive development of multiple designs anticipated beyond an initial conceptual phase?

A6: Proposer will utilize their experience to evaluate District needs, parcel size challenges, zoning restrictions, etc... and input from at least one public outreach workshop to determine best initial conceptual building design recommendation for Board consideration. Ideally, there will be only one, possibly two, conceptual design recommended alternative(s) that will best meet the needs. The winning firm will take all parcel challenges and District needs into consideration and lead the District in making a decision based on the firm's professional advice/recommendation. The District will rely on the firm's professional experience to narrow considerably the overall conceptual design alternatives, arrive at a clear preferred/recommended conceptual design as quickly as possible. Once the overall design is approved by the District Board, detail will largely be dependent on recommendations by the architectural firm, with GM/staff input.

Q7: What is the targeted LEED certification level?

A7: First level, LEED Certification, will meet expectations. Heavy metal higher certification recommendations will be considered if the winning firm finds cost effective and realistic to recommend to District Board.

Q8a: In your Addendum #1, you indicated that *If your firm does not have the in-house capability to support actual construction, ensure the project is completed consistent with the tech specs your firm created, then you must add a sub-contractor with this ability to work closely with you during construction*. Do you have a preference for type of project delivery?

Q8b: Could we partner with a Construction Manager to pursue the project if the scope of services is not within architectural and engineering design services Standards of Care?

A8a/b: The District has no specific preference for project delivery. Proposer's submitted plans for professional project delivery will be compared to other proposals received and play a role in final selection decision. Proposer can enlist the assistance of any sub-consultants necessary to provide the requested scope of services.