

County of Calaveras

State of California

ADDENDUM 1

**(INQUIRIES AND REQUESTS FOR
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION)**

TO

**REQUEST FOR
QUALIFICATIONS**

to provide

**Project/Program Management
Consulting Services for
Design and Construction of a
New Adult Detention Facility
in Calaveras County, CA**

RFQ-ADF-1

RFQADF1@CO.CALAVERAS.CA.US

[HTTP://CCWSTOR.CO.CALAVERAS.CA.US/CAO](http://ccwstor.co.calaveras.ca.us/cao)



ISSUE DATE:

September 30, 2008

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Per Page 6, Part II – General Instructions, Paragraph B - Submittal Instructions, the following are responses to all inquiries received prior to the September 23, 2008 due date for questions regarding the RFQ. Inquiries received subsequent to that deadline will not receive a response.

This is the only Addendum that will be issued prior to the due date for the Statement of Qualifications. Throughout this Addendum the term 'Responding Firm(s)' refers to the firm(s) that submit a bona fide Statement of Qualifications that conforms to the requirements of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and 'Selected Firm(s)' refers to the legal entity(ies) that respond to the RFQ who may be selected to perform services under contract to the County.

IMPORTANT NOTE TO PROPOSERS:

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) has recently notified the County that the design/build method contemplated for the Adult Detention Facility portion of this project at the time this RFQ was prepared is not compatible with the new State Public Works Board process, but that use of the traditional design-bid-build method is allowable.

The County may pursue design/build for aspects of the project not part of the Detention Facility proper. Such a decision would be made in consultation with the selected PM.

Given that this solicitation is a Request for Qualifications, rather than for a detailed proposal addressing each aspect of the tentative scope of work, firms may wish to submit a response which discusses their design/bid/build experience, as well as their design/build experience.

RESPONSES TO PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS

Q1) Is the County requiring the Program and Bridging Architect to: a) be contracted with the PM; or, b) will the Program and Bridging Architect be contracted to the County with the PM assisting the County in the selection process?

A1) Yes. The County will consider separate agreements for Project Management and Architectural/Engineering Services for the Bridging Architect, as is the industry norm.

Q2) The RFQ is a bit confusing in that we are not sure if you are looking for an Architectural lead or a CM lead. It appears that they are somewhat joined based on the tasks/services requested. Typically these two services are separate and Counties usually do one before the other.

A2) The County seeks a PM lead, rather than either a purely architectural or CM lead, for the reasons stated in response to Question 1.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Q3) We are seeing tasks within the RFQ that are for PM/CM services but also Architectural and Engineering services. Can you please clarify the County's intent for this proposal?

A3) The County's primary intent is to secure a PM at this time, although there may be a certain overlap in task areas. Further, it is the County's intent that the firm manage the work of the A/E firm ultimately selected by the County. The tasks listed for the A/E firm are indicative of the type and range of A/E services that the PM firm will be responsible for managing with the actual A/E services to be performed by the selected A/E firm.

Q4) Page 2 - Item 4, Schedule, states "...and anticipated durations for design and construction of the project..." It appears the County has predetermined time frames for components of the work. Will this information be made available to the RFQ respondents? This would be extremely helpful in defining our work plan and fees.

A4) The following schedule is based on the one submitted with the County's application for AB900 funding, and adjusted to reflect the Corrections Standards Authority's delay until September 18 of final awards announcements:

KEY EVENTS	START DATES	COMPLETION DATES	COMMENTS
Schematic Design with Operational Program Statement	10/1/2008	1/1/2009	May accelerate if architect selected in advance. Over-the-shoulder reviews.
Design Development with Staffing Plan	1/8/2009	4/15/2009	Over-the-shoulder reviews.
Staffing/Operating Cost Analysis	2/13/2009	4/15/2009	Submit with DD.
Construction Documents	4/29/2009	7/30/2009	Over-the-shoulder reviews.
Construction Bids	7/31/2009	9/4/2009	Accelerated process with advance pre-qualification and "marketing of contractors and sub-contractors.
Notice to Proceed	9/4/2009	9/19/2009	Accelerated process with documents prepared in advance.
Construction	9/20/2009	11/21/2010	14 months.
Occupancy	11/21/2010	2/21/2011	Allows 90 days transition.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

The schedule set forth by the County in the AB900 grant application reflects key milestones based on the design/build method of project delivery as permitted under Section 2011 of Public Contract Code. The selected firm will be expected to validate the AB 900 grant milestones and develop a workable project schedule incorporating the milestones.

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) has recently notified the County that the design/build method contemplated for the Adult Detention Facility portion of this project at the time this RFQ was prepared is not compatible with the new State Public Works Board process, but that use of the traditional design-bid-build method is allowable. Given that this solicitation is a Request for Qualifications, interested Firms may wish to discuss their design/bid/build experience in their response. The County may pursue design/build for aspects of the project not part of the Detention Facility proper. Such a decision would be made in consultation with the selected PM.

For purposes of this solicitation, responding firms should assume that the attached schedule is valid, but should be aware that the schedule, along with the presumed project delivery method may change as a result of state requirements pertaining to the acceptable use of AB900 grant funds. In any event, the County is interested in cooperatively working with the selected firm to finalize and validate the schedule milestones for the project based on the actual delivery method that will be used.

Q5) Page 4 - Item II.A, Selection Process, states “Selection of the Consultant will be a two-stage process: Request for Qualifications and Request for Proposal...” The RFQ appears to be silent to the RFP component of the two-stage process. Can this be clarified?

A5) The highest-ranked firm at the culmination of the SOQ evaluation process will be invited to participate in negotiations with the County. During this portion of the selection process, the County will request a proposal from the top-ranked firm based on a scope of services that will be jointly developed between the County and the top-ranked firm to meet the needs of the project. If the County is unable to successfully negotiate an agreement with the highest ranked firm, then the County will terminate negotiations with that firm and open negotiations with the next highest ranked firm. The County will repeat this process until an agreement with a qualified firm has been successfully negotiated.

Q6) Page 5 - Item B.6, Page Count: The scope of work will require the use of several professional consultants. Per the requirements of the RFQ, resumes are required for each of these key team members. Will resumes be counted as part of the 30 page limit or may we incorporate them as an Appendix, not to be included in the 30 page limit?

A6) Resumes will not be counted as part of the 30 pages, but each resume shall be limited to one page in length.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Q7) Page 9 – Item D, Project / Program Approach: Several pages will be required in order to thoroughly address all of the required tasks for this scope of work. Would the County consider a brief description in the body of the submittal with an expanded Work Plan as an Appendix, not to be included in the 30 page limit?

A7) Responding Firms shall describe the firm's plans and approach to accomplishing the work requested within the 30 page limit. The information provided shall be in enough detail to enable the County to ascertain the steps in the total services proposed. Please limit this section of the Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) to no more than 5 pages. SOQs shall provide a comprehensive narrative that illustrates and describes how the Respondent will complete the scope of services, accomplish required objectives, and meet the County's project schedule.

This narrative shall also illustrate how the Respondent will manage the project, ensure completion of the scope of services, and accomplish required objectives within the County's project schedule.

Q8) Page 9 - Item E, Insurance Requirements: Will written acknowledgment within the SOQ that a firm is capable of meeting the insurance requirements be acceptable or will an Insurance Certificate be required at time of submission?

A8) A written acknowledgement within the SOQ of a firm's capability of meeting the insurance requirements is acceptable. However, a Certificate of Insurance must be presented to the County prior to contract execution.

Q9) Page 10 - Item F, Fee Schedule: Our team noticed that under the Scoring section of page 4, Item II.A.4, the points assigned to the RFQ criteria total to 100% but page 5, Item II.A.5 identifies Fee as a Factor. We are assuming that the County will review the Fee Rate Schedules and then negotiate a contract as noted in this section?

A9) As stated in II.A.4, "The scoring will include 100 available points," distributed across experience, qualifications and approach. Paragraph II.A.5, states "Fee will be a contributing, not deciding, factor in the rankings." These two concepts are not mutually exclusive and should be read together. Any contract would be a product of negotiation between the parties, and hourly rates as provided with the RFQ will be a factor in the negotiation process.

Q10) Assuming the fee rate schedule is correct, shall we escalate these rates to coincide with the time required to complete the project or escalate and then have an average rate?

A10) Since the fee schedule will form the basis of negotiation between the County and the selected firm and the scope of services will be jointly developed between the County and the selected firm, responding firms should provide their hourly rates for the current fiscal year and indicate the timeframe when rates would ordinarily be due for escalation according to each firm's standard business practices.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Q11) If the County is not requesting the rate schedule above is the County requesting an actual total cost proposal for the project based on the scope of work as defined? Shall our fee be lump sum or a full comprehensive proposal based on hours and tasks? If a comprehensive proposal is requested would the County consider deferring the submission date due to the amount of consultants involved on a project of this type?

A11) Based on the response to preceding question, responding firms are not required to provide a comprehensive, project-specific proposal in response to the RFQ.

Q12) Page 73 - Task 3.1.2.4, Obtain the following Data: Is it the County's intent that the services required to create the data listed in this section be part of the PM's scope of work or that the PM Team will assist the County in obtaining this information?

A12) Given that the introductory paragraph to the Outline of Scope of Work states, "The final scope of services will be negotiated between the County and the Selected Firm," the County regards it as the PM's responsibility to collect and organize the data as necessary to advance the project, recognizing that some items may already be in the County's possession. The County may ask the selected firm to consider contracting with subconsultants to perform some of the work listed rather than relying upon the County to issue multiple solicitations for services required for the project.

Q13) Page 75 - Task 4, Bridging Architect and Design/Builder Selection for Detention Center: This section implies that the PM will prepare one RFQ process to select the Bridging Architect and another RFQ process to select the Design/Builder. However, the body of the RFQ indicates that the PM is to have the Bridging Architect (and their consultants) under their contract. Please provide clarification on this section.

A13) The County regards its reply to Questions 1 and 2 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q14) The response to Question 13 will greatly impact the RFQ preparation and team composition. Without an answer to this question it will be difficult to respond accurately. And, depending on the answer, it may be difficult to respond within the time limit stated in the RFQ. Will the County consider deferring the submission date based upon the date this question is answered?

A 14) Given the nature of the County's reply to Question 13, the County does not believe an extension of the submission date is warranted.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Q15) Will the addition of the 80 beds and the Administration Building extend the schedule duration?

A15) Construction of the full, 240-bed Adult Detention Facility is anticipated in the tentative project schedule included in the County's response to Question 4, and provided with the County's AB900 application. The Sheriff's Department administrative facilities are not included in the AB900 application, and thus not subject to the same specific schedule. However, it would be the County's strong desire to have the administrative facilities occupied on a schedule which meets the Department's needs, and which is likely to coincide with occupancy of the Adult Detention Facility.

Q16) Will the County want the CM firm to prepare the Corrections Standards Authority's funding documents, i.e., quarterly reports, cash draw-down schedule, progress payment requests, etc.?

A16) Firms may be called upon to physically complete the required forms or to provide the County with information necessary for County completion of the forms. The County recognizes its ultimate responsibility as signatory to and submitter of such forms with appropriate authorities.

Q17) Is it the County's intent to have the CM provide the "bridging architect" as part of the CM contract?

A17) The County regards its reply to Questions 1 and 2 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q18) Has the County conducted any geo-technical testing of the project site? If so, is that information available?

A18) Geo-technical testing has not yet taken place. The County would be willing to consider authorizing the PM to subcontract with the appropriate consultant(s).

Q19) The County estimated cost of the project is \$26.4M. Does this include any off-site costs, such as roads, sewer, water, drainage, etc? If not, does the County have a declared budget for these items?

A19) The \$26.4 million project cost cited is attributed to construction of a new 160-bed adult detention facility as funded under AB900. The County has issued an additional \$30.2 million in General Obligation bonds, a portion of which constitutes the County's required AB900 matching funds and the remainder of which are attributed to the costs of adding 80 beds, for a total of 240 beds in the facility, site development and approximately 48,000 square feet of additional Sheriff's Department facilities as discussed in the Introduction to the RFQ.

Q20) Is it the intent of the County to develop the site and facility design layouts as shown in the AB900 Grant Application?

A20) That is the County's intent at this time. However, the County reserves the right to change or modify the plans over time as new information becomes available.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Q21) Does the work associated with “reuse strategy” refer to the future vacated court building and jail?

A21) Yes.

Q22) To what level does the County desire LEED certification?

A22) The County desires to develop a project using sustainable design principles to minimize impact on the environment. Responding firms should expect that the project will be developed to incorporate standards and provisions to meet basic LEED certification standards, whether or not such certification is actually obtained as part of the project. A decision will be made at a later date in conjunction with the selected firm to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of pursuing higher levels of certification and/or determining if the expense associated with obtaining certification is warranted and feasible within the established project budget.

Q23) With respect to the 30-page limit, our resumes are comprehensive and long, but do detail our staff’s experience. Is there any possibility that you would consider the resumes not be part of the 30-page limit count?

A23) The County regards its reply to Question 6 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q24) I want to confirm that you want a total of (10) CD’s , DVD’s or USB Drives

A24) Correct.

Q25) I want to also confirm that the proposal pages should be double-sided.

A25) Firms may choose to respond in a double-sided format. However, the response length is limited to 30 printed sides. That is, a single-sided response would be printed on 30 sheets of paper, while a double-sided response would be printed on 15 sheets of paper.

Q26) Full funding has not been secured for the implementation of the project; is the funding available for developing the validation of the needs assessment, programming, master plan and bridging documents?

A26) The County has, at this writing, been advised of its award of the full amount requested under AB900. These funds, combined with the County’s received General Obligation Bond proceeds, enable the County to proceed with the full scope project of a 240-bed adult detention facility, 48,000 square feet of Sheriff’s Department facilities and all anticipated ancillary project costs.

Q27) What level of LEED certification is required for this project?

A27) The County regards its reply to Question 22 as responsive to this inquiry.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Q28) Will the County hire their own surveyor, traffic engineers, and geotechnical engineers?

A28) As contemplated in its reply to Question 18, the County would be willing to consider either hiring these services directly or as subconsultants to the architectural/engineering firm and/or project management consultant firm selected for the project. The role of the project management consultant in relation to these services will be negotiated directly with the selected firm.

Q29) Please provide clarification as to the project scope:

Q29 I) Which buildings/spaces are included in the \$26,387,591 construction figure cited in the county's Grant Application?

A29 I) The \$26.4 million figure represents the anticipated cost of a 180-bed Adult Detention Facility. Construction costs of an additional 80 beds within the facility, for a total of 240 beds, and other buildings anticipated in the project will be funded from the \$30.2 million proceeds of the County's recent sale of General Obligation bonds.

Q29 II) In addition to these buildings/spaces, what buildings not included in the \$26,387,591 are also part of this project and what are their budgeted construction costs?

A29 II) In addition to the Adult Detention Facility, the County anticipates construction of approximately 48,000 square feet of Sheriff's Department facilities as discussed in the RFQ's Introduction.

Q29 III) Is the county funded Dormitory part of this project?

A29 III) The 80 County-funded correctional beds are included in the 240-bed Adult Detention Facility.

Q29 IV) The Sheriff's Administration / OES building is part of the project per the RFQ but is shown as future on the Schematic site plan; please clarify.

A29 IV) At the time of RFQ preparation, the County had not finalized AB900 funding. Failure to receive the full amount requested might have required the County to adjust its timetable for development of the additional Sheriff's Department facilities. However, the County recently received notice that its AB900 award will be in the full amount sought, and now intends to proceed with the above-referenced Sheriff's Department facilities as part of the project at this time.

Q29 V) There is a building labeled Sheriff Exterior shown as future on the Schematic site plan; is this part of the project and if so what is this building, budget, etc.?

A29 V) To the extent this building is realized within the project scope, it will be included within the 48,000 square foot estimate for Sheriff's Department facilities as discussed in the RFQ.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Q30) Pg 5 & Pg 10 - Fee Schedule – Please clarify what you are expecting to be submitted with our response to this RFQ; is it an hourly rate schedule or a full cost proposal? Pg 10 asks for a fee schedule to be submitted with the response to the RFQ. Typically, fees are not included in response to an RFQ. Pg 5 indicates that fee will be negotiated at the completion of selection with the highest ranked firm which implies that a fee will be submitted following selection and meetings will be held to clarify scope, etc. We recommend that hourly rates be provided with the response to the RFQ and that the fee be submitted and negotiated after selection following the opportunity for scope clarification, etc. If however, a cost proposal is required prior to selection, we recommend and request that you require it from only the shortlisted firms and that it be submitted at the time of the interview.

A30) The County regards its reply to Questions 9 and 10 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q31) Pg 5 – B.5 & 6 – Please clarify, “Number each side of each page...”Are you requesting 30 pages, printed single-sided with the exception of pre-printed, double-sided materials?

A31) The County regards its reply to Question 25 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q32) Pg 72 – 2.2.1.14 – LEED specifications – Will the County be pursuing LEED certification for any parts of this project and if so which parts and what certification level?

A32) The County regards its reply to Question 22 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q33) Pg 73 – 3.1.2.4 – Which of these items is the County contracting separately for and which are included as part of the PM’s scope of services to do?

A33) The County regards its reply to Questions 18 and 28 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q 34) Pg 74 – 3.1.5.3 – This scope of work item references the preparation of an RFQ/RFP for Architectural/Engineering services. These services would normally be part of the Design Builder’s services. Please clarify.

A34) Examples cited in this item were intended to be illustrative, rather than comprehensive. However, as noted in the County’s response to Question 4, the County has been advised that State Public Works Board requirements will necessitate pursuit of a design-bid-build process for the detention facility aspects of this project. Also as noted in its response to Question 4, the County may pursue design/build for non-Detention Facility aspects of the project.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Q35) Pg 77 – 6.1.7 – Technical Inspections – Please clarify which inspections you want the PM to include. Who will be doing testing? Will the County hire a separate Testing and Inspection firm? Will the County be supplying an Inspector of Record?

A35) Consistent with the County's response to Questions 18, 28 and 33, the County would be willing to consider authorizing the PM to subcontract with the appropriate consultant(s). The County recognizes the need for an Inspector of Record, and does not anticipate providing such services on its own behalf.

Q36) Pg 78 – 6.5 – Building Commissioning – Is it your intent that the PM act as the Commissioning Agent?

A36) Yes.

Q37) Pg 79 – 7.2.4 – Please clarify and elaborate as to your requirements for an energy management plan. Do you have a sample from a previous project?

A37) The County does not have an energy management plan consistent with the type contemplated for this project, and seeks a PM with the qualifications to assure its delivery in this instance.

Q38) Pg 79 – Task 8 – Please provide further information on the Superior Court Facility. Will the AOC have a full time on-site Construction Manager overseeing this work?

A38) As noted in the RFQ's discussion of Task 8, the County and State are in the process of defining both the project and the parties' respective roles. Task 8 and its elements are included to provide a basis for future negotiations, if necessary.

Q39) Do you intend for the architects interested in the bridging document services for this project to submit qualifications for this RFQ?

A39) The County regards its reply to Questions 1, 2 and 3 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q40) In addition to selecting a Project Manager and a Bridging Architect, will the County also be selecting a Design-Build entity to provide design and construction services under a single contract? If so, what is the timeframe for the selection of the design-builder?

A40) The County regards its reply to Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q41) Are firms that did not fax the "intent to submit" RFQ form by the 9/9 date still able to respond to the County's PM RFQ?

A41) Yes. Any firm submitting a response in the form specified in the RFQ by the 5:00 PM, October 7, 2008 due date is eligible for consideration.

Addendum 1: Inquiries and Requests for Additional Information

County of Calaveras, State of California Project/Program Management Consulting Services for Design and Construction of a New Adult Detention Center

Q42) A critical question for us at the moment is - Will bridging design documents be a required deliverable as part of this current RFQ? As far as I can tell that question hasn't been specifically answered.

A42) Because of the CDCR directive, the County does not anticipate pursuit of a design/build strategy for construction of the Detention Facility, but may employ one for the Sheriff's Department facilities. In other respects, the County regards its reply to Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 as responsive to this inquiry.

Q 43) In your RFQ on page 1 you state the following:

"2. Needs Assessment. The County has received a needs assessment study, prepared by TRG Consulting (See Attachment 'A': Adult Detention Center Project Needs Assessment). The initial phase of services of the Consultant will be to assist the County with review and validation of the needs assessment."

Do you want to have the inmate population projections and the related demographic information reviewed and validated, or do you want the kinds of spaces/buildings that are involved in the project and the square footage of those spaces/buildings reviewed and validated? Can you expand on what you mean by "reviewed and validated," what level/degree of reassessment are you assuming? It would seem that you would want the Bridging Architect to do this work--is that correct?

A43) The County accepts the needs assessment's underlying population projections and demographic information. The County seeks review and validation of the projected facility size, support spaces and configuration, with the PM as interface with the architect on this element as necessary.