



Answers to submitted questions for: ***RFSOQ- Architectural and Engineering Services*** San Mateo Co. Replacement Correctional Facility

12/20/2011 | Jail Planning Unit | smcsheriff.com/jail-planning

1. **Q.** We have been advised by several sub-consultants that they understand the intent of the Para. 6.03, sub-paragraph C. to be that the Respondent is to simply list (ie: without firm bios, resumes, etc.) any and all sub-consultants in each discipline (re.: structural M.E.P., etc.) with whom they would be prepared or with whom they would prefer to work. Might you please clarify?

A. Confirmed. At the RFSOQ stage we are only requesting a list of firms for each discipline. Any information related to joint venture arrangements, preferences, or exclusive relationships should also be included.

2. **Q.** I have the following questions relating to the SOQ - specifically page 6, Section 6.03, Design Team Background, paragraph C:

Might you please clarify if the County is asking the respondent to list not only those subconsultants we would be willing to work with but those subconsultants we would actually propose for this particular project? In this context, certain preferred subconsultants might have already committed to team on an exclusive basis and thus might only come available should that team not be selected. Thus, should we propose on the basis of whom we believe would be the best team regardless of commitments, or on the basis of the best team currently available?

A. The County is asking respondents to provide a list of preferred subconsultants in their response to the RFSOQ, with the intent of ultimately selecting the subconsultants in collaboration with the selected Architecture firm and CM/GC-at-risk firm. At this time, respondents should propose on the basis of whom they believe would be the best team, regardless of commitments. Any information related to joint venture arrangements, preferences, or exclusive relationships should also be included.

3. **Q.** Does the County require firm profile and experience as well as key individual resumes for each subconsultant firm proposed for this project or simply a listing of the firm name and discipline of subconsultants we would prefer to work with on this project?



SHERIFF'S OFFICE

A TRADITION OF SERVICE SINCE 1856

A. At this time, please provide a listing of subcontractors firm name and discipline. Additionally, include any services your firm proposes to perform in-house.

4. Q. Would you please advise if proposal covers, backs and tabs can be included in our submission and if they would be exempt from the 50-page maximum?

A. Yes, they are exempt from the 50 page count.

5. Q. 2.01- Can we print 25 pages double sided instead of 50 single sided to conserve paper?

A. No, please refer to Part 7.01.

6. Q. 6.03 C. Do you want the prime architect to show a full team of consultants in the response and give an additional consultant list they would like or be willing to work with? Or do you only want the Architectural team qualifications at this time and give you our wish list of consulting engineers that we feel are best suited for the project?

A. At this time, respondents should propose on the basis of whom they believe would be the best team, regardless of commitments. Any information related to joint venture arrangements, preferences, or exclusive relationships should also be included.

7. Q. 6.03 C. If the prime architect is not local to San Mateo County and utilizing a local architect to help with permitting would you like the local architect listed as a team member? Or, can we do a similar wish list of local architects similar to consulting engineers that we feel are best suited for the project? This would give the jail planning team input on that design consultant as well.

A. Yes. List the local architect as a team member.

8. Q. 6.03 C. Are we to assume the CM firm will be doing the cost estimating with the PM firm checking costs or would you like the design team to make recommendations for cost consultants that would allow the design team an additional resource for cost information?



A. The CM/GC at-risk will provide cost estimates

9. Q. Part 6.03.C (Page 6) Is the County requesting a single preferred consultant for each category, or multiple acceptable consultants for each category?
In your November 30th presentation, the Sares-Regis representative stated that we are to submit the best team members for this project as an all inclusive representation of the make-up of the team presented.

A. At this stage we are seeking multiple acceptable consultants for each for each discipline.

10. Q. Part 6.08.A (Page 7) Are financial statements submitted under seal considered part of the 50 page limit? If so, could a summary statement be used instead?

A. Financial statements are not included within the page limit.

11. Q. The requirement for two projects over \$50 Million in an urban environment seems like it may be difficult to overcome for many firms. Since there hasn't been a significant amount of large correctional projects with the exception of AB900 funded projects which have not yet been completed, would the County consider smaller dollar volume projects as well as juvenile projects? Additionally, would the County consider broadening this requirement to include AB900 or SB81 projects currently in design and/or to include institutional public projects?

A. The \$50M minimum dollar volume will remain as stated in the RFSOQ.

12. Q. Section 7.01 states that lists of projects are excluded from the 50-page page count. Will you confirm that since Section 6.04-Correctional Facility Experience is stated as requesting a project list with accompanied data that this section is thus excluded from the page count in its entirety?

A. Confirmed

END