


**ADDENDUM TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – Architectural Design and Engineering Services**

	<b>ADDENDUM No. 01</b>
	San Mateo County 555 Government Center, Fifth Floor Redwood City, CA 94063
	<b>RFP: No. 2019-005</b>
	Architectural Design and Engineering Services - East Palo Alto Government Center
Date: July 2, 2019	

**INTENT:**

This Addendum is issued by the County of San Mateo to provide for modification and clarification of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for Architectural Design and Engineering Services dated May 30, 2019. Proposers shall ascertain prior to submitting its Proposal that it has received all addenda issued. Please clearly note the addendum date and number on your proposal.

In the event of a conflict between the terms and provisions of this Addendum and the terms and provisions of the RFP Architectural Design and Engineering Services, the terms and provisions of this Addendum shall control. In all other respects, the RFP Architectural Design and Engineering Services shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

**A. RESPONSES (R) TO THE QUESTIONS (Q) INCLUDING ANY MODIFICATIONS BASED ON THE RESPECTIVE QUESTION(S). SOME SIMILAR QUESTIONS ARE GROUPED AND SIMPLIFIED.**

**Q1** Please confirm are we to plan for reusing existing furnishings and equipment?

**R1** *Yes for purposes of your proposal*

**Q2** Is that true for setting up swing space areas?

**R2** *Yes*

**Q3** Do we reuse existing furnishings & equipment in the final locations, or do we plan for new efficient modern and comfortable furniture in the final locations?

**R3** *To be determined as part of RFP Phase 1 and 2 and Feasibility Study Option 1*

**Q4** Is there a budget allocated toward the furnishings portion?

**R4** *Not at this time*

**Q5** If we are looking at new modern and efficient furniture fixtures and equipment is that only for the County spaces or does that include the City offices and supplemental areas as well?

***R5 To be determined as part of RFP Phase 1 and 2 and Feasibility Study Option 1***

**Q6** Are we including any finish upgrades? I.e. floor coverings, wall finishes, paints, millwork?

***R6 To be determined as part of RFP Phase 1 and 2 and Feasibility Study Option 1***

**Q7** Are we including any upgrades to the main building lobby?

***R7 To be determined as part of RFP Phase 1 and 2 and Feasibility Study Option 1***

**Q8** Shall we be reviewing for full ADA compliance in the building including entry, path of travel, restrooms, etc.?

***R8 Yes as required by the Americans With Disabilities Act***

**Q9** Can you advise how many user groups are anticipated that we would need to meet with?

***R9 Please refer to Feasibility Study***

**Q10** The RFP has this language bottom of page 5:

Provide a wide range of cost estimates **and reconciliation exercises**, including preconstruction, concept, budgetary, design, construction, and engineer's estimates. **Value Engineering estimation and financial analysis of design alternatives; alternatives resulting from value engineering reviews of design and construction techniques, and costs due to site and schedule constraints**. Should we include an allowance of hours for the highlighted items?

***R10 Yes based on your experience when working with a variety of user groups on single project.***

**Q11** We want to confirm the estimates required are: SD, DD, 60% CD, 90% CD (no pre-construction, concept or budgetary)?

***R11 Confirmed***

**Q12** For security sub-consultants, is there a preferred vendor list that the city/county already deals with?

***R12 No***

**Q13** Are we expected to find our own sub-consultants or coordinate with sub-consultants already vetted by the city/county?

***R13 Design team is responsible for selecting their own sub-consultants.***

**Q14** In June 2017 a construction cost for Option no. 1 (Base Scheme 1- primarily building utility system upgrades) was estimated at approximately \$10.2M (with mark-up for Project Costs total was noted at \$13.3M) Can the County clarify this amount (now including escalation?) and the budget that is now assigned to this project.

***R14 The \$13.3M project budget includes all soft and hard cost to design and build per Feasibility Study Option 1 at this time, pending new estimates as requested per this RFP.***

**Q15** The Study notes an add alternate for upgrade to new LED light fixtures throughout the building; will this work now be part of this scope and is funding available for this?

**R15** *Pending an updated project cost estimate.*

**Q16** Please confirm the delivery method for this project (i.e. when GC will be brought on board)? RFP now reads as traditional Design-Bid-Build.

**R16** *D-B-B; Contractor will be awarded the contract pending bid results.*

**Q17** Will all the current occupants remain in the building? Are there any plans to finally move out or in any functions/departments?

**R17** *To be determined as part of RFP Phase 1 and 2 and Feasibility Study Option 1*

**Q18** Please confirm that the existing building shell/curtain wall-window system will not be revised/replaced as part of the scope (other than the roof system).

**R18** *Confirmed*

**Q19** Please confirm that no seismic upgrade work or strengthening of the building is anticipated.

**R19** *Confirmed this is not a seismic upgrade project*

**Q20** Please confirm the Furniture/Systems Furniture scope- design and procurement (if any) that is part of this scope. Primarily new furniture/systems or just reconfiguration of existing furniture/systems?

**R20** *To be determined as part of RFP Phase 1 and 2 and Feasibility Study Option 1*

**Q21** Can you please provide additional information on the statement: “analyze the benefits and limitation to the County . . . (in) relocating to other office space in the immediate area”. What will SMC Real Estate Groups involvement be with the Project?

**R21** *Item 3. Analysis stands as written.*

**Q22** It has been observed that separate projects may be on-going with individual current tenants of the building. Can these separate projects be acknowledged and what will be the coordination between this Scope and this separate potential work?

**R22** *To be determined respective client needs at the time of construction.*

**Q23** How many hard copies for this submission are required and does one need to be an original?

**R23** *Please refer to the RFP for answer*

**Q24** Please confirm the address to deliver submission to.

**R24** *Please refer to the RFP for answer*

**Q25** Regarding the construction budget, the RFP instructs us to assume Base Scheme 1 for the project scope/budget. Base Scheme 1 includes Option 1 for an additional \$1.5 million for interior LED lighting and controls. *Question:* Given the current energy code requirements, are we to assume that the construction budget will include the additional \$1.5 million listed as Option 1?

***R25 Please refer to Response R15***

**Q26** The Executive Summary of the SCA Hazardous Material Survey, as well as Table 1: Materials Matrix Report, characterizes potential asbestos containing material on various walls, floor, roofing, and site components. *Question:* Will the project scope/budget for this project be expanded to include either focused mitigation or full abatement of these materials?

***R26 Selective abatement is required to meet the developed project scope of work***

**Q27** It is understood that the A/E's scope includes the meetings with the tenants/user groups and the development of functional layout and organizational concepts through space planning. *Question:* Is the A/E team to assume that the overall space allocation /demising walls (the lease area) of each of the tenants spaces are likely to remain intact?

***R27 Yes***

**Q28** RFP Section 1.2, Item 5 (Page 4) ends with the sentence: "in addition to the following CEQA/EIR agencies." *Question:* is there something missing at the end of that sentence?

***R28 For clarity, the sentence should read ....; and potentially CEQA/EIR.***

**Initial and Date:** \_\_\_\_\_