



**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
Administration Division**

Dana S. Hertfelder, P.E.
Director
Mailing:
715 Martin Luther King Jr.
Way
Merced, Ca. 95341
Physical:
345 West 7th Street
Merced, CA 95341
Phone: (209) 385-7601
Fax: (209) 722-7690
www.co.merced.ca.us

Equal Opportunity Employer

ADDENDUM NUMBER 1

COUNTY OF MERCED
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

**REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS (RFSQ)
COUNTY OF MERCED SB 863 EXPANSION OF THE JOHN LATORRACA
CORRECTIONAL CENTER DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT**

FEBRUARY 3, 2017

This Addendum shall be considered as part of the Request for Statement of Qualifications for the Expansion of the John Latorraca Correctional Center Project.

Careful note of this Addendum shall be taken by all parties of interest, so that the proper allowance may be made in all information required for consideration by the Proposal Screening Committee.

Receipt of this Addendum shall be acknowledged in the brief cover letter included with Qualifications submitted.

ITEM # 1. Requests For Information and Responses –

RFI'S RECEIVED		
#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
1	Page B-4, Part II, Question 2. This RFSQ requires the Architect to carry Errors and Omissions Insurance with a policy limit of \$5,000,000 per occurrence and not less than \$5,000,000 aggregate. This level of insurance carried by the Architect can increase design costs. Will the Owner consider requiring the Architect to carry Errors and Omissions Insurance with a policy limit of \$2,000,000 per occurrence and not less than \$4,000,000 aggregate?	As long as Contractor has policy limits meeting the \$5,000,000 per occurrence and not less than \$5,000,000 aggregate. Architect could carry limits of \$2,000,000 per occurrence and not less than \$4,000,000.

2	Please provide a sample D-BE contract from Merced County for informational purposes.	Sample contract will be provided with the RFP.
3	Please confirm a past completed facility with multiple phases (Separate GMP, designers, pay applications, teams, etc.) can be listed as separate comparable projects, even if the master contract was shared between phases. (Reference Section B, Part V, page B-12)	Yes these can be listed as separate projects.
4	The Prequalification Package lists "in construction or completed and occupied" projects as desired attributes. For projects currently in construction, questions #5-12 are not applicable. Please clarify if projects in construction will be scored lower than completed projects that can respond to questions #5-12. Please consider the majority of state-funded county jail projects that are most relevant for this RFSQ are still in construction.	Questions would still be applicable. Please answer them to the best of your ability.
5	Question: The County website indicates that we can request a plan holder list for this project. Can you provide us with the current design-build teams that have expressed an interest in pursuing this Design-Build project?	List will be provided with Addendum 1.
6	Regarding Section B – Prequalification Questionnaire; Please confirm that a project that “completed” within the past 5 years can mean either substantially completed or final completion with final payment? (Reference page B-9)	Substantial completion would meet this requirement.
7	During the RFP phase, will there be a stipend for the pre-qualified firms that are unsuccessful in the final project award? Please indicate the intended value?	No. We will be requiring very minimal efforts in the RFP phase.
8	What is the anticipated schedule for RFP release, RFP submission, RFP award, and construction? Please publish a draft or milestone schedule.	See attached preliminary project timetable that was submitted to BSCC for this project.

9	Has the county (owner) completed a hazardous material survey of the existing facility, including possible asbestos sources? Can a copy of this report be shared with the prospective teams?	Facility was built between 1989-1990, the assumption is that there are no hazardous materials, the county maintenance has not come across any hazardous materials and no testing has been done.
10	Has the county (owner) completed a soils report and / or geotechnical survey of the existing facility, including groundwater levels? Can a copy of this report be shared with the prospective teams?	Existing soils reports will be made available during the RFP phase. DBE team will be responsible for providing a new soils report with this project.
11	Are digital signatures acceptable on the copies of the "Authorization for Release of Information and Waiver of Liability for References" form included in section B?	Yes digital signatures are acceptable.
12	Clarification: Please clarify that a Corporation licensed as General Contractor meets the requirements of a Design-Build Entity as defined in the RFSQ section A item 1.2 (page A-8)	Confirmed Corporation licensed as General Contractor meets the requirements of Design-Build Entity.
13	Pages B-15 & B-16 Authorization for Release of Information and Waiver of Liability for References. This form requires signatures by all identified Design and Construction D-BE team members. Can electronic signatures be provided or must all signatures be "wet" / originals?	Yes electronic signature are acceptable
14	Clarification: Please clarify that the intent of section A item 1.3.1 is to include the Electrical Subcontractor as a Design-Build Member.	See question 24 for answer
15	Section A. item 1.3.4 seems to imply that the final contract agreement between the County and the D-BE will be a best value GMP agreement. Can you please provide a sample contract agreement for reference?	Sample contract will be provided with the RFP.

16	<p>Section A. item 4.2.2 (page A-16) suggests that the second step of this selection process is to issue a Request for Proposal (best value competition) to the 3 highest scores of the RFQ. Can you briefly outline the level of deliverables that will be required?</p>	<p>RFP will be 80 pages max as well as and additional (10 Pages max) of design. Respondents may decide what conveys their design ideas best (Floor Plans, Elevations, Sections, Details, Site Improvements, Landscaping, Mechanical, electrical, Etc.). All drawings are to be to scale; plans and elevations are to be dimensioned. A reduced copy of all drawings in 8.5 x 11 format or 11 x 17 folded to 8.5 x 11 are to be included in the binders. Draft scoring sheet attached that may be subject to change.</p>
17	<p>Page A-8, Section 1.3.1 does not require the Structural Engineer to be identified in this RFSQ or that the Structural Engineer complete Section B, Part IV. Page B-1, Part I "Members" does not list Structural Engineers specifically, though there is room to add this discipline. Page B-10, Part IV, requires the Structural Engineer to complete the section in addition to all other designers and subcontractors listed. Is it the intent that the D-BE selected Structural Engineer be included in this submittal and respond to the prequalification questionnaire?</p>	<p>If you would like to include structural engineering you can but it is not required.</p>
18	<p>What steps will the RFP selection process include? And how will they be scored?</p>	<p>RFP will be 80 pages max as well as and additional (10 Pages max) of design. Respondents may decide what conveys their design ideas best (Floor Plans, Elevations, Sections, Details, Site Improvements, Landscaping, Mechanical, electrical, Etc.). All drawings are to be to scale; plans and elevations are to be dimensioned. A reduced copy of all drawings in 8.5 x 11 format or 11 x 17 folded to 8.5 x 11 are to be included in the binders. Draft scoring sheet attached that may be subject to change.</p>
19	<p>Will there be an honorarium offered to the two unsuccessful finalists?</p>	<p>No. We will be requiring very minimal efforts in the RFP phase.</p>

20	Clarification: Section A item 3.1.1 i (see also Part 1 item 1 page B-2) references a “copy of the agreement forming the D-BE partnership or association”. It is our understanding that a General Contractor as a Corporation will be considered the D-BE solely as defined and no additional agreement is anticipated. Please confirm.	Confirmed
21	Question: The scoring for Part V: Comparable Projects gives no credit for the Architect and Contractor having worked together on a Comparable Project meeting attributes 1-4. Can you modify attribute 11 to include credit for the Architect and Contractor having worked together on a submitted Comparable Project?	Scoring system has been approved by county and will not be changing for this RFQ.
22	Question: Section B part III question 17 page B-9. Will you consider any comparable detention or correction project, meeting the required Part V attributes, that the General Contractor and Architect worked on together in the last five years as meeting this requirement with no additional information required beyond that submitted by each in part V: Comparable Projects.	Yes this would be acceptable.
23	Question: Section A. item 4.1.3 references the county’s right to require interviews (page A-15). At what stage of the process will the county determine the necessity for an interview and how will such an interview be scored to determine the 3 highest scores to proceed to the RFP phase?	The RFQ phase is not anticipated to have an interview process. The scores from the RFQ will determine the top 3 qualifying teams. Interviews/Presentations will be done at the RFP stage to determine this D-BE selected by the county.

24	<p>Question: Part I page B-1 Members: references a list of firms and consultants that “shall be identified and required to complete Section B, Part III questionnaire” (see Section A 1.3.1 page A-8). We agree that the General Contractor, Architect, Mechanical Engineer, Electrical Engineer and the Electronic Security Systems design firm are key components of a design-build team to be identified at this early stage for consideration and thus subject to Section A item 1.3.1 Substitution constraints. However, is it in the best interest of the County to include the Mechanical Subcontractor and the Electrical Subcontractor as listed Members at this early phase of your selection process? These bid packages could be bid out competitively during the process of determining the GMP for best results. Can we reclassify the Mechanical and Electrical Subcontractors as Design Assist members only during the design phase (and not constrained by the substitution clause at the GMP phase) with the understanding that the Mechanical and Electrical bid packages will be competitively bid out?</p>	<p>Remove the following from the list of required members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanical Subcontractor • Electrical Subcontractor • Electrical Security Systems (ESS)/Data Subcontractor <p>They can still be shown but will not be required.</p>
25	<p>Clarification: Please describe the anticipated timeline, process, required deliverables, and stipend (if provided) for the RFP stage.</p>	<p>See attached preliminary project timetable that was submitted to BSCC for this project. RFP will be 80 pages max as well as and additional (10 Pages max) of design. Respondents may decide what conveys their design ideas best (Floor Plans, Elevations, Sections, Details, Site Improvements, Landscaping, Mechanical, electrical, Etc.). All drawings are to be to scale; plans and elevations are to be dimensioned. A reduced copy of all drawings in 8.5 x 11 format or 11 x 17 folded to 8.5 x 11 are to be included in the binders. Draft scoring sheet attached that may be subject to change. No stipend will be made available for this project as we are requiring minimal deliverables.</p>

26	Clarification: Please identify county's anticipated notice-to-proceed date for the successful DBE and anticipated construction completion date.	See the attached preliminary project timetable that was submitted to BSCC for this project.
27	Clarification: Please provide the county's draft agreement between the owner and the design-builder including minimum requirements for bonding, insurance, builder risk, owner controlled insurance (OCIP), etc.	Sample contract will be provided with the RFP.
28	Question: Can you please indicate what type design build delivery you anticipate using: i.e. - traditional design-build, progressive design-build, collaborative-design build, etc.? And indicate at what phase of design you might anticipate a GMP or Lump Sum commitment.	Traditional Design Build
29	Clarification: Please confirm county's current status with the State of California's SB 863 approvals process.	See attached preliminary project timetable that was submitted to BSCC for this project.
30	From time to time, an inspector can arrive on a project and have an unordinary perspective of a jobsite and provide a "serious" or "Other than serious" citation even if abatement is in process. Typically, the most concerning violations are "willful, repeated, or failure to abate". Is the intent of question 17 of Section B to disqualify firms for only "willful" and "repeat" violations? Should "serious" be deleted and be replaced with "Failure to abate"? (Reference page B-6)	"Failure to abate" will replace "Serious"

31	<p>Per Section B, Part V, Question 4 regarding criteria for comparable projects, the request is, "For the Architect, project involvement must be as the Architect of Record." Our firm has worked in association with another architectural firm in the design of recent large California design-build correctional projects where the scope of work has been split by buildings. While not the listed AOR, we were responsible for the design of these buildings, including housing and programs and have stamped the drawings for these buildings. Please confirm that we can include these projects as available to use for reference questions and we would receive a score of "Yes" in Section V, scoring sheet re: Architect of Record question. Our role was much more significant than a "consulting" capacity and our references will confirm our design scope.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Partnering or consulting architect on a project would be acceptable.</p>
32	<p>Regarding Comparable Projects, we have completed more than 5 comparable licensed correctional medical/mental health facilities, completed within the last 10 years in California. They all have between 45 and 64 beds and between 40,000 to 50,000 GSF and they are all LEED Certified Silver or Gold. However these facilities bid during the recession at less than half of the estimated value, between \$19 and \$21 million. In today's dollars these facilities would likely cost between \$40 and \$50 million. In this regard they would qualify as comparable projects over \$25 million. We have also completed jail renovation projects including security and access compliance upgrades; therefore, our experience is very relevant. Would we be considered as qualified if we submitted three of these projects as comparable?</p>	<p>Page B-12 "Part V" Question 1 is to be changed to read: "A Detention, corrections, or public safety facility with a construction cost of at least twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000).</p>

COUNTY CORRECTIONS TO THE RFSQ		
#	ORIGINAL	CHANGE
33	Page C-5 "Section C Attachments", Question 9 asked for Insurance EMR for 2012, 2013, and 2014.	The correct dates should read 2013, 2014, and 2015.

ITEM # 2. Attachments –

- 1. DRAFT RFP SCORING SHEET**
- 2. BSCC PROJECT SCHEDULE**
- 3. KNOWN LIST OF RFSQ HOLDERS**

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1

Department of Public Works

Richard A. Schwarz, Architect
Assistant Public Works Director

ATTACHMENT 1

Points	Scoring Criteria
40	Project Team and Project Management Includes listing of proposed project firms and staff. Project management performance including: communications, responsiveness, decision making process, general performance, customer satisfaction. Ability to deliver the project on time, within budget and achieve design goals. Change order record, QAC, Close-out
40	Construction Expertise Includes evaluation of construction expertise and performance relative to the proposed project. Safety considerations will be included here also.
20	Value-Added Enhancements Includes evaluation of Value-Added Enhancements
40	Technical Design Includes evaluation of drawings, demonstrated project understanding and needs, project design, and green building strategies incorporated.
10	Skilled Labor Force Availability Includes evaluation of Skilled Labor Force form.
40	Price Includes evaluation of the Price Proposal and the scope attainable. Also includes consideration for any contract comments/objections received.
10	Schedule Includes evaluation of the project schedule including consideration of completeness, understanding of project requirements and timeframes.

200	Total Points Available
------------	-------------------------------

ATTACHMENT 2

SECTION 3: PROJECT TIMETABLE

Prior to completing this timetable, the county must consult with all appropriate county staff (e.g., county counsel, general services, public works, county administrator) to ensure that dates are achievable. Please consult the “State Public Works Board (State Capital Outlay Process)/Board of State and Community Corrections Processes and Requirements” section, page 30 of the RFP for further information. Complete the table below indicating start and completion dates for each key event, including comments if desired. Note the required time frames for specific milestone activities in this process. The BSCC Board intends to make conditional awards at its November 2015 board meeting.

KEY EVENTS	START DATES	COMPLETION DATES	COMMENTS
Site assurance/comparable long-term possession <u>within 90 days of award</u>	12/17/15	03/15/16	BOS Resolution
Real estate due diligence package submitted <u>within 120 days of award</u>	12/17/15	04/16/16	
SPWB meeting – Project established <u>within 18 months of award</u>	12/17/15	04/17/16	Project is established to enable County to proceed with preliminary plans
Schematic Design with Operational Program Statement <u>within 24 months of award</u> (design-bid-build projects)			N/A
Performance criteria with Operational Program Statement <u>within 30 months of award</u> (design-build projects)	04/17/16	04/17/17	Completed within 12 months of project establishment
Design Development (preliminary drawings) with Staffing Plan			N/A
Staffing/Operating Cost Analysis approved by the Board of Supervisors	07/17/16	09/17/16	
Construction Documents (working drawings)	11/13/17	03/13/18	Completed by DB Firm
Construction Bids or Design-Build Solicitation	05/12/17	08/12/17	DB Proposals & Selection
Notice to Proceed <u>within 42 months of award</u>	08/12/17	11/12/17	
Construction (maximum three years to complete)	11/13/17	11/13/20	
Staffing/Occupancy <u>within 90 days of completion</u>	11/13/20	02/13/21	

ATTACHMENT 3

Merced County Department of Public Works Administration

PLANHOLDERS LIST FOR: Design Builder Prequalification for John Latorraca Correctional Center
 BID OPENING DATE: Tuesday February 28, 2017
 PLANS & SPECIFICATIONS: _____

SHEET NO. 1 of 2
 TIME 4:00 PM
 A/E ESTIMATE: _____

No.	Contractor Mailing Address	Phone No.	Fax No.	Set No.	Amount Rec'd & Date	Attachments	Ack Rec'd	Initials	Method Sent Date
1	Layton Construction Co. Attn: Josh Haines 9090 South Sandy Parkway Sandy, UT 84070	(801) 568-9090	(801) 569-5451					sg	M 1/17/17
2	Layton Construction Co. Attn: Ed Deffner 9090 South Sandy Parkway Sandy, UT 84070	(801) 568-9090	(801) 569-5451					sg	M 1/17/17
3	Dewberry Architects Inc. 300 N. Lake Ave., Suite 1200 Pasadena, CA 91101	(916) 239-7255						sg	M 1/17/17
4	Bernards Builders 7045 N. Chestnut Ave., Suite 103 Fresno, CA 93720	(559) 420-7505	(559) 412-4744					sg	M 1/17/17
5	AECOM Attn: Beverly J. Prior 300 California St. San Francisco, CA 94104	(415) 908-6183	(415) 796-8200					sg	M 1/17/17
6	AECOM Attn: Nina Gladstone 300 California St. San Francisco, CA 94104	(415) 955-2975	(415) 796-8200					sg	M 1/17/17
7	Sletton Construction of Nevada, Inc. 5825 S. Polaris Ave, Las Vegas, NV 89118	(702) 739-8770	(702) 739-9932					sg	M 1/17/17
8	Darrell L. Stelling, AIA Attn: Dan Sandall dstelling@dlrgroup.com	(916) 596-4343						sg	M 1/17/17
9	Arrington Watkins Architects Attn: Mike Condor 5240 N. 16th St #101 Phoenix, AZ 85016							sg	M 1/19/17
Addendum No.		Date		Remarks		M = Mailed		BF = Bid Form	

Merced County Department of Public Works Administration

PLANHOLDERS LIST FOR: Design Builder Prequalification for John Latorraca Correctional Center
 BID OPENING DATE: Tuesday February 28, 2017
 PLANS & SPECIFICATIONS: _____

SHEET NO. 2 of 2
 TIME 4:00 PM
 A/E ESTIMATE: _____

No.	Contractor Mailing Address	Phone No.	Fax No.	Set No.	Amount Rec'd & Date	Attachments	Ack Rec'd	Initials	Method Sent Date
						F = Faxed P = Picked Up P/S = Plans & Specs			AD = Addendum FE = Federal Express

10	HOK Architects Attn: Mike Retford One Bush Street, Suite 200 San Francisco, CA 94104							sg	M 1/19/17
11	Roebbelen Construction Attn: Rick Bruining rickbr@roebbelen.com 1241 Hawks Flight Court El Dorado Hills, CA 95762	(916) 939-4000							
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									