



Caring for Our Coast

♦ ♦ ♦

Gary Jones
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

Amy M. Caves
Deputy Director

May 7, 2020

**ADDENDUM ONE
REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR
HARBOR ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN CONSULTANTS
RFSQ #DBH71**

The Department of Beaches and Harbors issues Addendum One to the Harbor Engineering and Architectural Design Consultants Request for Statement of Qualifications RFSQ #DBH71, which was released on April 16, 2020.

As indicated in the RFSQ, Section 1.7, County Rights and Responsibilities, the County reserves the right to amend the RFSQ by written addendum. Part One of this Addendum contains the answers to the questions that were submitted prior to the deadline of April 30, 2020. Part Two of the Addendum contains portions of the RFSQ that have been revised.

The information contained in this Addendum One supersedes any related information previously provided.

Thank you for your interest in our Request for Statement of Qualifications for Harbor Engineering and Architectural Design Consultants. As stated in this Addendum, the deadline for Submittals has been extended due to the global COVID-19 crisis. Submittals must be emailed to Contracts@bh.lacounty.gov, and must be received no later than 2:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time, on May 21, 2020.

We look forward to receiving your submittals.

Very truly yours,

GARY JONES, DIRECTOR

Angelica Vicente, Contracts Administrator



ADDENDUM ONE

PART ONE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The information hereunder, specific to the sections discussed below, supersedes any information previously provided as to those sections.

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

Question 1: Any possibility you can tell me who the incumbents (winning firms) for the two current contracts are, and the dollar value of the awarded contracts? I think the current contracts are for the 2013 RFPs (DBH-49 – Engineering and DBH-50 – Architectural).

Answer 1: The firms that currently have As-Need Harbor Engineering Consulting Services Master Agreements are as follows: Tetra Tech, Inc.; TranSystems; KPFF Consulting Engineers; Noble Consultants, Inc.; Atkins North America, Inc.; Moffat & Nichol; Cardno Inc.; Dewberry Engineers Inc.; and TRC Engineer, Inc. The firms that currently have As-Need Urban Planning and Design Consulting Services Master Agreements are as follows: Frank R. Webb Architects, Inc.; Gruen Associates; IBI Group; Kritzing + Rao Inc.; Smith Group, Inc.; and PlaceWorks.

The current annual amount for the As-Needed Harbor Engineering Consulting Services Master Agreements is \$200,000. The current annual amount for the As-Needed Urban Planning and Design Consulting Services Master Agreements is \$100,000.

Question 2: What is total value of this contract?

Answer 2: The budgeted amount for this new Master Agreement is \$500,000 annually. Note that this amount may be subject to change.

Question 3: Is this a similar procurement as that issued about 5 – 7 years' ago?

Answer 3: Yes, this new Request for Statement of Qualifications (RFSQ) was previously two separate Master Agreements (As-Needed Urban Planning and Design and As-Needed Harbor Engineering Consultants). We noted that both are similar in services and that they could be combined into one Master Agreement with categories for which proposers can qualify for one or multiple categories.

Question 4: Will this Master Agreement supersede existing contracts that relate to the RFSQ's categories identified?

Answer 4: Yes.

Question 5: Are Landscape Architects eligible to prime?

Answer 5: Vendors may qualify in the Architectural and/or Landscape Architectural Design Services category if the minimum requirements, as outlined in Section 1.4 of the RFSQ, are met.

Question 6: Where do we find the required forms outlined on the RFSQ (pages 31-38)? The required forms are P-1 through P-17.

Answer 6: The required forms can be found in Appendix B of the Request for Statement of Qualifications.

Question 7: Section 1.1 states that engineering services may include evaluations and restoration of building. This part of the scope seems to align with past waterfront work that our firm has completed. Are we able to propose our structural engineering services separately, or would we need to team with another entity that specializes in harbor and coastal engineering? Should submissions comprise of a full team, with necessary subconsultants?

Answer 7: You may submit separately or as a team, in any category of the solicitation, as long as your firm or team meets the Vendor's Minimum Mandatory Qualifications, as outlined in Section 1.4 of the RFSQ.

Question 8: In Section 1.1 Scope of Work under General Information on page 4, please provide more clarification on the term "Industrial Design" in its relation to Planning and Other Design Services.

Answer 8: The Department occasionally requires design services for products or goods that are specifically designed to meet the Department's needs managing and operating within the coastal and marine environment (e.g. specially designed beach trash barrels, uniquely themed public furniture or bike racks, etc.).

Question 9: Under Section 2.3 RFSQ Timetable, it is stated, "SOQ's due by May 14, 2020, 2:00 p.m., PST for initial qualification. The County will continue to accept SOQ's throughout the term of the Master Agreement." Does this mean that **initial** qualifications may be submitted for consideration after May 14, 2020? Or, will firms who do not submit by May 14, 2020, be excluded from any further consideration?

Answer 9: Initial Statement of Qualifications (SOQs) submitted before or by the deadline of May 14, 2020 will be processed for approval by the Board of Supervisors. SOQs submitted after the initial deadline date of May 14, 2020 will be accepted and, if all minimum qualifications are met, executed upon delegated authority by the Director of the Department.

Question 10: Is it permissible to use an in-house accounting matrix which includes the requested information in the order requested verses form P-2? Our data is lengthy and would be very burdensome to capitulate onto the Form P-2 by hand.

Answer 10: No, please use our required Form P-2 in Appendix B of the RFSQ.

Question 11: The information on P-2 is for the last three years. On the direction for Form P-5, paragraph B1, page 36 it indicates to list all contracts within the past five years. This seems redundant based on the information provided on form P-2. Can you please clarify what additional information you are seeking on Form P-5?

Answer 11: Form P-2 requests services the vendor has provided for **public entities** within the last three years. The information requested on P-5 form is more specific as it requests references to document the vendor's required years of experience as stated in RFSQ Section 1.4. Please complete both P-2 and P-5 required forms. Please also refer to RFSQ, Paragraph 2.6.5, Required Forms, Part B for more information.

Question 12: Form P-2 of the SOQ asks to "List of all public entities for which the Contractor has provided service within the last three (3) years." Does this include private clients/residential?

Answer 12: No. Form P-2 should be used to list public, governmental, entities (i.e., municipal entities, public districts, state, or federal). Please use Form P-5, Page 3 to list references other than public entities (i.e. private/residential).

Question 13: In Form P-2, due to the high number of public contracts in which we have supported, we propose to provide 15 of most relevant contracts in Southern California in the last 3 years. Please confirm this would be responsive to the SOQ requirement.

Answer 13: It is sufficient to list fifteen of your most recent public contracts for Form P-2. Note that references to document the vendor's required experience should also be provided on Form P-5.

Question 14: In Form P-5, item 6 on page 3, due to the high number of contracts, we propose to provide 10 to 15 of our largest, most recent, and most relevant projects of the last 5 years. Please confirm this would be responsive to the SOQ requirement.

Answer 14: You may submit as many references as needed, however please ensure that the years of experience as required in RFSQ Section 1.4 is documented.

Question 15: On Form P-5 itself – please clarify, are you seeking five years or ten years' experience?

Answer 15: Form P-5 requires a minimum of five years of demonstrated experience within the last ten years for the Engineering and Architectural and/or Landscape Architectural

Design categories. You may also refer to RFSQ, Section 1.4 Vendor's Minimum Mandatory Qualifications, for more information.

Question 16: In Form P-5, item 1 on page 1, is the vendor supposed to demonstrate experience exclusively in Harbor/Coastal Engineering, or should requested experience cover all the Engineering Services listed in Section 1.1 Scope of Work, page 2?

Answer 16: The instructions for item 1 on Page 1 of Form P-5 state that the Vendor must provide relevant background information meeting the minimum mandatory qualifications as outlined in RFSQ Section 1.4, **including** those that are bulleted on item 1, Page 1 of Form P-5.

Question 17: Can you please clarify what LA County defines as "coastal area/region"?

Answer 17: A coastal area or region is a land or water area that is directly influenced by its proximity to the ocean. For example, in California, the area is defined by the California Coastal Commission as the "Coastal Zone."

See <https://databasin.org/datasets/ece6ae2d026b43959cfa11cceb2c07ac> for a map of the coastal boundary. The equivalent of this defined area in another state or country is also applicable.

Question 18: Can you be more specific as it relates to relevant "architecture experience" within the "coastal area/region"? What type of experience would the County consider to be satisfactory?

Answer 18: Any architectural-related experience in planning, designing, managing, and/or executing a development project within a coastal area. See Answer 17 for geographic guidance on "coastal area/region".

Question 19: How many Master Agreement contracts will you grant to Prime Consultant firms?

Answer 19: There is no specific number. The RFSQ will remain open continuously to accept SOQs throughout the term of the Master Agreement.

Question 20: Do you know if DBH has a set policy regarding mark-ups for subconsultants/subcontractors?

Answer 20: Please refer to Section 5.2, Contract Sum, of the Sample Contract.

Question 21: Do we need to submit or identify subconsultants at this time or can we submit at the time specific task order RFSQ requests are issued? If subconsultants are requested at this time, can we list multiple firms per discipline for teaming options as it pertains to the specific task order(s) issued over the duration of the contract?

Answer 21: You are not required to submit or identify subconsultants in your initial submittal, however you may, if you chose, include other firms per discipline for teaming options. If selected as a contractor and you wish to propose subconsultants for a Department-issued work order, the subconsultant would be subject to the requirements of Section 8.39 of the Sample Contract.

Question 22: Is there a checklist available, identifying key items or documents to be submitted by Prime Consultant vs. Subconsultant at the time SOQs are due?

Answer 22: No, Vendors are encouraged to read the RFSQ in its entirety to ensure a clear understanding of its requirements and objectives.

Question 23: Are there specific architecture, landscape architecture and/or planning projects that the County expects to work on in the next 2-5 years?

Answer 23: The Department has a variety of capital projects that are underway, such as beach, harbor, and park landscaping improvements, buildings, and facilities.

PART TWO

The information hereunder, specific to the sections discussed below, supersedes any information previously provided as to those sections.

1. RFSQ, Section 2.3, RFSQ Timetable, is deleted from the Request for Statement of Qualifications in its entirety and replaced with the following:

2.3 RFSQ TIMETABLE

The timetable for this RFSQ is as follows:

EVENT	DATE/TIME
Release of RFSQ	April 16, 2020
Request for Solicitation Requirements Review Due	April 30, 2020
Written Questions Due	April 30, 2020, 5:00 p.m., Pacific Standard Time (PST)
Questions and Answers Released	May 7, 2020
SOQs Due	May 21, 2020, 2:00 p.m., PST

SOQ's due by May 21, 2020, 2:00 p.m., PST for initial qualification. The County will continue to accept SOQ's throughout the term of the Master Agreement. SOQ's received after the initial due date will be reviewed at a later date.

2. RFSQ, Section 2.7, SOQ Submission, is deleted from the Request for Statement of Qualifications in its entirety and replaced with the following:

2.7 SOQ SUBMISSION

INITIAL DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF THE SOQ IS May 21, 2020, 2:00 p.m.

The SOQ must be emailed only, in PDF format, by the deadline date and time and delivered as follows:

- Email SOQs to: Contracts@bh.lacounty.gov
- Email shall include the heading: AS-NEEDED HARBOR ENGINEERING
AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN CONSULTING SERVICES RFSQ

Emailed proposals that are time stamped after 2:00 p.m. will be deemed non-responsive and disqualified from further review. Vendors who submit a SOQ by facsimile (fax), mail (USPS mail, FedEx, etc.) will be rejected without review at the County's sole discretion.