

# MWDOC Seismic Retrofit Project

## RFP Questions and Answers

1. Is the original engineer for the preliminary study (IDS Group) precluded from submitting an RFP for this scope and being selected?
  - a. No. MWDOC is also not predisposed to awarding the contract to the original engineer.
2. Please acknowledge: the contract awardee will be the responsible DROP/SEOR, so that IDS Group's preliminary studies are information only, correct?
  - a. Yes, the study is informational. Structural design is to meet an ASCE 41-13 (S-2) Damage Control Structural Performance level which will be the responsibility of the Engineer of Record.
3. Which will control the voluntary seismic improvements scope: the specified structural performance criteria with strengthening to be confirmed by a newly selected SEOR, or the IDS specified scope?
  - a. The objective of the retrofit project is to improve the building to perform structurally at a level that considers re-occupancy of the building within a relatively short period of time (S-2) for an event causing a PGA of .42g at the site (based upon USGS M8.0 San Andreas Shakeout Scenario modeling); and Life-Safety (S-3) Performance Level for an event causing a PGA of .79g at the site (based upon USGS M7.4 Newport-Inglewood scenario). As such, S-2 is on a continuum between S-3 and S-1 and IDS recommended improvements should be representative of the level of retrofitting needed. If the Engineer of Record for the structural improvements recommends alternative retrofits, they will be acceptable providing those retrofits compare favorably to the replacement cost of the building (or relocation to a new building outside of a liquefaction zone).
4. Please confirm that this will be a T&M professional services agreement.
  - a. As stated on page 4 of the RFP 'The successful firm will be awarded a contract with a not to exceed price based on hourly rates and a schedule of fees to be provided with the proposal.' The schedule can include contingencies and lowest bidder is not a guarantee of contract award; but consideration is given to thoroughness, knowledge of Orange County seismic issues, and demonstrated experience successfully working with other public agencies on seismic retrofit projects of this type.
5. There are a lot of moving parts, so that the scope may not be well defined in some areas. Consequently, the assumed effort could vary widely based on assumptions made by different proposers. How will the proposed estimated cost & rates with related effort (i.e. budgets) be used in the selection criteria?
  - a. See previous.
6. Who takes professional responsibility for the HVAC addition scope & Fire Department approvals indicated as nearing plan check completion?
  - a. The HVAC replacement at the Mission Viejo location is the contractor's responsibility and the scope does NOT include any structural improvements to the Mission Viejo location as the current building is unlikely to meet the needed performance level. We intend to simply replace the existing 2-stage HVAC unit and mount it to a concrete pad and add some flexible couplings. The seismic bracing of the fire suppression system for the Fountain Valley location will need to be sub-contracted to an Engineer certified to make such changes and take them through Fire Department approval.
7. Has a geotechnical report been prepared for each address? If not, should that scope be included or excluded from the proposed budget in the event that its required for plan check approval?
  - a. Only non-structural improvements are planned for the Mission Viejo location for which the plans have been completed, stamped and approved by the city. A geotechnical

# MWDOC Seismic Retrofit Project

## RFP Questions and Answers

report was completed for a 2-story laboratory for OC Water District located within 75 feet of the MWDOC Fountain Valley administration building.

8. Construction Management & Inspection: is MWDOC asking for a brief “plan” only, or are they asking the proposers to hire any necessary inspection companies? How should the inspection scope be determined without a completely defined scope or MWDOC’s input on their specific requirements?
  - a. MWDOC is looking for an Owner’s Representative to insure the seismic improvements are implemented as designed which includes actual inspection of the design elements.
9. Is MWDOC looking for Construction Management services from the DPOR, or simply Construction Administration?
  - a. Construction administration and verification that design elements are properly executed (Owners Representative).
10. What is the expected expenditure for this contract?
  - a. RFP Attachment D Table 2 (page 20 of 23) shows IDS Opinion of Probable Cost for structural & non-structural retrofit elements meeting an S-2 building performance level for a 475 year return event (amber colored cell including items a,b,c,d, & f ) at \$500,000. However, that did not include the additional costs to brace the fire suppression system or final design and project management costs. This was a rough order of magnitude estimate. Another metric is the retrofit costs for the building need to compare favorably to relocating to a new building outside of a liquefaction zone.
11. Are the following excluded from the page count: covers, cover letter, dividers, resumes?
  - a. Yes
12. How many references should be provided?
  - a. At minimum 3 (that are recent – i.e. within the last 3 years) Older references can be submitted but depend on the ability to contact and discuss the previous project with someone who worked on the referenced project.
13. Can MWDOC provide a percentage (%) weight for each selection criteria listed on page 11? Or should we assume the item listed first will have a higher point value than those listed below and so on?
  - a. We believe they are all important and need to be considered in the final evaluation.
14. Per item 5.1 (the evaluation will recommend one or more firms to fulfill the requirements of this RFP), it appears that more than one firm may be awarded the contract. If more than one firm is selected, how will tasks be assigned?
  - a. This is to allow for multiple approaches to getting the bid package completed and the inclusion of the fire suppression system design component.
15. When is the deadline for questions?
  - a. End of the day on Monday August 13, 2018 to allow time for response and posting to the web site.
16. Will the MWDOC post all questions and answers to your website?
  - a. All questions that are not already answered in the Request for Proposals.
17. How many meetings with users are needed? Is this something we can determine or do you have a set number? What is the availability like?
  - a. We would require at the minimum; a kick off meeting, at least one progress meeting prior to 60% review submittal, and a 100% review meeting. The number of meetings and permit review cycles with the City of Fountain Valley Building Department and City of Fountain Valley Fire Department are dependent upon the proposers expertise with getting plans through plan check.

# MWDOC Seismic Retrofit Project

## RFP Questions and Answers

18. Can work in both buildings happen concurrently? Where is the “empty chair”?
  - a. Yes, the bid package will specify that work can occur concurrently. Please define ‘empty chair’.
19. What are the operational impacts? What is the flow on the site and what areas can be used for staging? What required limitations might be present that are not explicitly stated in the RFP?
  - a. The bid package will specify that the scheduling of work in the Fountain Valley building will need to be coordinated as it will remain occupied. The Mission Viejo location is normally not staffed. Portions of the Fountain Valley parking lot are available for staging as well as some of the conference rooms. The Mission Viejo location has a separate locked truck garage, parking lot, and the building interior for staging.
20. When does the work need to be complete?
  - a. The deadline for completion of the bid package is to be determined, but is highly dependent upon permit review process with the City of Fountain Valley. The bid package will specify a defined period for completion of the work.
21. Are there any consultants that the District prefers not to use? All sub consultants must be approved by the District prior to use
  - a. This is a prevailing wage project. All plans will be stamped by professionals with valid license(s) from the State of California for the relevant work.
22. Is a continuous on-site presence needed? This is linked to the schedule and operational impacts.
  - a. No, the bid documents will condition the contractor to have a project superintendent/supervisor who is primarily responsible for managing and coordinating day-to-day production and schedule adherence on the project. The bid documents will then require the project superintendent to provide notification for inspection of the completed work prior to acceptance.
23. Is there a target budget? Reference is made to one, but I didn’t see it. Rough costs of work from consultant provided in Attachment D pages 20-21
  - a. See Addendum #1 Question #10