May 22, 2020
Questions and Answers No. 1

EXT DBI DBIRFQ2020-06
Event ID 0000003926

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR
As-Needed Consultant Services for Structural Design and Geotechnical Review

To Prospective Responders:

The Request for Qualifications for, EXT DBI DBIRFQ2020-06, As-Needed Consultant Services for Structural Design and Geotechnical Review, is clarified in accordance with the following document, Questions and Answers No. 1.

**Question #1:**

“In ATTACHMENT V: RESPONSE TEMPLATE, under II. Minimum Qualifications, the following certification is required:

“Each Respondent will be required to show evidence of having been in business for at least three (3) years. This can be evidenced by a City Business Tax License, Articles of Incorporation, partnership agreements, written contracts, income tax documents, or other documentation acceptable to the City as evidence of doing business.”

Although I have been a practicing engineer for much longer than three years and have served on SDRTs (now EDRTs) on numerous projects within the City for much of that time, I only became an individual consultant in 2018 and obtained my own business license at that time. As such, as a business entity, I do not have the three-years-in-business required by the qualifications as stated above. Does that disqualify me from submitting a response to DBIRFQ2020-26 that would be deemed as acceptable and qualified for consideration?”

**Answer #1:**

An experienced engineer who has been a sole proprietor for less than 3 years may avail themselves of experience at a prior firm in order to meet the 3-year minimum
Question #2:
“We’re reviewing the subject RFQ and have the following question(s):

The RFQ states that the anticipated not-to-exceed contract budget over the 2-year contract term is $100,000. Please confirm this amount is correct.”

Answer #2:
The anticipated as needed not-to-exceed contract budget is $100,000. Actual contract budget may vary, depending upon service and project needs at the City’s sole and absolute discretion. City will include in a Task Order specific services Consultant shall perform for a particular project. Refer to RFQ summary page, 1st paragraph, last sentence, “The Department does not guarantee that any Consultant prequalified under this RFQ will receive a contract to perform services.”

Question #3:
“The RFQ requires that the geotechnical member of EDRT be a registered Geotechnical Engineer with a GE license. However, this requirement is in direct conflict with Administrative Bulletin AB-082 requirements for geotechnical member of EDRT. AB-082 requires that the geotechnical member of EDRT be a highly experienced professional engineer with a PE license.

Please consider revising the GE license requirement to allow for highly experienced / highly educated engineers with PE license with name recognition and expertise in geotechnical earthquake engineering and foundation design from academia and industry to be able to continue supporting the SFDBI with geotechnical peer review services.”

Answer #3:
The geotechnical member of EDRT shall be a registered Geotechnical Engineer with a GE license in California, or a registered Civil Engineer with a CE license in California with highly experienced and expertise in geotechnical earthquake engineering and foundation design as prescribed in SFBC AB-082.

Question #4:
“This question is in regard to DBIRFQ2020-26 – As-Needed Consultant Services for Structural Design and Geotechnical Review.

Attachment V, Page 6 of 13 indicates that the respondent is required to have been in business for at least three years. Our firm was recently formed within the past two years, and so, does not meet this requirement. However, several of our partners have been practicing for more than 20 years and meet, or exceed, all other requirements, including review of low-and high-rise buildings in San Francisco. Will DBI consider waving the three year in business requirement so as not to exclude qualified proposers?”

Answer #4:
See response to Question #1.
Question #5:
“Our firm would like to submit multiple individuals for consideration for structural engineer. Should we submit a separate package for each person, or can we submit a combine package that includes relevant answers and CVs for each individual but does not duplicate the firm information?

If the stay-at-home San Francisco ordinance has not been lifted for office buildings by the response due date will it be acceptable to only submit electronically and will the RFQ issue an addendum as such?”

Answer #5:
Each individual who is qualified for consideration for the structural engineer shall submit separate package that includes relevant answers, CV’s of the individual and the firm information.

Hard copies and USB are still required and are due by June 12, 2020.

Question #6:

a) RFQ Section 4.3, Client references, requires three (3) references. RFQ Attachment V, response template, includes space for two (2) prior project descriptions. Is the minimum requirement to include three (3) prior project descriptions, consistent with the number of references?

b) RFQ Section 4.3, Client references, requires three (3) references. There does not appear to be a designated area for the references in the description of the response package (RFQ Section 4.2). Is it acceptable to include the three references in Part B, Letter of Interest?

c) RFQ Section 4.1 asks for electronic copies of Attachments I-V to be saved to the USB drive as separate, individual files. Should they also be included in the electronic copies of Response Package parts A, B, C which include the same attachments within them?

d) RFQ Section 4.2, Response Package, identifies three parts to the response package (A, B and C). For the hardcopy submittal, should each part be separately bound?

e) RFQ Section 4.2, Response Package, identifies three parts to the response package (A, B and C). It appears that RFQ Attachment V, Response Template, is included in each part. Is this intentional to facilitate review, or should it be submitted only once in hardcopy format (if so, in which section)?

f) RFQ Attachment II, CMD forms, requires that CMD forms be submitted in a separate sealed envelope, whereas RFQ Section 4, Response Requirements, suggests they are incorporated in the response package. Is it acceptable to submit (4) hardcopies of the CMD forms in one sealed envelope as part of the package rather than incorporate the in Part B as suggested in RFQ Section 4?

g) This event in the supplier online portal states, “To ensure that your bid is successfully placed, please review the attachments and submit the required documents.” with a ”Place Bid” button. Is it required that we submit our Proposal via this supplier portal as well as submitting hardcopies?

Answer #6:

a) The applicants shall include three prior project descriptions in response to each reference.
b) The client references shall be included in Attachment V, Response Template for ‘Prior Project Description’.

c) All documents shall be included in the USB drive.

d) All documents shall be put in one binder for each individual applicant.

e) All documents shall be submitted in hard copy format and in the USB drive.

f) The proposer must submit the following CMD forms in a separate sealed envelope marked “CMD Forms” with the proposal.

g) Do not submit via supplier portal. Submit your responses hard copy directly to DBI at the address provided.

Question #7:
   a) Given the current shelter-in-place mandate, may we submit the proposal electronically instead of hard copies and USB?

   b) Our firm would like to submit multiple Structural Engineers for consideration. May we include more projects to demonstrate the experience of our staff. If not, how should we demonstrate the qualifications of multiple engineers from our team so that each may be deemed qualified?

Answer #7:
See answer to Question #5.

Question #8:
   a) Confirming that the scope of the structural engineer’s review would be as required by Administrative Bulletin AB-082 2018?

   b) Are there other types of structural reviews that the City would request?

   c) Does SF DBI anticipate focusing on any building types in particular?

   d) Can a firm as Respondent put forth three licensed structural engineers in one submission, or would each individual licensed structural engineer need to submit separately as Respondents?

   e) If we’ve recently (in 2020) provided CMD Forms and First Source Hiring forms to the City, is it necessary to resubmit these forms?

   f) Given the pandemic, is it still necessary to submit responses as hard copies and USB flash drive by 6/12/2020 @ 1 pm?

Answer #8:

   a) Confirm

   b) Projects incorporating exceptions to the prescriptive provisions of the SFBC, and at the discretion of the Director of the Department of Building Inspection.

   c) Any building types that fall under the review requirements in AB-082.
d) See answer to Question #5.

e) The proposer must submit copies of the following CMD forms and first Source Hiring Forms.

f) Yes, please submit your responses as hard copies and USB flash drive by deadline as instructed in RFQ.